
Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We'll be starting the meeting now, is there anyone else on the line. Sida, are you there? Nope, no Sida. Well, I heard Seth join, so Seth are you muted?

Seth Greene: Yes, hi Cheryl, good morning.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I was going to say, please identify yourself, otherwise they'll think I'm crazy; I'm talking to myself as an alter ego. Now there is a voice out there called Seth! Excellent, terrific, okay, well, welcome one and all to the ultimate event, in terms of the last one of a long week, for the At Large community and the ALAC. Traditionally for several meetings now, we've held an Executive Committee meeting, which is normally "What do we still need to do" and "What do we need to allocate to people to do in the next week or ten days". But we have blown that agenda away and we are following on business which was well worthwhile the conversation that was coming when we had Kevin in the FY11 budget, which he can now say is passed.

So, it gives a great sense of, you know, doneness. And [Mandy] is with us because we don't have a budget, as in At Large. ALAC and At Large do not have a budget. David's department has the budget and we have some vague mechanism to try and get a small piece of the shrinking cake. So very much what happens is that it ends up too hard when requests come through from the regions because nobody knows what form to fill out, or who to put in what sort of line of agreements, and who needs to decide on what. [Mandy], being of the partnerships and we've had very profitable discussions with [Mandy] in the past, about how we can use ourselves and our resources, because we are out there on the edges, on the ground, relatively capable and trustworthy, especially if you give us a script and a talk-it to follow.

So we can be of use to you, and we certainly believe that that would be increasing the profile of ICANN in all right places and in all the right ways. I probably should remind you both that the At Large community specifically the leadership of the At Large community has brought in, in our short time, new members to the GAC and new members to the ccNSO. So we are not just building ourselves, we are building the organization more broadly. And let's note Barbara Clay's apologies. There apparently is some requirement to have communications people with you when you do press conferences. I don't understand it, but apparently, seeing as the board is doing press conferences, it's probably wise that she is there with

them and not with us; but she does intend to have a follow up call and meet with us. But we'll have got the money and the management talking done today. That's always a good start! We can work out what the pretty colors are and what the words will say later.

Female: You can do the message afterward!

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, yeah. I think we all know what the message needs to be, it's just "How do we actually do it?" So, where do we begin? Kevin?

Kevin Wilson: Hello!

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hello.

Kevin Wilson: I think, at least someone on the phone is in the morning, so I wasn't allowed to say good afternoon, right? One thing I just wanted to make a point of clarity that I spoke with David Olive and Heidi and Matthias earlier; and I think in the prior meeting on the budget I said there was an open position and I think one of your members pointed out that there was only, you know it wasn't listed as an open position. So I think they've targeted someone who is now in the consulting. So I won't spill the thunder on that, but I think it is someone that is already working with us that uh –

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You've got to move the deck chairs.

Kevin Wilson: From a professional services line to the personnel.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I hope it is someone we like or this is going to be painful.

Kevin Wilson: And there is someone, there are other movements afoot that David or Heidi can, you know, I don't want to. But from a budget standpoint, yes, there are slots planned for that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: In addition to us becoming to capacity?

Kevin Wilson: From the framework to the draft, there was an increase in the budget. That's the point I was making the other day and that's true too. I won't communicate more than that, other than there might be some communications about more than that that were being discussed. So it's not my role to say how that might play out and how there might be extra

support for At Large. And then I just wanted to, you told us when the right time was, I wanted to explain the change that happened in the budget from the open forum. Yesterday was a very busy day for finance and Doug in brokering. So I wanted to explain that process if I could, so now is a good time?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, let's. Good.

Kevin Wilson: I think one of the loud and clear messages is what you just said earlier, which is, we don't know where in that budget, which is longer and longer and more and more details, and for some reason we were not getting loud applause on "Gee, we've been asking for more details". Thank you very much. We've been asking for more details – the community has been asking for more details on the budget and we've been working very hard with Heidi.

How much time did you spend on our budget this year, a lot right, on drafting in the community, on drafting and adding numbers and working on templates and trying to figure out the process and synthesizing comments? We did all this work for the budget and we weren't getting this loud "Hoorah" of praise for "You finally heard us, that we needed more information, we're gonna do that". We heard "Oh, we see that you worked really hard, but we don't see the data that we need to have to convince us that you are doing what we want to do".

Now, what's interesting, and this is the point that Doug was making (I guess he said this in the board meeting, not in the open forum) was that staff was saying "Well you're not telling us what you need." Was it Sylvia, and there were a couple of people actually in the meeting the other day, we weren't hearing – I'm saying, "Tell me what you need; tell me, do you need a meeting, do you need a phone call, do you need a consultant for 12 hours a week? Tell me specifically what you need." And so that, we need a translation cost, interpretation in the five UN languages and accounting language too! So that's kind of where we are.

So I think Steve Metalitz and Avri and Marilyn voiced it more strongly for all, I think, really in that open forum. And Peter picked up on it and said "You gotta broker a deal right then, you gotta figure out what they need and do we need to tweak the budget at the last minute?" I think Sylvia could have done it, and I think anybody could have said the same thing as strongly in the open forum and they would have come to the same

conclusion, they needed to have something specific. And so the message has been, this is the way, I'll try to be as brief as I can but it is still fresh, so it might be a little long winded, so take the hook out if you need to. So the message is "We need more details of the budget in the way that we think." That's one point.

In the specific situation of constituency support, which was discussed in, which in my mind is the first one, but I think it is really a model and a paradigm for all, in the constituency support, that includes Heidi, Matthias, Glenn, in addition to registry and registrar support, those folks. I'm using people's names probably because you know them best rather than saying "Meeting two, room 201." But it is the same model, right, that we use for budget purposes. So we have, so the constituency support was heavily edited and crafted by Time and Craig, if that helps.

So the registry support and the registrar support, they crafted that section most, so therefore it looks like a registry and registrar support document. But if you look at the detailed spreadsheets, it includes time for secretariat support, communication support for all groups, right? So therefore, it is the exercise to just re-draft those documents and throw the word At Large in there, and throw in the word ccNSO and throw in, I think that's maybe something we could have done better on that. But I think the real issue is, how do we?

One is, are we unfairly supported and I think that is the message I'm hearing. What's interesting is every single budget meeting I'm going to, I'm hearing "There is this huge budget and this huge section of the budget, but I only get a very small amount so the other guys or gals are getting all these budget dollars." So that's one common theme I'm getting through. So if I add it all up, it sounds like we're hiding money or something like that.

And as you know, we are not, we are really very accountable and transparent and well-audited. So what that means is that there are all these shared resources concept; so everything is for everybody. The bottom line is, what the brokered deal was, in the late July timeframe, I am to lead an effort, and I'm starting with those three that I mentioned from the gNSO, the non-contracted side, to and just because they were the most vocal in that meeting. But I think I should have the same exercise and Sylvia wanted to give me her specifics, and Tijani also wanted, he met

with me this morning, he wants to give me his list and make sure it's clear; and Heidi, I know you and Matthias will circulate that as well.

So we need to get that list of what the requests are, but I think the first step is this, number one, that we will put together in each section, the particular constituency's support, we'll say what the specific things are, direct things are, that are in there. Now, it won't be any surprise for those of you who know ICANN's books if constituency support is four million dollars, I don't remember what it is right now but if it's \$4 million, we might find direct \$700,000.

A very small portion of that are actually things that people go "Oh, I know what that is." I'm not talking about people, but very specific things; registrar data escrow is \$450,000. Those kinds of things, there are a relatively small amount of those, most of it is a shared resource concept. So the first thing we'll do is put the direct things, we'll put them explicitly there; we'll probably post them on the website for everybody to see the specific things.

The second thing is, we'll then say "Here is a process", a form or I like your idea of having a requisition form that says "we want X. We want X meeting, we want X travel support, we want X consultant, we want a bridge, we want extra translations", whatever thing that translates into a requisition, not just "We want equitable and fair." We want to translate the comments that are coming in from "We want equitable treatment and fairness and acknowledge of "fill in the blank." In their case, NCUC, or IPC, or BC, what's BC called?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Non-contracted user house.

Kevin Wilson: Anyway, whatever, I call them BC, they are Marilyn's group. Sorry. So they will come in with specific things that identify it. My expectation is, and this was part of the resolution and part of that discussion that happened last night, but my expectation is that they will, that that should be open to all, that all groups would have the same thing. So if you need a RALO meeting or if you need an extra set of conference calls, or if you need to have a fact-based study that is X, you would put that in there. So, the thought is "Well, that's great for FY12, but what about FY11?" So the thought is that we'll initiate this by the end of July, early August, we'll post that, we'll have that available. Will we be able to increase the budget and have all the things that you all want? No.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Unless we start printing it!

Kevin Wilson: I thought about that. We won't be able to do that. But, I believe that most of the requests are really small, efficient type things. Meaning, labor allocation; maybe there's more labor in different groups; or it could be just a little travel support for one meeting or a little outreach. I'm not hearing loud cries of "I need to have twenty more people, or ten more people." So it seems like, we'll see the requests and then we'll process that, and I have a feeling within that range, we'll be able to prioritize it. Do you want to jump in, oh of course, I think it was three or four points, I got through two.

Female: Okay, but in addition to that requisition list, is there also going to be a process set out as well, as well as an element of redress of how, let's say you know, you turn it down, can the community member then come back? Will there be a set up process spelled out?

Kevin Wilson: Will the process be set out, that's what you are saying. So let me, like I said this is still, I have not written this, I've just heard this and kind of participated in the discussion. So I think step one, we put up the list of things that are sort of direct costs. Oh, I know what that is, that's a meeting. Oh, I know what that is, and that's for me, that's something specific for me. Not an ICANN meeting; you already know that that's in the budget but a special meeting that's targeted for "My group. Two is, we'll have a form and a process that would say "We want to have - do you have a question?"

Okay, so the second thing is we'll have, say, a requisition form that would say if you want to have X specific project then that will be submitted for consideration. At that time, we're obviously going to approve very quickly, very quickly we'll approve items that have no budget issues. There are many, many suggestions in the list that had no real significant budget impact; so what we did, if you look at my comments in section C, it says something like "Passed on to executive or board for consideration." So if it was reallocate Heidi's time from this meeting to that meeting or something like that, that's not a budget issue, that's just a reallocation.

If there is a budget issue, we'll have some sort of discussion. Obviously if there are a hundred suggestions like that, then it is going to have a budget impact and we'll have to reconsider that. So that's two, I think. Then three and this is the part that is really, this will be a learning process; this

one and two will be a learning process, and three, we will then be set up for FY12 in a much, much more constructive and powerful way. Did I lose you?

Female: No, you haven't lost me.

Kevin Wilson: And here's the reason why. Number three is setting us up for FY12, the budget development process, where we will talk with ASOs and ACs and their subgroups and whatever members and that's to be determined, who those are, and reach out to them in say, September, and say "We want you to be in our budget information process." And then you're involved in September, and then hopefully by Cartagena, the process will be much more evolved. Instead of waiting until March so that you can respond to a framework. So that was more long-winded, I probably could have succinctly said that in about three minutes if I was tighter, but I hopefully get the general gist of where it is heading.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, we've had introduction, I think it is important that we give the community and anyone on the line an opportunity to clarify and make sure they understand exactly what you are talking about. So first of all, to open the floor, has anyone got any questions or clarifications that you'd like to explore no. Go ahead, thank you Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I guess I can't tell you how delighted I am, that essentially what we are talking about here is a view of the budget with the categories that are meaningful to the support organization or the AC; although I'm not predicting it will happen, we may well find that there are items there that when we see the price of it, we may decide that's not our priority. We may decide that simultaneous interpretation on some level of conference calls is not worth the \$10,000 calls, but we would prefer to do that.

You know, use that for regional assemblies, to use a thought that we've never had before. I'm not predicting that, but that's an example of what may well happen, so I look forward to that. I reacted very negatively to one thing you said; you said, in reference to the registrars' constituency, that – I'm sorry, I've lost the word now – that the capturing of registrar data and sending it off to Iron Mountain, the escrow, thank you. I would not consider that a registrar constituency support item, I would consider that part of our core business that we're in.

So I would worry if that is part of the \$4 million that are deemed to be registrar, registry, or gNSO support. I mean the gNSO could be abolished tomorrow and you still have to do that. So I worry about, maybe we'll learn something in these categories. So that's one kind of thing. The other thing, going back to Avri and Marilyn were asking for

Kevin Wilson: I need a pen; I want to remember all your thoughts –

Alan Greenberg: If I could get the pen out of my pocket, I would.

Kevin Wilson: Kathy, in an internet environment when no one has a piece of paper.

Alan Greenberg: I don't think anyone denies that there are costs in running the gNSO that are shared among the constituencies and should be apportioned to them. The comment about equitable, or I gather initially in the discussion, it was equal treatment, that there be some level of allocation that is available for each of the constituents, your stakeholder group, or advisory committees to use with a little bit of discretion or at least to fund their own secretariat or whatever it is.

I think what the user house saw in the budget presentation is that, yes there were gNSO things but it was divided into two categories: general gNSO support, which is shared among all of us, Glenn supports everyone for the policy staff; and registrar/registry activities. There were no things identified as activities for the other stakeholder groups; and that's where the eyes bugged out and said is this fair. Ultimately, it's not clear that the non-commercial stakeholders want a tutorial on intra-registrar transfer and some of these items may not be applicable. But you want to be able to break it down and understand, and see that you are getting at least a little slice of the pie for your own use, as opposed to the general good of the gNSO community or something else.

Kevin Wilson: Just to respond to a couple of them, and I think I'm only going to get two of them right now. One is, you want to see that list to see if it's worth it. So I want to be clear that this is not, staff is going to develop another list of items that would be considered. The idea is the community, in this case, what's communicated is that constituency support the community would see what's there and first of all, realize that it is a very small list that is targeted. Most things are general, and we will describe some of the general ones, so most of them, very few of them would be targeted.

But the community would propose items as opposed to here's a menu list; next year this might change, but I'm talking about for FY11, hey, I want to have a regional assembly in Cartagena or in the February meeting, or whatever, and here's how much it's going to cost and what do you think of that? Does that make sense? So we have to be careful I'm not setting myself up for delivering a menu of items that you'd be considering. It's rather a process by which we would consider – you can finish my sentence, as you usually do – that you would provide, we are providing a process to ask for things so that they can be considered, reviewed, and ultimately decided on whether we implement.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry, I thought there was a question mark and a pause before. I think what we're looking for, and you're coming pretty close to describing it, is equivalent to what happened with the gNSO in this fiscal budget. That is, they know they are going to have to do a number of studies or similar things; \$400,000 was the final number, I'm not sure, was allocated, and they will then have the ability, in conjunction with staff, in deciding what is the right use of that money.

Knowing that there is a ceiling, it's not unlimited. They don't have to spend it, but if there are appropriate things that they try to prioritize them. And we're looking for a similar thing. We can then debate if \$400,000 or \$22 is the right amount, and we can then have the debate of how do we do value judgments on should the money be spent on any given particular item. But we shouldn't be having to go into the whole budget process because, to use an example that was raised at one of our earlier meetings, we need another 50 copies of a brochure printed out for our regional meeting.

And we literally spent 15 minutes this meeting because there were only 15 copies of a Spanish brochure printed out and they were planning to have a meeting with 30 people at. And that's not what any of us should be wasting our time on. Of course some of the numbers will be bigger, but that's the kind of thing you waste time on if there is no process.

Kevin Wilson: And then the second thing, you mentioned about the registrar data escrow. So we use the term RDE -- Registrar Data Escrow; when that gets translated into a document, it looks like registrar, oh; it's a tag to registrar constituency. Therefore, as you pointed out, it should be talked about in every single meeting that I don't know; maybe At Large was the author of

that concept. So that's a really, really ICANN thing. That is not a registrar issue.

[Avri]: You can read this, as there is a risk of the business often. They contribute with saying part of this money will to reduce their risks, so it is a registrar issue, a registrar issue. So it is a budget for them. I can read easily in that way. We have a business here, and in our group there is a huge risk in some place. So, we got this part of our money, I put in ICANN to reserve or reduce our risk in front of the population, from our clients in general. So, becomes a registrar budget.

Kevin Wilson: Let me make sure I understand, it is in the registrar budget.

[Avri]: No, because -

Kevin Wilson: It's in the registrar, in the ICANN world, it is in the registrar, Tim Cole and his group manages that budget. And I would argue, it is in the constituency part of the budget and it says registrar, but maybe we should call it data escrow, that's the point I was making and the point that was made last night. That really is a benefit; it's not for the registrars that we are forcing them to do data escrow. It is for the protection of the internet and it is for the registrants.

Alan Greenberg: Can I try? This is in an area that I feel moderately strongly about. Data escrow is a registrar issue, and I don't mind it being listed as such as in the budget. But it is not a registrar constituency issue. The registrar constituency can have a vote and say, "We trust you other guys, we do not need to be involved in policy discussions at all; we turned back the travel budget you were giving us, we're not showing up at meetings anymore."

You still have a data escrow issue; you still have to pay Tim Cole to manage the process of dealing with the registrars, even if the registrar constituency, even if the registrar constituency turns in their bold cards. In my mind, there is a big difference between registrar constituency and a registrar issue, which is one of the core businesses we are in now.

Kevin Wilson: Okay, so that leads to my next point, which is, it is really hard, it is very, very challenging from an accounting, bookkeeping and budgeting standpoint, to characterize these in a way that lands well with any group. And to say with everyone is almost incomprehensible. So I just wanted to communicate that. So we are going to make a step, that is what we

negotiated last night, to address the issue of the perception that, because of the way we wrote it and used the words registrar registrar, registry registry in that section, to address that we are going to show what things that we think are for a specific group; that are for registrars, that are for registries.

Then you'll see \$4 million, \$800,000 or whatever it is, and it's associated with the specific things. I think it's inevitable you get asked the question "Well, where is the rest of the money, what is the rest of the money being spent on?" And then we'll get into the cost accounting and other areas that will be of interest. So I really am saying that not because I think it's hard, I'm saying that to set the expectations that when – I forget her name, from GoDaddy – spoke and said "Where's my line item budget?"

If we go into detail for a section, you're not going to have a bunch of line items and then pick a menu of items. It just won't work that way. Unless you think the way we're currently thinking. So that leads to my next point, which is how do we present the budget? Several years ago, you know, when I started, we had an accounting budget; so we think in terms of departments and cost codes, travel, meetings, things like that.

Then we decided the Board Finance Committee and others, we need to think like a functional, we need to think new gTLDs, contractual compliance, that sort of thing. So we started doing functional budget and that's what we're really talking about. Last year, there was a huge outcry that we needed this particular rule related to Gs vs. Cs, but it was an ALAC as well. We needed to have a customer oriented budget and I use the work customer in italics because there are not customers, but constituents.

So we had to come up with a way, so we used the organizational structure of ICANN on the second, almost front page of the website, and we came up with the Gs, Cs, ALAC, RSAC, you know the org chart and we allocated the resources, we showed a view of that. It was not a line item budget within those items; it was a reformulated, reconstituted budget to show that way. So we're, I think there is another challenge that will happen, which is that some people want to see how much money we spend on, say, the new gTLDs, or on security, and other people will want to know how much we spend on ALAC and SSAC.

You see the challenges we have? It is a matrix organization. And I don't want to make everyone a cost accounting PhD -- I'd love it if they did!

But I know that's not realistic, so I have that challenge in a bottom-up state. It is easy to do a matrix organization when you own the company and you have a CEO or a hierarchical structure where now, we are bottom up. So if people come in on one element of that matrix and then another one comes in under the other element of the matrix, we have an inherent disconnect. So I am working out those problems, and that's the challenge that our accounting department has every day as we try to come up with these reports.

We are able to now show these views so that at least the dialogue is there and the discussions are there we'll make progress on that. But I wanted to share my pain and our pain, the finance department's pain, in that process in the hopes that maybe we will come up with an organizational structure. I've heard that our management structure will be held accountable to reconcile this, so I'm very optimistic that it will happen in the next year or two, and I think your wise input into that will really help in that process. So I just wanted to share that, those were my thoughts coming in and I wanted to share those.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Kevin. I dragged up a piece of history because I'd like to sort of look at beyond the analysis that we all need, so that we can all work out what is in, what is out, and how much we need to share. We had a mention of a process. In 2007, in June, was when the At Large Advisory Committees' finance and budget subcommittee proposed to the department that we are a needful child of a mechanism by which the regions and the at large structures could, in a fair, equitable, and global way, sort out their requirements in a projection that could fit into a budget in any given year. Now that's ancient history.

But what I'm saying is, we've been desirous of having a structure that says to the ALSs, early on in the fiscal development you need to plug into bigger budgets. Each region would like the following; they know they can't have it all in one year because that won't work, so they've worked out this run order; or they've worked out that what they would like is to have a figure "fill in dotted line here" that allows them to send leadership to regional and local IGFs or meetings that are meaningful in global partnerships criteria for ICANN to be present at.

That type of thing, we've got shared aims, shared benefits, and shared knowledge of the fact that you can say, Mr. Jones, Yurenkevic, Kazbekistan, we're having a meeting in Kazbekistan, could you go and

represent your ALS. And we can at least put them up in a hotel room. To speak on behalf of Tijani, which I promised him I would, we have the African region and his particular grouping with an already accepted, green-tagged workshop for the IGF.

Now this is level partnership's business to deal with IGF, but you don't even know about it. I'm quite sure you don't know that there is another part of ICANN; well we believe we are another part of ICANN, putting stuff in to things you are already involved with. We've got to start finding a mechanism; not just a dashboard to share reporting, but a place to share planning; a place to say who is doing what and what their particular priorities are.

Our priorities are outreach and inreach, and when you talk about regional general assemblies and those sorts of things, and there the children have to fight it out and work out who goes first and who goes third and the lot, that's okay, we can do that. But there's the inreach part which that is all about, and coming to these meetings is part of the inreach. The outreach is twofold. It is to expand, as we need to, if we are going to be globally representative, we do need in our totally biased view, to have one At Large Structure per country.

We don't really need, is it 8 or 9 in Germany? It's a huge number of At Large Structures in Germany. Yeah. And that's fine, and that's great; but I'm most concerned about getting double figures in countries than just one in most countries, particularly emerging economies in developing worlds. And to do that you have to grow it by sending someone, very much like NomCom. So if there was a TLD meeting, if there was a NIC meeting, if there was another useful meeting in the internet ecosystem going on, that's the time that they might be able to spend two days and go there. But we don't want to fly them from Brussels to the middle of Asia.

We want to get them from Hong Kong to somewhere close. Until we've got a shared space, which is why I was going to have [Mandy] here, then we can't even start guessing on what the dollar amount. I mean, you know how much, pretty much by formula, it costs to send person A from here to here. We can do that budgeting; we can fill out that paperwork. But can we get to that point where there is sufficient self determination at the regional level or at the ALAC level, don't particularly care, but at some level where they know at any given year, they can make a request and be

fairly confident that they have got an allocation of “fill in the dotted line” for these agreed activities.

Now it doesn't mean that you can go off to do things that don't go through approval; it doesn't mean that you go off to – yeah, but it gives some sense of assurity so the Tijanis of the world don't work hard, get somewhere, get accepted, and then aren't even able to get covered to do the presentation when all he is trying to do is make us look good. Go ahead.

Kevin Wilson: Thank you Cheryl. So the challenge, that's great, that all makes 100% sense. So the challenge is, what's the structure? What is the organizational structure? We do not have a vice president of At Large.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We've got a director of one.

Kevin Wilson: I mean, we don't have a budget center all that large.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's undebated.

Kevin Wilson: We have a policy department and we have an IT department and we have a finance department, and I'm trying to think of who else. We have a meetings team, these are all, you know, so for you to understand the way our current structure works, would require you to understand 25 departments and say “Gee I'd like to request a meeting.” That means I have to go to Stacy and Nick and people like that; and by the way I need food for there, so I'm going to have to ask Steve, because he has the admin person that has the catering, and I need to go, I could go on and on explaining that.

And so we're not organized the way that, as you, as a leader. And the reason why we're not, there is a history, I'm sure you who have been around a lot longer than I have know that, is because Theresa, she was really the kind of germ for the whole EAG reporting, that opening treatise, is that it's all one, like the internet, so to try to become a pay for service type thing is a mistake. It's heading down the wrong road. I sense that ICANN is coming to the place that it will head that way. But I don't know, that is heard to say.

And whether it is organized by ALAC, SSAC, RSAC, the way the organizational structure is now, or whether it is organized by key activities: security, contractual compliance, the way our functional

reporting is, or some other organizational structure, or some mixture of that, I don't know. And that is the part, from an accounting standpoint, my goal is to reflect the organization so to the extent that we screw up, it's because we're pretty good at following the organization. The organizational structure is challenged.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Screwed up.

Kevin Wilson: So it's a very challenging thing, where the rubber meets the road with accounting. I really like your idea of having a requisition and it gets approved and, compared to a budget, but until you have a leader of that or a department of that, it won't happen. You could go to Heidi right now and say "Could I get money for travel support?" or David, I guess you could give it to Heidi and Matthias, and they would bring it to Dave, to give travel support, we're gonna give X. And it might be in her budget, or it might not be in her budget in that department. Anyway, I'm rambling.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You are rambling. That's partly the point. We could do that, but the facts are, Heidi doesn't have a budget. David has a budget. Heidi doesn't have a budget. David's budget includes Heidi and the team. So we need to start fresh, and I think we should do it from a shared knowledge, shared resources, shared opportunity point of view. And at the moment, the best fit we see with what we want to do, and I believe you'll find business constituency will be wanting to do this too. I think other parts of ICANN will be wanting to do this too because they are looking at outreach and inreach opportunities too.

They want to further, they want to get people to come to NomCom appointments; they want to do various things - doesn't matter whether you're me or Marilyn, if there is some sort of a theme of what the "in" game is trying to be. And the natural fit is with global partnerships at this stage. We are more likely to be wanting to do similar things in the same places; but we have no mechanism of talking to each other, which is a little bit scary. Just before I go to you –

Kevin Wilson: This is a really quick question. This is wonderful, do you have the list?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Every single year we have produced the list, and it goes to Heidi and it goes to Heidi and then it goes to whatever black hole; apparently it doesn't actually get to him. No, no, he keeps plausible deniability. I have had

plausible deniability from this man year in and year out since I've met him that he's never seen any of these requests.

Kevin Wilson: A prioritized list, I want to see it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: There is a black box somewhere. Because the regions give it to us, we prioritize it, it goes up through Heidi. Now I doubt she's eating it. So if it's not getting to you in the black box, the magic happens.

Kevin Wilson: Just for yucks, could you project the recent one, just a spreadsheet, yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What you hear, from the frustration in my voice, which is only partially feigned, is to echo what I hear again and again and again from the ALSs and the regions. Because they've given us this every year, you know. Asia Pacific has said "AP Star is an identified thing that we would benefit by going to, and we can't give \$5,000 to send someone to AP Star ever." We've done the costings, we've put it up there.

Okay, just for the record and Seth, if you want to prepare yourself for the next hot potato after I give to Alan and then [Mandy] the opportunity to discuss what we are looking at now; I was going to see if we could go into the dim, dark, wonderful world of budget allocation for the At Large improvements, and I think it is important that Kevin have a look at how we've limited our expectations of cost. So you might want to prepare yourself to talk about that. So you're having a look at that. Would you like to tell people what you are looking at, or should I?

Kevin Wilson: You should.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I should, okay. On the screen at the moment, we've got the FY2010-2011 APRALO budget requests. We've got exactly what the costs would be, we have exactly what the project is, we have presentations to back it up, and that is an absolute example, for example INET Asia in Hong Kong; if you scroll down you would see regional IGFs and various things. Keep scrolling down, we have the same thing from EURALO; keep scrolling down, you have the same thing from LACRALO; keep scrolling down, you've got the same thing from NARALO; keep scrolling down. Are we getting to be a bit repetitious here?

And to that end, that then is subject to community agreement and the regional leaders decide, because they know there is only this much tiny

possibility of cake, what the priorities are. And this year, they were saying in a rotation, a general assembly of their region in the place that an ICANN is, so it is the cheapest travel and most likely. We figured that was cost effective and fairly intelligent.

Kevin Wilson: So is this, this is a, I think I have seen this before. So this is not a spreadsheet that has, 1-2-3-4-5-6 in priority. That's what I thought I saw in the prior slide, I thought you were going to say, I understand there are a lot of these types of things, and I love the fact that, this is Nick's input too, I can tell.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But what we should point out is, as a result of our earlier attempts in 2007, we were told that, actually now you can pull up the letter from Denise, we were told that there was no place for us in any of these decisions. It was not our right or our responsibility; staff has fiduciary responsibility and we should not and could not prioritize. So if we've had a change of faith and if we've had a change of direction, and I believe we have, then now is the time, in a post-AIC environment, where there are very good reasons to engage with public and get public trust and get public involvement and we're a way of doing that.

Kevin Wilson: I want to see this, this is fun. For those who are like –

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, it's the next one down. Scroll down to the bottom of the page Matthias, no scroll down – email in response to the minutes, that's the one.

Kevin Wilson: What is SC?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Subcommittee.

Kevin Wilson: That's your term?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's our term.

Kevin Wilson: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So, this is what we get back. "Dear committee members, thank you for your interest, you nuisance little individuals that you are. It's worth reiterating chapter and verse you foolish children. Proposed ICANN budget developed by yadi, yadi, yadi would be posted on the budget will be. I would also reiterate the fundamental point that ICANN's budget is

managed and all expenditure made by ICANN staff. It is staff's responsibility to manage funds in a manner that is consistent with ICANN's requirements and process and consequently what it means is", and you can read all of that with, perhaps, less vehemence than she got in my voice even then, was that we do not have a place in making prioritizations. We would be delighted to prioritize for you.

Kevin Wilson: Can we get number three on the screen.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, yes, this is good, here we go. "It is not in keeping with ICANN's bottom-up approach for the ALAC to attempt to centralize and make decisions about whether or not approve a budget or expenditure proposal from an At Large region. Staff welcomes all input on development and a staff process is in place." We would like to see that to address At Large spending requests.

Kevin Wilson: Okay, so, can I just - so that, the challenge whenever you have this, and this fiduciary responsibility is really important, I get that all the time, where we say, just give us a bucket of money and we'll figure out what to do with it best.

Alan Greenberg: We have never said that.

Kevin Wilson: I know you have never said that and maybe I'm showing my lack of political skills here, by direct speak. But I want to make it really clear – this is very synchronistic, isn't it, that we are sharing a microphone. So this fiduciary responsibility is a very important concept. So there is a black box aspect to the budget development process and it has reached a feverish pitch of upsetness at that and that's the reason why we had that last minute brokering and finally decided with this 1-2-3 step that I mentioned about July commitment, August commitment, and most importantly for FY12. So we'll do that. The thing that does concern me about this, and I obviously didn't review this, was this last year?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, no, the year before, as you came on board.

Kevin Wilson: The point about, it seems to be saying "We are not interested in your prioritizing". That's a concern of mine. And that's what I'm saying from the first thing I'm saying, "You give me millions and millions of dollars in requests". I heard that and commented on it, noted no noted no, that's what I have to say, right? But if you say "Here's millions and millions of

dollars of requests, the first one is \$5,000, the second one is \$8,000, the third one is \$240,000.” If I can do that then that is really helpful. Now, here is the point that is a little tricky. Right now, ICANN cannot, unless there is a fundamental change, and it might happen very quickly, I don’t know, and I’m speaking to board members here, tell me if I’m speaking out of turn, that we cannot hand over that prioritization process either.

We can take that input into the process. But we cannot just say we’re going to allocate the money in accordance with a priority system that comes in to us. It is an influencer. Here it says you’re not even allowed to think about prioritization, that’s not good. But it seems like it should, it’s a progress up to what Chuck is saying “I want to be a department head” or what Steve Crocker is saying “I want to be a department head. Give me my budget; I know how to manage a budget and all that.”

So the question is, did you fill out a non disclosure as a staff; what happens if you are over budget? What happens if the other budget is over budget? All the staff type management of budget stuff that happens, are we ready to have the SOs and ACs enter that world. And the model of ICANN is, you’re supposed to not worry about that. You’re advisory groups. You come floating in, you develop some policy, and you do that process. But now the money has become front and center.

So that’s the challenge we have. I think the plan that Doug has really authored, which is this 1-2-3 that I am talking about, is to lance it by showing that the number of specific requests are not so great. But I might be opening up a can of worms, that we’re going to have to reorganize and the SOs are going to be division heads and will actually have, you’re going to have, we’re going to put you in a big room with all of those people this morning at 8:30 and say “Okay, you duke it out and you tell us how you’re going to allocate the resources.”

Alan Greenberg: Whoever is playing with the screen, I’m going to want to go back to that letter when I talk.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks for that, on the speaking order, no, no, no, I’ve got an order. I’ve got Alan -- did you want to say something or are you just busy scribing? I’ve got Alan, I think I’ve got [Mandy], then I’ve got Sebastien, and then I’ve got Vanda. Oh and Analisa. Were you before or after Sebastien? Oh, before Alan. Do you want to say, thank you Analisa.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not ceding, but I'm letting her go first!

[Analise]: Thank you Cheryl, thank you Alan. So, I have a couple of questions. How, is this a once a year budgetary thing on your end, where the input should come in by a certain date and it would be for a whole year. In other words, if the input came in from ALAC.

Kevin Wilson: No.

[Analise]: Oh, so how many times a year?

Kevin Wilson: So, this new program, in which we would take specific requests from the community and was focusing on – how do you describe all three of the groups - non commercial stakeholders group?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, no, non commercial users group.

Kevin Wilson: Which feverishly rose from that when the board said you had to come up with some way of getting the budget passed, otherwise there was a risk of it not passing. So the plan from that is to come up with, make a list, and we'll have some sort of process where we accept the list, and that's by August. No discussion on whether that would be an ongoing thing or whether that would be part of it. But the process, we would learn from it and then that would influence the FY'12.

[Analise]: So, I guess my follow up comment would be, that has to be synchronized down to our level so that these requests come in in the right order, I mean they come in at the right time; but the other aspect is, if we prioritize them, they are prioritized by ALAC's priority and they're going to arrive to you, and suddenly those priorities really don't count anymore and then you guys have a whole new set of priorities because you have other organizations that are also submitting stuff.

Kevin Wilson: That's the part I'm trying to say. I don't think Heidi or David, if he is making the decision on the prioritization, would not want your input, it's very important. The distinction I was trying to make and I don't know if I'm speaking out of turn here, is, who makes the decision. Is it a staff decision and then they are deciding between the different pressures that they have on our side, but in any case I would be shocked if David didn't say, "I want to know your priorities, I want to know, is Asia more important than Africa?"

Is a regional meeting more important than an ICANN meeting?” I think we all want to know what you think your priorities are. The question is, who is deciding and who is making the ramification, what happens if there is a variance, all those budget, staff type things.

[Analise]: I’m sorry, I know there are other people, but, once we would determine what the priorities are, or we work in sync and everybody agrees on how to decide, once it gets to your department and you’re taking input and requests from other parts of ICANN, you guys have to set new priorities. So somehow, there has to be an internal little space waiting, that ALAC’s going to get something that you guys have to be expecting to give something to ALAC. And that has to be a priority in your department.

Kevin Wilson: I need to understand your question. Are you talking about the return, or are you talking about the?

[Analise]: The budgeting. We’re requesting?

Kevin Wilson: You are talking about the new process that we are talking about. It’s open. I have to create it. We’re not going to create it.

[Analise]: So ideally, you just have spaces anticipating there are going to be requests from these groups.

Kevin Wilson: Up to date, I send Dave, or this last year I sent Denise, and there was this transition issue that we had from Denise to David. But up to now, I ask David, I don’t know how he got it. I had no idea. This is interesting to me. If I had known this, I would have said, you know, “Denise, have you checked with your folks, you know, your groups that you’re supporting to see if you have landed right on their priorities, or have you just?” And I’m sure she would say, “Oh of course.”

But this new process is bypassing the current process. So I have to be careful that I don’t upset the structures that we have internally. What am I going to do if ALAC comes in with a high priority request and David says, “I don’t have budget for it.” I have a very challenging challenge. So the point is, just incremental steps. Tell you what we currently have that is identified for ALAC for NCUG.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What you're talking about is non-commercial that house. I really tire of an Advisory Committee to the board being equated with a subset of a subset constituency of the GNSO. Can we get that flow chart straight in everybody's minds?

Kevin Wilson: Well that's an even greater challenge. I can imagine that if one of your ALSs in Argentina came in and said, "Cheryl's not prioritizing that right", then do I have the responsibility –

Alan Greenberg: This is part of the problem we have had with this staff. It would never get to that stage because it came up through the ranks to ALAC. It rises from the bottom up.

Kevin Wilson: Doesn't that raise up to Chuck?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, the way to check is at ALAC.

Kevin Wilson: No, to Chuck Gorman, the GNSO.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: For the transcript, the off-microphone conversation is comparing the ALAC percolation proposal of information and prioritization with that of the GNSO.

Alan Greenberg: Just for the record, in the GNSO, the chair is essentially not going to take decisions on behalf of any of the constituencies. It is either decided by the group as a whole or it doesn't get decided, with very few exceptions, a couple of things. Cheryl was saying that she feels that we belong more with global partnerships than somewhere else. I'll give a slightly different view. I don't really care if we are under the overall umbrella of global partnerships or policy. No matter which one we are in, we are going to need to work closely in the other one and the budgets will commingle. Tough, life is hard.

So which one we live in and which one we visit, it may be easier one way or another, but they are going to commingle. As we have talked with David all this week, we are occasionally going to need policy staff who will help us on writing real policy which is not global partnership's job and if we're under policy staff we'll occasionally want to send someone to an IGF and it will fit well under global partnerships. Its life is not going to be completely easy. In terms of the frustration that you clearly hear in our voices, certainly those of us who have been around awhile, this kind of

memo, although it's long ancient history, shows you a little bit of it. If you look at number three, recognize that, especially at that point, although to some extent now, ALAC is about peripheral in ICANN as you could have gotten.

We are around the edges, we are a noisy critter that best goes away, but we're not quite going away yet. So the concept that ICANN is trying to centralize something, can you think of anything more centralized than the ICANN staff, and that sentence just doesn't parse. And it's trying to say ALAC, which is the noise around the periphery, is trying to centralize a responsibility, where instead according to ICANN's bottom up, it should be part of the staff responsibility. So if you sense a bit of frustration, you see one example of it and it is not the only one.

Kevin Wilson: Now, I do agree, that the third line that said "I want to reiterate that the ALAC's input, as well as that of broader at large community, in particular the RALO leadership is welcome to be very carefully reviewed and considered." So that's counter to that.

Alan Greenberg: Let's not try to parse Denise's memo anymore. Let's just say it generated a lot of frustration. Okay, in terms of fiduciary responsibility, if you asked me would I like you to give me a pile of money and American Express credit card in ICANN's name that I can sign for in any way I want? Yup! I do want that. Do I expect you to give it to me? No! So, I could agree with Steve Crocker, but I am quite happy to let the ultimate fiduciary discretion and decision making be done by an ICANN staff member who at least talks to us. And that's all we've ever, ever, ever asked for.

Just like the GNSO has \$400,000, Chuck Gomes is not going to sign the check. Chuck Gomes' signature is not going to allow accounting to cut a check on ICANN's behalf. It is going to be policy staff in conjunction with decisions made by the community. And again, that is all we are asking. Would it be nice to have an unlimited credit card in ICANN's name? Yeah, I want it, I want to be the first. No, she wants to be first! We'll get one for each of us!

The last point is, I understand why the issues that we prioritize may not be fundable. I do not understand, and again there may be specific cases in any given case that we are asking for something really stupid, that if we give you a prioritized list with values on it, you decide what envelope you want to fund, but why would you not, assuming the envelope is bigger

than the first item. He's going to give each of us a half of an American Express card. Since you've already destroyed it, I'll make your life easier!

If we've prioritized four items and none of them are above the overall envelope, why would you not accept our first one unless it was something really, really stupid, and we are capable of doing that, I know. I can understand why you would want to set the envelope, but why would you reject the prioritization if it is within that envelope? I'm just curious, I don't understand that logic?

Kevin Wilson: Why would we? If you came up with the first priority to add a credit line to the credit card – I'm going to officially give you my expired credit card to emphasize your point! But no, I could see why, I could see situations where a splinter group, put it this way. If I listened to every single comment made on the budget, and even with the people that speak very, very strongly and loudly, I don't think the community would appreciate that, would consider that.

Now I'm not saying that ALAC would come up with extraneous comments and suggestions and do that, and I would guess that you're all very dedicated, and as Noam Massa (I think his name is) said, that you are all full of heart as a volunteer spirits, my guess is you're going to make suggestions on that. To answer your question, I could game theory and come up with an answer why it would not be treated as high priority. But at the very minimum, as Denise's number one email said, it should be considered and carefully reviewed.

Alan Greenberg: Just as a quick follow on. I can imagine why we are requesting something which is deemed out of scope, completely, and not fundable. I question if we're likely to get a lot of these items if they are likely to be in conjunction with staff. But, you know, if we put something number one that our staff support whispers in your ear and really stupid and out of scope and is dangerous, you are quite within grounds to not fund it. But I don't think those are going to be the norm.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I just want to give it to [Mandy] because she has a particular response back to one of Alan's points, and then it's to you, Sebastien.

[Mandy]: Actually, what Alan is talking about where there are some activities that are going to fit under the purview of one department vs. the other, is actually following along the accounting, the way the budget is being

presented to the community. So, you know, Kevin has identified the ball of wax that is global engagement. Well, global engagement covers a variety of things, and he's identified. So, in many ways, what you are talking about follows along with the way finance has been trying to present the information. I also think that this new discussion of a mechanism for trying to capture because, to be honest, what is happening now is we have the demands of the constituencies as understood by the departments because of the strategic planning process, which the community engages in and the staff is tasked with operationalizing that.

And within the budgetary process, and I don't think I'm talking out of turn here, Kevin, we have to sit there and each of the departments is saying "But we have this amount of work that's been identified, and we know what that costs, and we know how much demands we had last year." And we're being told but guess what; the budget does not encompass everything that each department has identified.

And so, we're sitting there around the table and we're saying, "We gotta cut this, we have to reduce that." And so, there is already that horsetrading going on within the existing identified work trying to operationalize the strategic plan as articulated from the community, at the same time, we are getting things lobbed over the wall because a particular constituent has gone to a member of the board, that they met in a certain setting, or they are saying "We don't see why we can't get support to go to this meeting, which we believe would be critical to the outreach on behalf of ICANN."

So this is a mechanism to try and capture, in a more directed fashion, those interests will have to come out of someone's hide. And I think one of the mechanisms supposed to make the process – I know that we've talked between global partnerships and the At Large community about mechanisms to try to make the meeting representation more visible to you; there's been a conversation about using some sort of interface on the confluence Wiki so that we can see what meetings are already being covered, or you can identify.

To be honest, the most effective way to leverage an extremely limited, and it may not look like it's limited, but it is a limited pool when you think about how many people globally you are dealing with, the most effective way to leverage the resources are for you as a group and the active individuals to be identifying the work you're doing, where you are.

Because the most common request is we need to send 25 people to this meeting that is half a world away. That is an expensive proposition.

We may not be able to 25. Or, there may already be local representation that can attend. And I realize you know this all. So the more visible we can make to you where there are already meeting coverage and you can make to us where you've got people who could go to EuroDig, which is in their own city, walk across town, get us the resources, get us the slide deck, get us this, we can make the presentation.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And we are trying to do that.

[Mandy]: Yes, I understand. We are building toward that. We can try to be more effective at the leveraging at the same time, while also having a new mechanism that captures and maybe makes visible to all the constituencies these kinds of discussions, because we do, understandably where you sit is where you stand, or where you stand is where you sit, so people understandably see the greater synergy between perhaps their personal interest than something that is happening and we're all making tradeoffs.

Alan Greenberg: There are people involved in this process, not all of us, but there are people who have managed budgets, sort of within the same order of magnitude as ICANN's and from a personal viewpoint, you ain't seen constrained budgets if you've never worked for a public university.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think what's important is, and let's hope the confluence Wiki gives us the opportunity to do that, one of the things that was mentioned to me at a dinner last night is equally scary and equally useful, because it was an opportunity for ICANN to have a booth at an event. There is probably not staffing or availability to sort of parachute, lob that over the wall to you.

But it is quite likely that one of our ALSs could sit in that booth, where ICANN has been offered a free booth, and promote ICANN, given the toolkit. So I think there's that sort of two way thing. But we've got to get a place for these things to get recorded, reported, and indeed budgeted for. And Lisa, I've got to go to Sebastien, and then I'll come back to you. Go ahead Sebastien.

Sebastian Bachollet: Thank you, very difficult to answer to this discussion. I would like to give some comments. I think if we discuss with the global partnership department it is because we can't find some common ground with other

group in ICANN to go to same type of events. If the goal is to outreach for RALO, it's maybe not the same if it's to outreach for ICANN. Multiple groups means that, I think it's important to try to see where we need to go but also, what other countries we want to target. And I remind you that we put something into the strategy planning, I am yet waiting to see the answer why our proposal was not included in the strategic planning.

The summary of comments is not an answer of what was done with it. And why am I insisting on that is that, if at the level of a strategic project was included our suggestion, that means that would have been an ICANN issue and not just anymore an At Large issue. But it seems that it is not because other constituents here disagree with that proposal, because I never see somebody written something against, that it was a decision taken by, I will say the staff, because I don't know how to say who it could be.

And then we will not make this story again, but if I remember well the discussion we had at the last ICANN meeting, we were told that if it is not in a strategic project it is because it is a operational project and from my understanding, then it will be in the operational project. And it is not. Because what we say, we say two things: One is that we need general RALO, general assembly in the region that it is not traveling to other parts of the world. But we need also, and that's traveling to the other side of the world, we also will need, one day, a second summit. Here, we are still discussing about the fact of who are general assembly, how we make outreach in our region, and I think that one day, I'm sorry to see, that (inaudible 01:17:01) will have given up.

Alan Greenberg: One day you'll give up, is that what you said?

Sebastian Bachollet: Yeah. We will say, "Okay, you don't give us the tools to work." Because as I said during the EURALO showcase, our leadership in the ALS structure, like in any organization change, let's say each two years, four years, that means that each two years or four years, we need to rebuild the confidence, rebuild the knowledge with the new leadership of those ALSs. It's like when you have a new board member, you need to train them. We need to do the same thing with the ALSs' leadership when they change. And if we have no opportunity to meet them face to face, we can't just train people by participating in a conference call.

So you see, it is a little bit of a mess what I am saying. But it is a lot of little things that start to be very, very annoying from the bottom of the process. And once again, if it is not in the strategic and it is not in the operational and now you ask us in one way or another to have a list and maybe even prioritize within the region. I just want to recall that each RALO was formed by an agreement between some ALSs of the country and ICANN CEO. We sign MOU. And how you undo all that? We have difficulty and I have difficulty to understand what we can do to help the process, because I am sure that we are one of the important pieces within ICANN, especially with the affirmation of commitment.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Sebastian. Vanda, grab that microphone and then Analisa.

Vanda Scartezini: Well that's not – my viewing of all those things, not only is there not enough organization right now inside ICANN among groups that, also together with reduced budgets, has become a mess. Because there are a lot of new people and with little knowledge about what's going on.

Kevin Wilson: I want to make sure I understand that first sentence. You said that there is not an organizational structure?

Vanda Scartezini: No, I said all those new people coming, which so quickly changes, you can see that when you talk with people, they of course, they don't have knowledge enough to be in that position yet. They are requiring some time and training and so on. And I see, I know that we are facing a reduced budget. So there has become to priority to you. So it has become a snowball. And that is where the opportunity to use the structure of the volunteers becomes important. Because they already are there; they already have the knowledge; they know the values; they know the priorities; they know everything.

So if we start to work more closely and staff, all the group, uses more the people around the world – it's cheaper, it's fast, and the result, I am sure, will be better. So what I see is a lack of understanding of the structure of this organizational role by the administration of ICANN because I can see in Latin America for instance, soon as we get together with LACNIC, and oh, Brazil has some money and can give some sponsorship for the others. So, if we would use more organized, certainly we are going to have much more representative, etc.

Even in this IGF, I am on the board, but I don't know if someone, someone was going to be in the IGF. And we know that we are going to face a very difficult time in Mexico in ITU. And this is going to happen in Latin America and Mexico. So there will be a D1 IGF regional meeting in Ecuador. Politically, Ecuador is completely against us, as a country; so, what the hell we have planned for that? So it is amazing, you know, disrupt organization right now. It's like that, I talk with some of those people over there, yeah we need to go, yeah, who?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We have a very short amount of time left on our agenda.

Vanda Scartezini: It's just to see that we are lacking more and more.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We are being under-utilized. We could work a lot smarter and a lot less harder and I think I just want to allow [Mandy] to do we have anyone going to these things?

[Mandy]: You're asking about the - actually, Vanda raised both the regional IGFs and the plenipart. Yes, we have a team - parenthetically, the IGF has gone from once a year to a complete, you can imagine there are now regional and every country has its own. So the proliferation within the IGF space is actually causing us to redo internal prioritizations, so if there is going to be, if every country in Africa has an IGF and there is an East African and a West African, they're going to have three or four regional ones, then we start to have to do round robins where this year. We actually do have people going to the IGF prep in Ecuador, it is happening in August.

[Mandy]: Well, LACNIC, APC, Institute of (phonetic) Nupif and we will have at least one staff person attending, as an organizer.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Please use the microphone if you're going to speak, it's impossible otherwise.

Alan Greenberg: I'm sorry, I was just following up on [Mandy]'s comment that LACNIC as a regional, it is part of the ecosystem, the internet ecosystem. But they have actually been very concerned to have good representation at Quito. And so they have actually gone and looking to sponsor people from NGOs and other groups to go to Quito.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Which brings us back to the shared space and knowledge, the shared understanding and all of that, [Mandy], do you want –

[Mandy]: No, and this is the kind of information that we could have in those places, and we've done monthly reports that have the next month's travel, and I know that Heidi and I meet once a week and one of the conversations is trying to have the projection a year out. So that you see where things are going to cover, keeping in mind that things do change rapidly and things blow up and have to be addressed. So yes, specifically for Quito, yes we will have people there, yes we are working with local organizers, and clearly you are going to have folks there too.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: [Christopher], go ahead. I give preference to people who haven't spoken yet, so [Christopher], go ahead.

[Christopher]: I think Vanda has got a point here. The fact is that one of the reasons why ICANN is not supported in a wide range of developing countries and by the more governmentally oriented people in the United Nations, one of the reasons, quite frankly, is that it is still perceived as a highly commercial organization and a highly American organization. Now those of us that know the organization from the inside know that basically it is a much more international organization than an American organization, although this is not yet reflected in the composition of the staff.

And the At Large constituency, organization, is your main and, with the exception of some board members, perhaps the only credible advocate of the multi-stakeholder concept in vis a vis our critics. And, unless you can draw on the resources you have, and by now you can see it around the room, you can see it is in our plenaries, by now you do have in nearly all regions a small but significant group of people who know the story, who can present it well, who could certainly benefit from staff support in terms of toolkits or even presence if it is essential.

But they must be front. To take an example, I would rather Carlton went to Ecuador to get his fingers burnt in the ICANN argument than that the staff went. And I can think of many other examples. Now I saw my name pop up there on vis a vis Eurodig; I went to Eurodig as chairman of a different organization. So just a detail. I certainly did not ask ALAC to fund me.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: None of those are funded, and with the exception of one IGF, which ICANN did fund me to attend, my ccTLD sends me to all of those things.

[Christopher]: Well, funnily enough, if asked I would not have advised people to fund missions to the Eurodig, because they are being somewhat disparaged by the European parliament – but that is another, some other internal European story. But internationally, Vilnius by all means put together a strong team led by a board member or two, but with constituency support in the first instance. The people who should be speaking for ICANN in this context are the delegates and the volunteers. The staff should be supporting.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you [Christopher]. And for the record, of course, we have both Asia Pacific and the AFRALO region with accepted workshops at Vilnius, if we get anybody there, we will be wearing our ccTLD hats. Go ahead Analisa.

[Analise]: Thank you. It sounds like Kevin was talking about a mechanism that has to still be created in order to do this in sort of a fair and equitable way. Just one concept that maybe people have thought of, but maybe in hearing this it will jog someone else's memory and mind to think of something else. It's almost like a little puzzle piece of layers that, like excel sheets where you've got x and y and then there are layers. So on one hand, perhaps, you could start off with what ICANN stands for in the strategy of what they want to do as reaching out into the world, say, pick one thing, say outreach.

Then at the same time we have all these organizations such as ALAC, and they do outreach also. And if, maybe the budget process included maybe a coding system where in the strategy of the year we were going to do these particular things, A, B, C, and D, then that gets distributed to all the constituencies as a warning of this is what we are looking to fund because of the big giant plan. And then the constituencies each have, they know their own priorities and what they stand for and how they best can fulfill their mandates.

They can prioritize and they can code their events and the current relevant things like the Ecuador meeting and that kind of thing and then the overall final objective would be to budget, to finance events that are leveraged that satisfy more than one. So that way, you've got his instance that Cheryl's talking about where one contingency is working with another on

a common thing but really killing two birds with one stone (which, I hate that expression). But I bet we could find things that were satisfying three, at least. You know, stuff like using the local people so we're not doing all the airfare, and then it is satisfying ICANN at the top at the same time too. So I kind of see, the X, the Y, and the hologram version of it.

Kevin Wilson: What's the X, what's the Y, what's the Z, in your paradigm?

[Analyse]: It would be, you've got ICANN's strategy of what they need to accomplish on a global outreach. And I'm just saying this is just outreach. Obviously ICANN does lots of things. So you would have ICANN's strategy, I'm not even sure where that is. So you would have ICANN's point of what you have to accomplish and then you would have, maybe you would have regions or areas or types of outreach, that would be the top, and then the depth comes from all of the organizations. So they each submit their version of that x and y, and you just kind of hold it up to the light, wow, if we do this one, it is going to satisfy three or four constituencies.

Kevin Wilson: So we actually do have an X, Y, Z, we actually have a four-dimensional accounting system right now.

[Analyse]: But is it not just accounting, is it actually desires of those groups?

Kevin Wilson: That's in the coding and the ideas that should affect requisitions and should affect decisions on what meetings you go to and everything. The one thing we don't do right now is geography from an accounting standpoint. The IRS is saying that we have to report our costs by account by geography, but we haven't thus far.

Obviously you are organized geographically. But ICANN's finances, you look at the budget; it mentions we have an office in Sydney and an office in Palo Alto and an office in Brussels. But it doesn't say we have this many resources in Africa and this many – that would be another dimension for us to consider. That's why I was curious if there was a design like that. It's never been asked, but it's –

[Analyse]: I guess one of the dimensions would be policy. Not a financial dimension, but a policy dimension.

Kevin Wilson: Just so you know, it is functional. So the fifteen organizational activities, gTLDs, IDNs, contractual compliance security, and we call it the EAG, the way our organizational structure is ALAC, SSAC, GNSO, CCSO, GAC.

Vanda Scartezini: We are not; it is a good idea Analisa, because geographically, when we will be international we are going to have geographical organization because there is almost a recent distribution of address? CCs, no? New TLDs? Communities? ALAC? Everything will be in all the offices if you become international. How many people in the staff I have for this region. That is a quick response that you need to have, at least for the GAC. And whatever. We are going to have, we are going to need to start to think geographically, because we need to become international and this is a lack of movement that we are seeing right now in ICANN. Because we started and the feeling now in the community, we are way in the back.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And we would all prefer to go forward. We have just a few minutes, and I do want to encourage it to be just a few minutes, to look towards travel. That is the second note I have had to that. I hate travel. Go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Alright, just a couple of comments, some of which I have already said to various people. I found it exceedingly encouraging that one of the items that we had been begging, pleading and whatever, bribing, for was to please allow all ALAC members, if they wish to, to attend the Board meeting, and I was delighted to see travel rules saying “You should leave on Friday, unless of course your flights leave too early, in which case you can leave on Saturday.”

Thank you. I’d like to see, in the future, some similar flexibility for people arriving. This time I was very fortunate, I arrived early in the morning and you very nicely arranged for a hotel room to make sure I didn’t have to wait in the lobby for four hours. When I arrive somewhere at midnight, however, you also tell me I should survive on four hours sleep after a 36 hour trip and attend the meeting at 8 o’clock the next morning, which I don’t find quite as appropriate and we’ll have to work on that end of the trip next time, perhaps.

We are still having an awful lot of problems communicating with constituency travel and with BCD, and in my personal case, they offered me a flight, I said “No” for what I thought were very good reasons. Only a week or so later they came back and said “Okay, how about this flight?”

I never found out if they accepted my “No”, if it was escalated to 14 levels in ICANN, or what the process is, but someone caved and I am grateful. They foisted the same sort of flight on someone else who didn’t have enough, energy I think, to say no it.

But even without any of those particulars, and we’ve had plenty of those, we’re still having issues with flights that are costing a lot more than they should, with people being forced to take airlines for a savings of \$50 or \$100, which make the trip significantly more complex for them or not nearly as comfortable, as it were.

And somehow, we still need to refine this and it really shouldn’t have to be escalated to the CFO for this level. I don’t know what they pay you Kevin, but it surely is not to handle these kinds of things. And to be quite candid, until we get to you, very often, we don’t get a rational answer. So I don’t know how we’re going to fix it, but we’ve really got to.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, if everything was simple it would already be done, so it gives us something to do!

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl, in this particular area there are simple things that never get done. And I speak for someone who has arranged travel from the weirdest places you can imagine to the weirdest places you can imagine for 150 or 200 people, and yeah, I understand the complexities.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: As do many of our travelers, which is the measure of the frustration. Go ahead, and then I really want to just take a couple of extra minutes for Seth. Sorry, I don’t have the room at open, if you’re waving at me in the Adobe room, I don’t see it. Go ahead Sebastien.

Sebastian Bachollet: Just to remind Kevin that we have a pending issue that we agree with something you were supposed to say yes, about my trip.

Kevin Wilson: I assumed you and I would meet sometime this week.

Sebastian Bachollet: Yes, but because you ask me do everybody agree on that, so okay, when you want.

Kevin Wilson: So let’s make sure; don’t let me forget, Kathy, so that I don’t forget to talk with Sebastian. But I’ve made the decision and be bold and after I go back maybe I’ll write it before I go back, that I am going to recommend

internally that we change our process so that we become, get out of the travel administration. I think that is a loud cry. We're working very, very hard and not getting a lot of credit, and it doesn't seem to be getting a whole lot better, and it's taking a lot of my time and a huge amount of Steve's time to administer that, and Matt's a great person, but he's not a professional travel agent for executives and that's what you need.

So I honestly believe that travelers, that the best decisions are made at the travel level, but then that means it is a change and we would have to put in a control system and someone would have to do an estimate of what a reasonable amount, and will have to deal with, when I tell you the average fare is \$1200 for this trip X to Y and you say no, it can only be done for \$1400, how we are going to handle that. So I am going to recommend that. What I was trying to hint at the other day is if I could get you all to change the travel guidelines through the comment process and I was hoping that you would draft something.

I would still encourage you to do that; I would discourage you to go down through the fiduciary challenge route, which is, just give us a bucket of money and we'll figure out how to do it. Or the credit card, uncut credit card. So I discourage you from doing that. Several of the community members, I guess not in the At Large earlier, several community members say they want to really just give it to the, you know, our constituency and we'll figure out how to do that. But if we can agree to travel slots, let us decide, we'll ask for reimbursement, I think that will reduce a lot of headaches.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead [Christopher], and we just need to be very cautious going down the reimbursement pathway. I think you need to have local arrangements for best value because not all of our community members are in a position to buy up front. We are representing from emerging and developing economies. We still have, every single time we arrive, people who are asked for credit cards for the guarantee at the hotel that they are being paid for and they don't own what that thing is.

It is not the only time several of us have ended up at the front desk saying "Just use mine" and just let this poor person go to bed. We do need to remember that we are from a moral privileged position, and as we move through the next billion, and the billion, and the billion after that, that is not going to be the case. So, if we're gonna be inclusive, we've gotta be careful as we do. Go ahead [Christopher].

Alan Greenberg: Before he goes ahead, there's some details we're going to have to haggle on, that's not today, will someone who's prettier than me, please give this man a hug!

Kevin Wilson: Can I amend my suggestion, what I'm going to write internally, and I really don't own this, I know you think I do. I own the travel guidelines synthesis process like I own the budget. I don't decide that, it is a community synthesis process. That's why I was trying to hint that if you wrote this, it is a lot easier for me to push it forward. I'm going to take the initiative though, from the feedback, as the slot concepts of the travel slots and the travel guidelines that broaches that.

A limit so that you cannot have, you know there is a limit per meeting, and a suggestion on what a good number to do is, but have reimbursement, have an availability for advances if needed for those who maybe couldn't afford the travel at all, and then have a preferred travel agent as a resource, not as a requirement, so anybody who wanted to could use BCD or whoever our preferred travel agent is, and then they could get that and then we get the advantage of, they will service them, they'll be held accountable, and they're going to lose business if they're not the best travel agent in the world.

And they'll also be knowledgeable about the particulars of our constituency. So hopefully they'll win the business one traveler at a time as opposed to being forced to have people use them that don't want to use them.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's music to our ears. Go ahead [Christopher].

[Christopher]: Well, I think it's all been said, but just to support Cheryl's caution about the problem of funding up front and the developing country participants, but also to point out that within Europe, most journeys are still under \$100. What you've described is a degree of overhead and administration on top of that very small expense, which is not justified, does not make sense, and below a certain amount. When I travel between European cities on behalf of other organizations, if I'm reimbursed that's another matter; but the total budget including the hotel for a three day meeting can be less than \$300. So what you've described is an administrative overhead which is not justified for that kind of expenditure.

Kevin Wilson: No, it's ridiculous. But [Christopher], I want to understand your first point, you were saying, what was the thing about the advance that you said you disagree or agree with that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, it's very important. One of the things I would like to just take a moment of this, I have no idea Seth what time it is in New York, but you're a hero for being on the line – have you snored off, got a coffee, or gone home?

Seth Greene: Oh no, I'm here Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Brilliant, brilliant. We have in front of us the At Large improvements implementation project plan and yes, this is your staff that you met last meeting.

Kevin Wilson: Hi Seth!

Seth Greene: Hi.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: While you have Kevin in the room is there anything you'd like to take us through? I've put up on the screen the ALAC improvements implementation project plan, dated 7-June-2010. Take us, perhaps, to wherever you'd like us to look and short and sweet would be appreciated.

Seth Greene: Certainly, thank you Cheryl. I think I would just like to point out probably given Kevin's presence with us, the short budgetary section that starts at the bottom of page 3, where we point out that the \$50,000 allocated in the FY11 budget, the ALAC decided is hopefully and likely going to cover the explicit At Large costs that are going to be incurred for the improvement project. In the event that they don't, full elections will have to be made regarding the priority of items and what can be put over to the FY12 budget.

But of those explicit costs that we expect to concur, that are expected to incur by the ALAC in FY11 basically involve four of the 13 recommendations; certainly a major one, relatively speaking, is recommendation 4, which speaks to ALS education and engagement for which a lot of materials are going to have to be developed and the initial development will be one area that will likely incur some expenses. We're talking about items such as brochures, podcasts, etc., online videos. And related to that there is also same type of development of materials for

soliciting and working toward getting further input from consumer representative groups, which is recommendation 12.

The other two recommendations that are expected to incur some specific at-large costs are recommendation 7, the choice of communication and collaborative tools and, similarly, recommendation 9, the improvement of translation and interpretation processes. For those, the ALAC expects that there will be the necessary trials and evaluations of various technologies regarding communication, collaboration, various services regarding translation and interpretation. For those with the main costs where the BLI predicting, and I think actually short of going into any more, and probably at this point unnecessary detail, that's probably all that I need to say Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much Seth. And I think what is important is that whilst this hard-wrought, community-driven consensus build information and agreements and established norms of what we think will or will not be costly in any way , shape or form to ICANN, has gone to the structure improvements and by definition to the Board in the fullness of time. I very much doubt Kevin that you have seen it, and yet this is in your bailiwick. I want to make sure, has Kevin actually see this part of our documentation? Because I think what often happens is it fractionates.

We produce this document and send it to the thing that is ICANN and the magic doesn't happen to make sure everybody gets to see it. But what we've done just so everyone understands is we have assumed that the costs attributed to us for things like education outreach would be up to and including the first ready to run final draft, in other words, final to go to print. So, costs for getting publications or waving ours down the first time. It should be then up to, whoever is using them to then have it in their cost center in the future. For an At Large improvements costing, it's just the first one. I think we may need to talk more on this. And if that's the case, then we need to set that up in the not too distant future, because we now need to make a lot of these implementations happen.

Kevin Wilson: Still a little confused, I guess. Maybe I just need to do an offline conversation with Heidi and Matthias and Seth. So I think this is in sort of the general realm of what we talked about, I don't know, two meetings ago when we did the At Large review, and so we were going to come up with, you saying "How much budget do we have" and I kept saying "Well what do you need" and we had that kind of fun back and forth. So then I

though we were going to come up Nairobi in the discussion when I met Seth, was the list. Here are the activities and here is the cost, travel, consulting, communication, etc., a list, and then presumably there should be a list of prioritization. Looks like there is a lot of good information here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We have any number of lists that clearly need to be looked at carefully. Staff will be bringing things up, but Vanda would like to speak to this matter.

Vanda Scartezini: This is exactly same kind of answer. First of all, we just voted today. And this was going to be reduced to a kind of resume that the CEO is going to make, so whenever you were going to make, so it is quite important that this resume really represents what is there, because once we are going to vote and approve next meeting, there is this resume because it's already what we approved it today.

Guys, we are asking the CEO to make a resume to us to approve. So it is quite important that inside this resume will be in some way attached to all the plan because it is needed and that the resume represents really what is there, because, or we are going to make a mess of everything that we have done in this improvement process.

Kevin Wilson: Sorry, so when you say resume, you mean -

Vanda Scartezini: Resume, yes, someone, one of you will write a resume – summary.

Kevin Wilson: So the point is that the board will vote on a plan and there will be a cost associated with that plan and do we know what those costs are, would be.

Vanda Scartezini: Would be, of course, a lot of those –

Kevin Wilson: I thought, and I apologize that I'm not closer to this, but I thought one of Seth's tasks was to actually come up with the total cost of that and that would be part of the decision-making on how fast we implement, how extensive we implement the At Large improvements.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Heidi has an intervention.

Heidi Ulrich: Yeah, I asked Legal about that. Actually the ExComm, Seth, and myself worked on this a considerable amount of time, and we spoke to Legal

about this and they were of the opinion that the board would not require such detail on these line items. I mean, I do remember your talking about that. In fact, this format, this project plan is a revised project plan that came with directions of the chair of the SIC, you can scroll up, and those points there were exactly what the chair of the SIC requested to be put into this, or the outline of that project plan.

Kevin Wilson: There are budgetary implications – okay, it allocates \$50,000 of the implementation of the ALAC At Large improvements. Yeah, that was just a rough estimate; I remember being there at that time. What I thought was going to happen was going to happen was \$5,000 for this, \$600 for this, etc.

Heidi Ulrich: Yes, I do remember that discussion in Nairobi, but again, Legal said that at this point that –

Kevin Wilson: Was that Amy or John?

Heidi Ulrich: It was Samantha, that board did not require this kind of detail. Let's take that offline, I have a feeling the finance committee would have a difference of opinion, but we'll, let's work that through.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It would be delightful to have more opportunity to work things through, and I think that is pretty much what we were aiming for today. There is always a wealth of information I think you leave with, and I know [Mandy] is just filling up notebooks just devoted to us now, which is great, except you need a purple cover. It's, ALAC is purple.

Heidi Ulrich: How about a purple flag?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, that's a start; we need a library of purple. But we are at the edges; we respond to what we are gold and then we don't get told when the requirements change and that has to change. Because that builds the frustration, that builds the confusion, and when we work with people, when we work with [Mandy], when we work with you, we find more mutuality and potential than we believe possible.

And I think these exercises somehow need to be done little and often and less painfully. And I think that is why putting into the new mechanism of the strategic planning budget, the way you're going to have the ICSO

people involved earlier on, is a light at the end of the tunnel, which we hope is not an oncoming train.

Kevin Wilson: Thank you for that, I appreciate that. We'll talk offline about the specifics of that with Heidi and Sam, or whoever it is. But I really would like to make a request to have your help on how I can deliver the September interaction with the SOs and ACs so that you understand, so I have a commitment that by December – I told you about the July and August commitment for the FY 11 as sort of a trial balloon.

But I'd really like your help on not just At Large and ALAC, but certainly start there, but I'd like your help, it's a request, a personal request, your help and ideas on how to engage the SOs and ACs in a productive way, starting in September. I don't know if that means an open cattle call conference call that leads to, or you know, do I the issue of subgroups within that, or all of that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, we have got a budget and finance subcommittee. We've got an organized budget and finance subcommittee which is fully regionally representative and it is their job to make sure they bring the regional view in and out, so you just need to work with them.

Kevin Wilson: So it's that, which is great, but I'm also interested in, how do we, you know, if Steve as SSAC chair wants _x_, you want _y_, how do I deal with RSAC, which I've never met the chair –

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: There is this wonderful thing called the Support Organization and Advisory Committee chairs' list. Naughty little people that we were several years ago we stopped talking to each other and then we put some emails together and then all hell broke loose and there you go, it's a good thing in my view. On that now is the chairs and vice chairs of all the ACs and SOs, including ISO, and so there is a conduit to get to us all, and we can sort it out, that's why we talk to each other.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, one and all. I don't know why it is that as soon as you mention money, things tend to become far more important and take far more time than anyone ever expects it to, but I guess that's just your world, isn't it? It's like Groundhog Day for you, isn't it? You go from one to the other and say the same thing again and again. One day I hope you'll wake up and I hope it is not a nightmare that you walk into and that you go "Wow this is good, we've got somewhere."

Kevin Wilson: And the ice sculpture will be flawless.

Male Speaker: I just want to comment that I just find this to be refreshing in contrast to that letter that we had so much fun taking apart a little while ago. There really is now, and being a member of the budget committee that Cheryl mentioned, that there really is a conduit and a way of starting to address some of these things and getting something done. I'm very encouraged.

Alan Greenberg: You can rebut us both at the same time. There may well be not one size that fits all, but if, you know, I'm not even sure what question you asked about whether in September we're looking at how to gather information about what we need in terms of budget, or how to present it. If one asks the question, chances are some innovative people will come up with some answers, maybe one, maybe multiple ones.

The situation may very well be different. SSAC already has a budget. I don't know where you present it and where you hide it away in a little pocket of the overall budget. They actually have an employee, so somewhere that is budgeted. The situations are different, but I think we can do innovative things if we understand what the problem is and what the target is. Trust us enough to make a mess of it and we'll try not to.

Kevin Wilson: Just remember, there is something Lisa said earlier about, we're now going to start with addressing, hitting priority issues with this new process. So I want to make it really clear so I don't miscommunicate. We've always had that. So that has always been the intention. The challenge has been that we have this process by which staff works together and puts together a framework and then we get feedback and comments and we synthesize that, and we have a draft document and then the draft documents get synthesized and feedback and we have this final June meeting where there are a lot of discussions and feedback and then we have a final budget that is submitted. So that is the process.

Five and a half months. Most organizations, five and a half months to have a communications, that much communications and the pages of analysis that we do, they would say that's a pretty robust consensus based budget. It's not at ICANN, we realize that. We've gotten that message loud and clear. So what we've done is, okay, instead of having a four and a half month process starting in the March, that Nairobi meeting, that March or February, instead we are going to move that back even further

than the Cartagena meeting, the AGM meeting, we're going to move it back to September.

We're going to start the discussion with the SOs and the ACs, and say "We want to make sure that you are helping us do the big dial prioritizations." And I'm sure the first question is going to come out as we need more information and then my next question is "What information do you need?" So that's what I want to do is plug that in so we don't have miscommunication going on for four months and we are still in the same place in February. We address that in September as effectively as possible. Does that make sense?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Kevin, that's a great analogy, the big dial picture where you've got them participating initially and everybody is seeing that it's not about me, me, me my group, it's about the big picture and then, yeah, they are all contributing to the same overall result.

Vanda Scartezini: May I make, just around the table, complain that I would like to state that Doug and you have made a lot of difference. We had nothing. And we have a quite good one; needs improvement, but you have done very good job. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: For the record, this is a standing ovation to Kevin that he's got to take.

Alan Greenberg: And I'm going to have to hug him if no one else does!

Kevin Wilson: I'm really glad Kathy came!

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you one and all and we can thank the phone bridge and thank the interpreters. Thank you all.

--End of recorded material--

