

ALAC_Secretariats Wrap Up Meeting_20091029_1010218_262056

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: -- excellent afternoon in the DNS Abuse Forum. Particularly the closing questions and indeed the closing proposal were very, very important. But more importantly, relevant to us where we had the clear intention of a future task force being put together, which will be a cross-community task force. And I think a recognition throughout the voices of the Internet end user as well as (inaudible) needs to be heard in that process.

I did make a personal plea today with [Geeza]. Whilst in principal, I can't imagine this committee in any way, shape, or form, or indeed I suspect the regional leaders either them wanting to be 100% behind that, perhaps it would be nice if we got the RAA amendments and the Registrant Rights workgroup off our plates just before we lump ourselves into rebuilding the whole world.

But no, it's all very exciting. It's all very important for the full hitting in the direction. And that's something that I trust Rudi and the others will be putting into their report.

(Technical difficulty)-- a couple of things I'd like to do, but I'm-- (technical difficulty). So we will (inaudible) meeting.

So what we might do is just wait another moment or two whilst we move the order around. One of the things that we have-- I don't see Scott in the room yet. And I gather that there's been a preview at the Secretariats Meeting about some pretty exciting stuff. And on cue, there's a man who knows how to communicate with people, know how to enter to a stage. Scott, I've heard rave reviews about a certain something that you shared with the regional leaders of the community. So if you'd like to take the--

Scott Pinzon: Sorry, Cheryl. No, we didn't quite get to it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Didn't quite get to it? So it is a premiere. Wait until I got-- the people are begging to put it on. I thoguth it was because you were begging for us to look at it.

Scott Pinzon: We can still beg because we haven't seen it either.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Right. You're actually begging to see. I thought you were so excited, and then you say I've had a preview. Perhaps I shouldn't have told them that. Scott, it's all yours.

Scott Pinzon: I think we should play a chunk of it so you can see what we're talking about.

[Video played]

So while they're working out the technical difficulties, this is an audio podcast. We're targeting, trying to produce it twice a month, and it's specifically targeted for newcomers to ICANN or newcomers to the issue. And the idea is that it would take one issue per episode and answer some very basic questions about it in a space of time that you could listen to it on a coffee break. And we're creating it under a Creative Commons license, so if it's something you want to reproduce or mirror or put in your podcast or whatever, it's all yours. Are we ready to try again?

Unidentified Participant: Shameless theft is permitted. [Background conversation]

Scott Pinzon: Well, to give it away, Dave Piscitello actually came up with this idea of a way to frame complicated issues by answering some basic questions which are, what is the issue, why is it important, who does it affect, who's supposed to fix it, and how can the listener get involved if they want to participate?

So that is basically the format of the podcast. And we have been discretely passing it around in the community, and one of the questions we got is that because we were making it as sort of a proof of concept, all you hear in it is three North American voices. And we don't feel that that represents the diversity of ICANN and how much we esteem other communities. So my hope in bringing it to you is that some of you would be willing to have your voices in the podcast, reading some of the introductory material and some of the identification material and those kinds of things.

So if you are willing to do that, I would like to come back after this meeting with my little 4 track recorder and I'll have a script of a whopping 61 words for you to read, if you're interested. So I think it would be a real honor to us to have the At-Large voices in a podcast aimed at newcomers.

We want both English and whatever you can bring to the table. If you can translate 61 words off the cuff, then we'd love to hear it in languages you know, too.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So while we're hoping to fix the data (inaudible) problem-- is it ready yet or not? That would be a negative, right. Not until Collin comes back. So much for making you rush up here. Sorry, Scott.

I gather that if I look around the table, there was a few nods of heads, but let's raise a hand so Scott knows that it's worth him bringing his 4 track back up. Whom we've other language and other voice abilities would like to read 60 odd words into this? We see Carlos. We see-- enough of the Spanish, come on. Vivek, I see you. Dave, I see you. What other languages do I have? Nobody can ever understand Australian. I see you, Rudi. [Sejani], do I see you? You going to put your voice? No? Okay. Andres. And of course Hong, definitely. In German? Wolf? Good. French, yes. Dutch, of course. I'm wanting you to come forward. Okay. We've got a bit of the United Nations. Portuguese, great. Okay. So I think you've got a fair cross section there. You're coming back.

Scott Pinzon: Thank you very much.

Unidentified Participant: Swahili. (Inaudible) Kenya.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Great. Yes, definitely. So to that end, and to cut our losses, might I suggest that you come back at the end of our meeting and we do our premiere at the end and you'll get them all excited and ready to roll on the sound bytes.

Scott Pinzon: We're actually working on episode 2 right now, so I must go.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Fantastic. Thanks again, Scott. Well that's a mix of great excitement and bit of disappointment because it would have been nice for you to actually hear it go, well, I love it, which I sort of thought was the plan at the Secretariats Meeting, and then have some recordings done today. I think it's, from my totally biased view, of course only barely managing the English language being Australian, I think it's marvelous to have it in multiple voices. But what is important is that we're talking byte size, easy to reproduce, short, succinct, plain language explanation.

What's more exciting is they're already saying, what else do you want us to focus on? Which is why I thought it was highly appropriate to go to the regional leadership and Secretariats Meeting because it's your education and outreach needs that this is one of the tools that we're going to be able to help provide you with. So I'm sorry that you haven't seen it before we officially see it here, but let's hope we can fix all of that by close of business today.

Obviously they've tracked Vanda somewhere. And what I would like to do is just note then for the record, and we'll go back to it later, that of course with this meeting, we have certain formalities happening. Many of our hardworking-- (technical difficulty) the At-Large Advisory Committee are changing their place to work in the ICANN world. And I think we should take a moment to formally recognize those that are joining us, which we did at the beginning of our meeting on Tuesday.

But also, I want to take a moment to recognize those that are leaving us. And unfortunately, that does mean that I have to look to our apologies.

And I know you all know Siva has been unfortunately delayed by urgent medical intervention. And we want to record for the record our thanks to him and his efforts in the last 12 months as our IDN liaison. We recognize, of course, James will be replacing him in that role, and we look forward to seeing particularly the technical expertise in some 10+ years experience in this area that James will be bringing to the table.

We also want to recognize formally as Jose leaves us and Sylvia joins us that Jose is not actually lost to us totally. He is very much tethered to us as the Nominating Committee appointee from Latin America and the Caribbean. And Jose, we definitely want you very closely related so when you're sitting in [filter] as you will be -- and I know you know all about that because you've done it before -- that not only will you be bringing the voiced concerns and the needs of Latin American and Caribbean, which aren't being replaced with time, you do need to work with the rest of the regions and of course with the ALAC as a whole to see what how our needs are best going to be met. So there's no way we're actually losing you.

Someone dedicated to Avri Doria, as she left her role in the GNSO as chair, the song Hotel California -- you can check out, but you can never leave. And I think that applies not only to Jose, but of course to Vanda. Because Vanda in no way is leaving us, but technically she's changing roles from being one of the Nominating Committee appointees to our ALAC, and becoming our board liaison as of the close the AGM tomorrow.

We also need to recognize that Fatimata Seye Sylla is unfortunately, due to complications of both travel and requirements for urgent medical conditions to the checked in Washington, was unable to join us. And I have written her a personal note expressing our sadness that even though she did quite literally try through extraordinary lengths, I think, to get herself here, she has in fact had to go home.

She wishes me to pass onto you her regrets for not being with you. It was her intention to be with you. And I think with your permission, I will write a card and note on behalf of all of us thanking her very particularly for what I think has been an incredible job

bringing the voice of Africa forward. And Hawa (ph), if you would be so kind as to make sure she knows what we've said here.

There is of course also Suay (ph) who has-- I have been in an unfortunate, I guess to say, has missed a couple of our face-to-face meetings, but since has joined us on the teleconferences. She has certainly contributed to our Cairo meeting and some of our workgroups. And it's with great sadness that she finds herself unable to perform to her own standards.

And I think we should be able to write with your permission to her to say we understand how busy it is in the life of a volunteer, but we certainly thank her for her offer to continue to make outreach into Vietnam, and perhaps assist us in our one ALS, one country where she has not had the time or capability to be involved directly in our committees as much as she would like to, or of course, the policy development process.

Jose, seeing as you're the only one, there's no way I'm not going to try and embarrass you, so come on up here.

Jose Ovidio Salgueiro: Am I going to sing?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We can certainly try and follow on the Korean tradition. We have here-- these somehow didn't get stolen. And it's not just a matter of picking one out. We've got the very rare black ICANN t-shirt, and I have one here for you to all sign for people we expected to be here but who not. But we do have an extra large. Let me find the right one. Let me see. Here we go. The XXL. Hope we don't embarrass you too much, but we've all signed it. And it is without-- (technical difficulty)-- as a token of our esteem. For the couple of years you've spent with us, we never want you to forget, and we want you to wear this with pride.

Jose Ovidio Salgueiro: You can be sure that I will never forget this year here. They were amazing, and I want to thank you all for the time we spent together. And we'll be seeing each other. And please count on me while I am on the NomCom. Thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We can always sing Hotel California -- you can never leave.

Jose Ovidio Salgueiro: Absolutely.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. I think a round of applause. We'll make sure these all get to the right people. And we do have one for Vanda, and we think we might make it a request that she wears it probably at her first face-to-face board meeting, just to remind everybody.

Okay. Well that pretty much sums up from the chair, other than a little piece of any other business that I'd like to intersect into the beginning of the agenda, if I may. Sebastien, this is through the measure of the IIC. There has been some modifications. I gather staff has provided you with hard copy of the minor modifications? Can I ask that-- (technical difficulty). Okay, well can we get the IIC stuff in front of him?

There's two documents that you've been given. One is the recommendations for improvement to public consultation process. That, the proposal has been to take to an online vote. And I'm more than happy just to start that pretty much straight away. But you do need to obviously have the opportunity to read and study that and make sure that we've dotted all the Is and crossed all the Ts.

The other, which I don't have a copy of in front of me -- thank you very much -- is the advisory of the ALAC related to the staff document entitled "Improving Institutional Confidence the Way Forward." This was the vote that had begun on the Friday the 23rd, and which by agreement at our session on whatever day of the week it was -- I think it was Tuesday, or was it Sunday -- we held, we withdrew, and then we've had some minor modifications made to it.

I assume there would be a redline version available, but Sebastien, seeing as you're the lead on this particular workgroup, if you'd like to speak to this matter. And I would like to ask the community if we would be willing to vote face to face on this now. If you are willing to vote face to face on this now, I'll hold the proxy of the recent instructed proxy of Alan Greenberg as to how to vote. So Sebastien.

Sebastien Bachollet: I'm sorry because you didn't get the redline version. What I suggested that if you can give me one screen, plug in my laptop, and I will show you the way I make the modification. But in fact, it's really the result of our work on Sunday. It will be easier if I can show you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: While we're getting set up, could I take the [temperature] of the room? Are you, having looked at the redline version, if you find yourself satisfied with the output and the hard copy in your possession, are you willing to take this to a face-to-face vote here -- yes or no? Anyone who disagrees with that, depending on if you agree with the redline version. All right, in which case we can take the time now. Look at the redline version as briefly as we can and then take this to a vote. Thank you, Sebastien.

Sebastien Bachollet: Under the redline version, I tried to-- I will show you the differences. As we agree, we add the word "gender" and the list of region language and culture differences. And we strike the example least of duty who could be taken or places which could be taken to account. Then we withdraw that. I'm sorry to my mail coming.

We add this sentence, "recommend that policy review material staff prepares for the Board should be make available on (inaudible). At the same time as they are available to the Board, particularly (inaudible) prepared for decision by the Board." It was a decision, sentence suggested by Adam and we discuss this sentence.

I try-- I am going quickly, but I just show you the differences. We strike all about IIC because it wasn't supposed to stay here. It was, let's say, a joke of my part to see that IIC was a lot of different meaning within the organization. It was a bit difficult to understand what we are thinking, where we were thinking about.

And there were a last sentence, was it supposed to be either; there it was to say that one moment I was working, I take inputs from Adam. Obviously not enough. And then we do that on Sunday, and now it's taken to (inaudible) have to try this [stuff]. And for the rest, nothing else changed. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Any questions or concerns? Do you require a certain amount of time to read this? Should we enter this back into the meeting stream later? How do you want to proceed? Adam, any statements, any comments, any concerns? No concerns? Are we happy to take this forward to formalization at this point in time? Go ahead, Adam. I think it would be delightful to have you move it. Thank you very much. And if you could use the microphone because it makes it so much easier for the streaming.

Adam Peake: I'm (inaudible) on my (inaudible). Yes, I would like to move that and to thank Sebastien for his tolerance.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can I call for a second to that notion? Thank you very much, Patrick; a European block.

For the sake of transparency, and this being an open vote, as it would be in the world of the big pulse, I will read the following -- I vote for approving the IIC document as presented to me at 5:00 PM, Thursday at the ALAC meeting. Signed, Alan Greenberg. He indicated providing we didn't make substantive changes to the document, I was to table this as his vote. And you can all check his signature if the urge takes you later.

Seems we have one vote for the affirmative. I will do the reverse of what I normally do, and I will ask for those ALAC members who wish to vote for this resolution of making official this as a statement of the ALAC to raise their hands. Thank you very much.

And I will now ask for any member of the current ALAC who is possibly dialed in to -- [pursue] they may dial in -- to let us know if they want to make any vote against or abstain. In which case, I think we can call that unanimously carried at the meeting. Congratulations and congratulations to the work team who put this document together. Specific congratulations to you, Sebastien. Thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent. All right. Feedback and reporting back from the non At-Large meeting, and identifying action item, if any. Can I just say before we go into this, I'm certainly not expecting to go around the table and say, I was there and I thought this. What I do want staff to do, however, is to pick up the space and place and show us where your little reports can go. And I will be making reference to that in our annual report. So the link that goes to that, if someone drills down and wants to look at the reports that I've said our community is making, would be very, very nice if you had your reports there at the time. So all I can do is trust you to put your reports in, if you haven't already.

Can I however say that one thing that has been noticed and has been not a continuous, but a not infrequent statement to me is how obvious it was to many in the other parts of the ICANN community how we were in so many meetings and contributing in so many ways. So believe me that the fact that we were in the rooms and contributing and making significant contributions, particularly I think we can say here in the Strategic Planning and in some of the workgroups, review the NomCom and other things, has definitely been noticed. And I want to thank each and every one of you for that pretty heroic effort. It's been full on, and you've all done brilliantly. So thank you so much. But just before you sign off, sign on, and do we have the links?

There is a simple space for you to put more pieces of information. Does anyone wish to raise any matters arising from any of the meetings they have attended, however? I'll open the floor. Thank you, Adam.

Adam Peake: For our NomCom delegates, it would be to remember gender and keep pushing gender bounds in your selection, please, or selection considerations. And to take that as an issue for the whole committee.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Carlos.

Carlos Aguirre: (Spoken in foreign language)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. And I think considering that this is meeting [formal] side of the public record, would it be appropriate for us as a committee, a broad committee -- not any of the ALAC, but of the regional leadership here at this meeting -- to make a note to him of that effect, that we appreciate this particular approach and to how inclusive an open it has been?

We might also want to take a moment and fall back onto something that Peter Dengate Thrush said several times in his meeting, and that is if it is measured, it is improved. And I note when they measured the representation in the room of the Strategic Planning, the At-Large Advisory Committee, or At-Large, came up immediately as being the majority of the people in the room in contributing to that process. So I think that's something that was definitely noted even from the very top.

So is it your wish for us to drop the small letter circulated and then have it formally put forward to the CEO and President? Yes? Good? Excellent. Thank you very much. Go ahead. Thank you, Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Actually, if this is the meeting where Rod put up this survey monkey survey that he wants to get people involved in, if he wants to get lots of responses, and we go back to our ALSes, it's very possible that we could probably have the preponderance of answers in that survey if we pushed it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What an excellent plan, Evan. Perhaps that's something that some of the other regional leaders might think is a darn good idea. Anyone else wanting to bring any particulars forward from the meetings they've attended? Thank you, Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: In the work that we've been doing on the task force on gTLD naming issues and things like that, we've accomplished I think a very good amount of work in a short period of time. We have some real work ahead of us with some very compressed deadlines.

I would note, just going forward, that I'm a bit disheartened with the approach that's being taken in the GNSO towards us. It's actually reduced our participation from what was originally envisioned.

I suspect, especially given a report that the Ombudsman is going to publish tomorrow morning, that the atmosphere is probably going to get worse before it gets better. But we've got to be conscious of this, and we need to mend bridges and continue to work forward with them. But it's going to be difficult.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, the whole context of working together to find neutralism, wherever it is in this particular issue of new gTLDs and the IRTs, is important. And I would like to note that I've heard very positive feedback from other parts of the GNSO where they've found where there has been mutual interest, the ability to talk with your team and get feedback from it in the, even in this compressed time has been very useful to them.

And I do think that one thing we might be seeing in the not-too-distant future is a far more useful resource for people who are involved in either cc or g-based policy development, for us to be included earlier rather than later in the processes. So there might be a little bit of rough with it to work through, I guess, but we're all up to that because we're all professionals and we will all manage. Adam, and then Carlos.

Adam Peake: Just following on from what Evan said. It's been usual practice -- this is a question -- has it been usual practice for the GNSO to accept two ALAC members to almost all working groups? Is that correct that there's been two usually? That's been the default for them?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No. In fact, there is inevitably a default number. This particular issue was the early discussions in the preamble GNSO, the preparatory GNSO meeting. So when we had the old GNSO lineup specified to. When it was transferred into the new GNSO seating on Wednesday, it was very specifically and very deliberately reduced to the one.

And obviously, that saddens us, but we will work with whatever tools we are given. We have a tool kit. We'll use it. And we have excellent expertise in Olivier and Alan who will be sharing the chair as alternates. They do have alternates. They will both be attending. It's simply that only one can speak at any particular point.

I think it's a minor issue. It's one that we need to watch carefully for ramifications. But I'm equally confident that some things are inadvertent. And I think perhaps more is being read into this than is necessarily the case. Go ahead, Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: I'd just take a step further in saying although it's hard to go through specific details, there has been some planning going on. And actually, there's going to be more positive outcomes coming out of this turn of events than perhaps we might have imagined.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not only do I hope for that, I think it's a very likely thing, indeed. Carlos, thank you.

Carlos Aguirre: (Spoken in Spanish)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. I have an order of Sebastien then Vanda then Rudi. Anyone else-- sorry Hong. Sorry, Hong is not wanting to be on stake as we (inaudible) this point.

If I may just indulge you; I will be very happy to add to our list of letter writing a letter to the Board. What I will do is-- we didn't have the full board because there were other commitments. And I think those who did come need to be specifically recognized rather than just thank the Board generically. So I will ensure that we have the exact names who were there and drive very personally (inaudible) to the Board, naming those members and giving the feedback from our perspective of how worthwhile it was.

I think it's also very, very important for us to note in that letter than when we had our first breakfast in Mexico, they came very, very gradually, very, very reluctantly, and nowhere near as well represented as they did today, and we did slightly better in Sydney.

But what I'm very interested in doing is comparing after the board meeting tomorrow how many of the key players of the workgroups and committees-- sorry, the board committees that we in fact had at those tables. And I'm suspicious, highly suspicious that amongst those members who turned up were people who have deliberately turned up to engage with us because they have a very particular role in the next 12 to 18 months or two years on the Board, and they definitely want to see how we can be of assistance or how we may not.

So let's look at who gets what jobs in what committees and ensure that as we write back to them, if any of them have those leadership roles in those committees, we note that to thank them for coming and offer ourselves specifically in any way that may help their particular work agenda. Thank you. Sebastien.

Sebastien Bachollet: May I suggest, Cheryl, that we take a little moment about gTLD, because it seems that after the intermission of Carols, it was the reason why then I withdrew my, or asked to speak later on because it was not on the subject. I hope I have the agreement of the chair on that. And then if I have the agreement of the chair of that, I will give the speech to Vanda later.

Vanda Scartezini: Just to make one point to Carlos that if you have been in the session this morning, you have heard what happened with the full support of (inaudible) proposal. And this could be a shortcut to the new gTLDs. And I have been talking around, and it's really a huge support, and maybe we could do something about that. So it's a very-- maybe the it's not

so long term that we're going to see something happen in the new gTLD; just a kind of a complement.

And I'd like to remember -- it's in the middle of the process I just getting, sorry -- but I'd like to remember to mention that we as ALAC should expect it, a kind of astute or information about the consequences of the (inaudible)-- or no, about the registry and (inaudible) before any action.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: She was caught-- that captured for our records. Evan, your point is to [Gs], but back to Sebastien first, or no?

Sebastien Bachollet: In terms of gTLDs.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: gTLDs, yes? Yes, thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: As it turned out, our table had a couple of directors as well as Kurt Pritz's edit. And so the conversation definitely got to gTLDs, and specifically the concept of categories, but maybe not the traditional kind of categories. Not necessarily on type of application, but on difficulty of application.

So some of the directors at the table, they actually coined the term "pussycat domains" for the TLDs that would be able to go through with the least amount of objections and possibly allowing for different kinds of streams that they could in the early goings, identify which ones were the least contentious ones and perhaps put them through faster.

And this could go along, in fact, with Jonathon's proposal of sort of doing the pre-- the statement of interest, plus deposit kind of thing. Allows for a little bit of vetting. And so for instance, things like some of the IDN-based TLDs, as well as some of the least controversial ones like BZH and things like that could possibly go through, indicating progress from ICANN, indicating to the rest of the world that things are moving, things are going ahead, even though we still recognize there's some difficulties with some of the longer, more contentious parts of the process.

Sebastien Bachollet: I wanted to talk about one other event who came during this meeting. It was we're meeting with the GAC. Because it's the first time with ALAC and GAC together with everybody, with one and half hour long. We were able to really talk and exchange and be able to spend at least some of the time on that.

And I hope that it will be possible to follow, to have some follow up on that because I think it's really important with the affirmation of commitment that it's on the-- now it's-- we've asked, we already need to work with them more closely because both organizations, both I see a role, an important role in the future of that. And I hope that one day we will be able to set up a liaison with the GAC from the ALAC. It will be a great improvement. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead, Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, I want to add an observation. Having been in the GAC - ALAC meeting also, and then later on in the ccNSO meeting, it pops up that from the North European region, the geographical names has been a hot topic for them. And it's going to be rediscussed, it seems, in the ccNSO. So we have to keep this in mind that we are not yet rid of this argumentation of let's say in blocking the geographical names for the ccTLD space.

And just another observation I made, and for the record, when visiting several meetings yesterday, I observed that in some cases, most of the audience were ALAC members.

And I think that's also something we can applaud for us that we have been taking the power and the presence in the meetings where all the others were seamlessly tired, and the ALAC people was not.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We're a resilient lot. The next step, of course, is going to be that we have some form of [riven] at least, if not the colored lanyards, so they know it even more obviously. Adam, and then Carlton.

Adam Peake: About the GAC meeting, I think it would be very nice for the next meeting, the Nairobi meeting, we could have a pre-session so that we can prepare a little bit on what we're going to talk about because it's a bit scary at the beginning until we get going.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well you don't like to live dangerously? How very disappointing. Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Cheryl. Just to add a little grist to the mill, for the evaluation of the new gTLDs. You might wish to think that a little bit about this -- what is going to get to gTLD stage in production, you have to go through an evaluation criteria, set of evaluation criteria, that would have been developed whether by a contractor or by ICANN itself.

There is going to be an issue that when you have developed the criteria and applied to one set of generic gTLDs and they go through, and you apply a different criteria for the others that are coming behind it, there is going to be an issue. So just need to think about it.

It revolves on the evaluation criteria. The guideline is the guideline. Out of that is going to come a set of criteria. And I'm going to tell you that these lawyers have been waiting the pounce on the issue of not being equally protected by the evaluation criteria.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think that's probably a question we can raise back, at least our concerns about disequity in criteria. But of course, it is something I'd be highly surprised if, particularly the legal advisors at ICANN, were not well and truly aware of and doing as much due diligence as possible.

Personally, I'll be Godsmacked if we had a drifting in criteria. I think the whole name of the game is to get highly established criteria and then ensure that there's absolute equity. And one of the matters I had presented to me as a concern when people were talking about the concept of categorization was of course that would have to be ensuring that there was no disequity in any of that. So I think there is a (inaudible) eye on that, but more than happy, particularly if you start pinning it for us, to integrate that into a discussion point.

And the other thing I think, Evan, going back to the conversation I know you were having over morning tea because I was listening in, the point was made there as well I think, Evan, that you'd need to make sure that in any given group that was going forward, you dealt with all of those that you didn't do with 5 of the 10 that came through. You would have to go through all of them. So I'd be very, very surprised if people weren't being very concerned about that, but we've seen strange things happen.

And is there anyone else wishing to speak on the matter of new gTLDs? Indeed, Hong, We are ready for you. Thank you.

Hong Xue: Thank you, Madame Chair, for [ugDLDL]. So I have one point is on IDN new gTLDs. ICANN has been doing research on IDN new gTLDs for more than 10 years. But it seems quite shocking that ICANN is so much unprepared for this issue.

And I've been following the discussion on the Internet all through the week. Even before the week. It's very surprising to hear that ICANN is not talking about on how to remove the barrier where there is in fact two, three character requirements. It is possible for [CJ Tay] Group to apply for two character TLDs, or even one character TLD. They're now moving from two character to one single character.

This is really surprising. From day one of IDN per (inaudible) they've been emphasizing the value of user experience. If they really understand the user's experience of CJ Tay Group and a couple of other IDN language groups, they should know that in many of these communities, this one single character this means a lot of things. One example is telling that is for confusion is very profound. But lots of things could be expressed in three characters, and each one single character means, well, 100,000 character words.

So now ICANN is stretching whether this is possible to allow this dot.com-- [.home] as a single character TLD. This is quite surprising.

Let's go back to the point that's been raised by Cheryl at the beginning of this meeting. If you the community, IDN user community, could be involved in the policy and the technology development of IDN at the very beginning, and ICANN would be equipped with expertise of the language, on the usage of the language, and the uses of the character and there won't be such unpreparedness and at such late stage-- oh, okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hong, are you pleasantly surprised by some of these things, though? I would like to hear that you are at least pleasantly surprised by some of these things. I'm quite certain that when you, in the absence of Siva, if you'd take the time to brief James on all of this, he'll be well prepared and well equipped to bring that forward.

But one of the things is I think we should see it as a more flexible and less inflexible way forward. And I think that's good for us all. So any other comments on this? Thank you, Patrick.

Patrick Vande Walle: One additional remark has been said repeatedly -- thank you -- and well, I have a mike now. Thank you anyway, Sebastien.

It has been stated repeatedly in different technical meetings that adding new gTLDs to the root is going to be an issue -- either a small, a medium, or a large one -- depending how we handle to problem. As a root server operator indicated this morning, first we will ask, can you add DNSSEC? And then if that, can you add a IPv6? And then they said, can you add new gTLDs? And then they finally come up in saying, can you add all of them at the same time? And obviously, they don't want to.

They don't want to because they want the DNS to cut the new functioning and see what happens when we start adding a lot of new things to the root. Which means that ICANN might have to delay the moment where a new-- some gTLDs will be added to the root. In other words, who will come first and who will come last?

And if all this takes let's say 24 months to add all these TLDs to the root, because we want to proceed with care, that means that you don't want to be the applicant #500, of course.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent point. Go ahead, Vanda.

Vanda Scartezini: I also heard this morning that maybe they will refer to delay the DNSSEC because just few are aware in putting the root this kind of (inaudible). So maybe this is another flexibility also that comes up with probably where the-- let's see what we're going to have

in two weeks or something like that with the report that they're going to have to the ISOC. I don't know.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Right of reply, then. Yes?

Patrick Vande Walle: I don't feel (inaudible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That doesn't mean you have right to reply.

Patrick Vande Walle: Yes, you are right; I've heard similar rumors. But I've also heard the strong comments from the part of the technical communities saying that we should not-- they should not give an advantage-- they should proceed in a way that is technically sound rather than in a way that is politically sound. The political way is do the gTLDs. And the technical way is do DNSSEC first. So the Board will have to balance between both proposals.

I don't say they are mutually exclusive, but at some stage we might say, well, let's add the note. Com, net, and if you made your ccTLDs, let's add the DNSSEC signatures, and then stop there. Go to the new gTLDs, and afterwards, on the afterward, continue adding the DS signatures in the root.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. I see Des and then I see Gareth? No, I just see Des. Des, when you're doing this, it's very confusing for me. I was unsure whether I was talking to Carlton, whether I was talking to you or-- Gareth, go ahead, please.

Gareth Shearman: I was also at some of those SSAC and root server sessions, and I certainly detected the same thing that my colleagues here have been talking about. And there is a fair amount of controversy and a fair amount of nervousness, I think, on the part of some of the individuals involved about just what's going to happen. And there's no guarantees.

And the studies that have been done, although they've been-- the attempts have been made to make them as comprehensive as possible, there are still I think gaps in assurance that things aren't going to come unstuck if some things are done first.

As a matter of fact, in the SSAC session on Monday, there was a good bit of fun when one of the chair was challenged by one of the board members that was there as to what he would say if he challenged him about the reasons for putting the DNSSEC first. And the chair said, well I'll take you in the corner and we'll talk about that. So it certainly is an open question and something we need to keep our eyes on. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Keep our eyes on. And I think going back to the point Hong was making, if something that is avoided in future planning, if we have a cross community approach to things. So that I think something as an advisory committee we perhaps need to also keep our eye on and just remind when things are coming up that earlier intervention across community, earlier discussion across community can only lead to earlier, better outcomes.

If we-- go ahead, Adam. And that's it for this topic.

Adam Peake: The technical community couldn't have been asked more times how many new TLDs can the root take. It's just that they didn't really bother to answer the question in the way that they should have done.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. I'm not sure we can let that stand on the table without-- because it is both streamed and it is something that many of you-- I find contentious, I find slightly unacceptable in context because I think the point that we're making this morning was that they have answered, but in sections, which was valid.

- Adam Peake: I think what that does tend to do is show a lack of engagement that should have been, which should have taken place, and hopefully it won't ever happen again. But it is foolish that they were asked at multiple meetings. And the ITF was specifically asked to respond on how many it could do, and they specifically went and answered that how many question is it possible. And it was probably inappropriate of them.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's a very literal reading of the questions, perhaps. Sebastien, short response.
- Sebastien Bachollet: Just to tell you that I was in charge of the review of the introduction of the first TLD. And ICANN was supposed to gather together information and data at that time. It's a reason why there were a second round of TLD to allow that. And we are actually waiting for those.
- I will not push the blame on the technical community on this, but I think that there is a lack of a lot of organization in people in that situation where we are today, unfortunately.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. And if we move on to our next agenda item now. I think we've probably captured most of our action items as we've gone through. If not, I think there will be opportunity for it to check the list that we produce at the end, or probably produce at the end of the meeting; not just this meeting, but the whole of the ICANN meeting.
- We now move to next steps with respect to specific key series that were identified earlier. The first one is education of TLD managers, and we have a review of text. Patrick.
- Patrick Vande Walle: Yes. Well let me first get to the text. Don't know if it's on screen. I must say that between the time we had this discussion, it was on Tuesday, and today--
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Matthias doesn't have it to put on the screen.
- Patrick Vande Walle: Yes, and it's not linked to any webpage. I'll get my laptop.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Would it be appropriate for us to jump to the next one then? I think if you move across, it would be easier.
- While the wonderful logistics of being tied up with black cord as they work out how we're going to be connecting the audio/visual equipment goes on around me, I'd like for us to then continue to move on. And I'm going to look at the ALS - ccTLD bridge as formulating a working group. And I'll recognize Ron and Rudi's incredible work on this, but also ask Rudi if he'd like to briefly speak to and request for the formation of the working group. In advance of him speaking to the formation of the working group, I would like to propose that the ALAC stands ready to create this working group immediately after this presentation. Go ahead. Thank you, Rudi.
- Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Cheryl. Well, after Seoul, I proposed that I will try to write down in the next two weeks an operational plan so that we can have a view of at least those who are interested can have a view on the operational plan of it. And the goal I haven't had is that in Nairobi, we would be able to bring up already results coming from the floor, from our ALSes. And I'm almost sure that the room will try to help me to have some reflections back from the ccTLDs or some of them.
- And a little dream I have is that in Brussels, I would like to have ALSes and ccTLDs who have been talking to each other on stage, and showcase that it works. I think the best way to motivate others to participate, you put them on stage, you put them as the first who succeeded, and they will motivate others to come up and join us. And that's I think the best we can proceed for the moment.

I have already got some reactions from candidates. And as I thought I would be happy having five, I think I'm going to have 50, if I can be like that. So thank you already for the support and I will try to do really my best for getting this as a sample of outreach, and if possible, having some educational stuff in it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, Rudi. And one of the things I think as we formulate this particular workgroup in support of this project, it's not a standing workgroup. This is an ad hoc workgroup. We'll look at what the production of it is and reconsider ethics of this later. But in terms of the preparation of an ad hoc workgroup to support this particular project, can I put it to the ALAC members that this becomes formalized? Is there anyone who wishes to object to this? You wish to speak to this? Go ahead.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes because I was thinking that at the ALAC level we'll make a working group with a broader objective, including this one.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Would you care to share with us what you mean, the broader objective? Thank you.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes. It was discussed on Tuesday, one ALS, one country. And one part is the discussion and is the work we will do with the CC, but it could be other way and other things to do to add to this broader objective. And it's not in contradiction; it's just for ALAC perspective, I think more a boarder issue.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Back to you, Rudi. And I do think that this project is an analysis of existing as a product of this particular activity. We're (inaudible) into that. But go ahead, Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, I think that what Sebastien is proposing is what we finally have to do. Maybe this ad hoc workgroup can help us to define which way we can have a larger workgroup working on one ALS, one country. Because we have also to discover how it works from the ccTLD side. And as I heard already from [Roland], he has some figures on that also, that there is still a lot of work to do to get for every country also a ccTLD and a ccNSO member. So they have the same effort to do.

If they can try to do it together, they can share costs eventually. But we share efforts also. And maybe the one ALS, one country can be, can start immediately after we get the first results out of this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Rudi, but I would caution us to consider that in fact it wouldn't be the job of a large workgroup to do the one ALS, one country. It is the very much the remit of the regional leadership and the regional At-Large organizations because it is their ALSes that would be what's being focused on. So the At-Large Advisory Committee would be facilitating, encouraging, and doing everything possible. I think the actual outreach and design should be cross regional. And to that end, I think the design that you proposed where we have at least one member per region is essential.

So can I ask, Sebastien, rather than trying to do too much too soon, if we just start with the ad hoc group? Thank you. Adam, go ahead.

Adam Peake: It's worth keeping in touch with the Nairobi meeting planners because there's an AFTLD meeting being held the week before Nairobi, which is being planned now. There's not much details of it. So this actually might be something that you could fit in prior rather than during.

And also, there's some beginning of discussions now about trying to make some sort of thematic themes around development and supporting developing countries, which it may or may not fit with. But depending-- so there may be space for it in other parts. There's

all kinds of all over the schedule, in other words. But keep looking at it, but keep talking to the meeting planners.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Adam. Just as Ron leaves, I just want to give him the microphone for a moment. He's got other commitments calling him way. I'm sure he and Rudi and everyone else on the team will be very keen to follow up on your suggestion. And thank you. Go ahead, Ron.

Ron Sherwood: Thank you. Can you hear me? Thank you. It's a privilege to be here, and it's a privilege to work with you. I will be pleased to join your working group. I know we're going through a lot of work online as well as face to face with other meetings.

I can report that my reports of the NSO Council was adopted, and everything that was in that report, and I'll send you a copy, is in favor of doing what you plan to do. So I see it going the right way.

I've also learned more recently and everyday that there are a lot of TLDs that actually not only have outreach programs, but work with ALSes. So we need to find out who and how and why and what the benefits are and be able to share that news.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed. That would be very, very useful marketing tools. Thank you very much, Ron. And I just-- while we're on this topic, James mentioned that his interest was also to look at a little survey or information-gathering exercise regarding what ccTLDs might have been interested in the Fast-Track implementation for IDNs. It appears to me there's a clear nexus there that I think we should read to the record that working together on this makes sense. We don't want to get survey-y exhaustion.

Ron Sherwood: Well if I may, just before I leave, the CCs are getting a lot of requests of surveys from people all over the place. I think that what I can do is to handle any needs that you have and compress them into one survey so that we don't get survey sick. Thank you, everybody. Goodbye now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Ron. Thank you very much. Okay, I have Hong and then I want to put this to the vote. Hong. Sorry, Hawa. My error.

Hawa Diakité: (Spoken in foreign language)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I can't imagine it's doing other than that. That sounds like an excellent plan. Thank you very much, Hawa. To that end, then, we're looking forward to making this is a formalized, but nevertheless, ad hoc workgroup. I think it's clear we're going to be asking for regional input. We'll put that to the regions. People want to put their hands up now or approach Rudi now, please do so. His aim to get at least one person per region; more are fine. James, I think by definition you need to be part of that. Now, just-- and Hawa, obviously.

I see Sylvia. I see the whole of Latin America. I see Dave. Thank you, Dave. I definitely saw the whole of Latin America. At all levels I saw Latin America.

But one thing I'd like to do is have a slightly experienced ALAC leading this. And to that end, Adam, you have the connections. Would you be willing to take-- the formal ALAC lead is that we put in (inaudible) the workgroup? There we go. Does anyone object to that design plan? Done. Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen.

Now, with time being what it is, and with Scott being back and I believe is organized, with your indulgence, I'd like to break in the proceedings the way we should have started,

which is to look at a little bit of exciting news. Or listen, sorry, to some exciting news and have a listen to the podcast. You've already definitely got the talent lined up.

And because you have other commitments, Scott, and it will give us a chance to get up, stretch, and grab a cup of coffee or water, after the podcast, if we can have people, particularly those of you who aren't part of the voting mechanism yet, so perhaps just some of the regional people, go do whatever it is you need them to do with 61 words and return to the table. That would be fantastic. Is that how you want to do it, Scott? Is that for you or not now or what?

Scott Pinzon: (Inaudible - microphone inaccessible)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I wasn't suggesting-- when I said go, I did mean go and perhaps use one of the other rooms. So that would be my design there. Just for the record, Scott said he had every intention of going and finding somewhere quiet to do the 4 track recording.

So, if the audio/visual gods and goddesses are with us, we should be able to listen now to cue. Well, something's on the screen. Of course the audio gods may or may not be with us. So of the regional voices-- (technical difficulty) --up the rank to go and do the recordings, followed by who? Someone needs to put their hand up. Ah, here we go. Sylvia. So Didia (ph), then Sylvia, and then we'll move around.

[Video played]

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. That's all very exciting. It goes on for another few minutes, but I think you've got the flavor of it. And we're going to send people off to go and do this; their talking headpiece over 61 words.

I think this is hugely, hugely exciting. And I hope that the regional leadership can see this as a valuable resource. You're probably too tired to think about it now, but we'll make sure that the mp3 file of this goes out to you all and you can start sending it to the ALSes and getting a feel back for what might be possible and what desires they might have for future information.

Right. Back to you, Patrick. Thank you very much for the indulgence. And when Dedia comes back, perhaps Sylvia can go and do, and we'll sort of move up the table that way. Go ahead.

Patrick Vande Walle: Okay. Thank you, Cheryl. Let me summarize some of the events that happened between the conversation that we had on Tuesday and today. On Tuesday, we had this conversation on the basis of which I've drafted the documents you see on screen. And I went looking for further information from the ICANN staff and from the ICANN partners that work on the ccTLD education.

And apparently, which is something I didn't know, but there is a whole ccTLD program currently going on. It's currently going on. It's going on in Africa. It will be a session also in Asia. There could be sessions in Central America if there is sufficient demand. And the sessions at this stage do not address DNSSEC.

They do not address DNSSEC mostly because the trainers were unable to actually find out what was requested, which sort of training was requested for the ccTLDs, which level, etc. So they are telling me, look, if they want training on DNSSEC, they can have it. We can organize it if only they ask for it. Because we don't want to spend the money, the budget on organizing trainings that people will not put to use.

And at the same time, because it now seems that ICANN would go for a more or less simultaneous deployment of DNSSEC and the root, new gTLDs, IPv6, etc, there will most probably be in the beginning some pioneer TLDs that will be added to the roots, and the rest of the TLDs will be added one by one as they come to ICANN or to IANA to request to be added.

But they see it-- so as I said, there is no specific DNSSEC training in the three modules they just suggested. Reason being that first of all, they don't know what the people want to hear, but DNSSEC also requires good level of expertise, not only on the way the DNS works and how you run a TLD, but also on the subjects like cryptography, for example. And again, if they were to organize sessions on DNSSEC, they first would have to organize sessions on cryptography, or at least some basics of cryptography.

What I want to say in summary is that these trainers have a program. It does not address DNSSEC. It could address DNSSEC. It could address DNSSEC once they have identified the demand.

So the whole point I was trying to make on Tuesday is actually a bit moot in the sense that first sentence, for example, we-- I'm not sure that we wish to draw the attention of the Board on the challenges raised by deployment of DNSSEC. Or maybe we could leave that one, but a lot of the text would be, could be deleted. For example, the last paragraph, ICANN is already doing that.

So it is doing that quietly where we were not even aware. ICANN was doing that. I think we should rather than complain that ICANN is not doing anything, we should quite to the contrary congratulate ICANN for doing that. Actually, I heard that ICANN spends \$500,000 a year on training ccTLDs. That's a major investment. So I would suggest--

Vanda Scartezini:

Patrick, just had something. It's small. And there is a lot of CCs that just give some information technology and so on for the developing countries, and share with them some knowledge and so on. So it's an old problem, in fact, that-- (technical difficulty) --you need to have even people that is capable to train, because most of the people don't know how to deal with (technical difficulty).

Patrick Vande Walle:

Yes. Well, you can be assured that the training that are being financed by ICANN, by ISOC, and NSLC are done with professional trainers with a long experience on the matter of-- I saw some of the documents from previous trainings and they were done by people like Olaf Kolkman, who some of you may know, or (inaudible) and people that you would find, for example, in SSAC or RSEC.

So what I would suggest here is to more or less forget even-- most of what is in the proposed text and actually start drafting something from scratch if we need to draft something from scratch. And what I'd like to hear from you is based on the additional information that was given, if you still feel there is a need to send a note to the Board to support that effort because they are already doing it.

Vanda Scartezini:

I should believe we should cut a lot of issues that we had talked about. But it's important to make sure our concern about the idea that it's not done. And that we wish, at the least, that this will take it into account and that incorporate-- in some way incorporate it into the normal training that people worked on in order to assure that we're going to have in the timeline all the small ccTLDs with knowledge about how to do and implement it with DNSSEC. That's, in my point of view, what we could suggest as a concern of the ALAC with the people in that region.

- Patrick Vande Walle: And I would like to add to that that actually, even some small ccTLDs have already started deploying the DNSSEC, even-- although only a testbed. But I was surprised to hear yesterday in the DNSSEC workshop that for example, in Ameba (ph), which has .na with 2,000 registrations, already signs the [design]. And this is being done on the spare time by a gynecologist. Well, he presents himself as a gynecologist. He said day an obstetrician at night, and a ccTLD manager on Sunday.
- Rudi Vansnick: He's got the profile of a new ccTLD manager?
- Sebastien Bachollet: I think we need to have a document, because it's also important to take this opportunity for At-Large and ALAC to say something on technical issues.
- Now what we'll write at the end of the day I would say I don't care. But I think we must not delete all this text because there are some things-- maybe we will get answer that it's done, but as you say, it could be done, but it's not done. Then let's leave one part of the text to say we are concerned, and then we will see what will be the answer. We are concerned; we inform the community that we are, as end user, concerned with the deployment of DNSSEC in our TLD CCs and gTLD world.
- Patrick Vande Walle: Okay. Well, I will suggest in a new text in the coming days, and we can continue the discussion on the list I suggest.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, Patrick. Just-- I told Vanda that she couldn't go because we still had something to vote on. We don't at all have anything to vote on, Vanda. We've tricked you. So if we can get that mike back and--.
- Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible - microphone inaccessible)
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, that's all right. I have total trust in you. And Vanda, if I can get you to come over here and we can do a little something. Yes, we're going to do a little duet. The little duet goes like this -- we got Jose earlier, but now it's your turn.
- We want to thank you for your formal role within ALAC as a NomCom appointee from Latin America/Caribbean. We want to make it very clear that there is no escape, and that we're not letting you in any way go. That we have such faith and are so excited about having you as our liaison to the Board. And the confidence we have in you is beyond extraordinary. I don't know how everyone else feels, but I think we are going to move from strength to strength under your voice and leadership on the Board. The trust you bring is phenomenal.
- We've all signed this ICANN t-shirt. Where you wear it and how you wear it is your choice, but we hope it's from-- it's from our heart, and thank you. All the signatures are on there.
- Vanda Scartezini: I'd like to remember you that I missed you in the ALAC. You can not get rid of me, no. I'm still here. Because the formal work of the liaison is really to report to the ALAC. I have no real commitment with the Board. My commitment is with the ALAC. So, thank you very much. I love it. Love it. I love it.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Vanda. And Vanda has offered to save an ex-officio post with the executive committee, do the extra monthly meetings and all those sorts of things. Phenomenal work. It fits. It looks good. It looks good. Excellent. Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen who are remaining--
- Vanda Scartezini: May I leave?

- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You can escape from here and go to your other role. We will work tomorrow, indeed. Thank you. A temporary reprieve is all we're going to give you.
- Vanda Scartezini: Jose? (Spoken in foreign language)
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Vanda, I'm just wondering, we did want a photo shoot. Can we just quickly gather around Vanda somewhere, do a quick happy snap of us all, and that will meet all those needs at one time and you can then escape. All right. Whoever's going to do the photography, get yourself organized. The rest of you, get yourselves a smile.
- Unidentified Participant: Sorry, Terry (ph). I want to say goodbye to you or (inaudible) because I have another compromise now. Tomorrow, I leave early in the morning. So, see you.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye bye. Thank you. The only remaining ICANN that we will be dealing with into today/tonight's agenda, we'll put the matters of the education TLD as discussed onto lists. We're going to move the other items onto list or our next call.
- We do want to quickly look at the allocation of new ALAC members to ALAC committees and working groups. So Nick, you've got that up there, and in a perfect world, you might be able to read it, but I can't.
- Nick Ashton-Hart: (Technical difficulty) --mended for most of these working groups since the Summit, and I think some of them are probably quite out of date. For example, we still have Khaled Koubaa as the chair of the new gTLDs working group and Erick Ahon and Sebastian Ricardi as vice chairs. And Erick, his ALS is no longer a part of At-Large, for example.
- So I'm wondering if we could also visit this. I suspect that Evan is effectively the chair of the new gTLD working group at this point, for example.
- So if you want, Cheryl, you could just go from the top-down and see are people still willing to serve and other vice chairs who are still engaged.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Go ahead, Evan.
- Evan Leibovitch: Given that I'm not on ALAC, if that's acceptable, I'm certainly happy with that.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Let me make it clear. If there are any of these working groups, other ALAC working groups, the idea is for them to be regional ALS and community populated and led. Our role is to facilitate, encourage, give them the mechanisms for it to happen. And we will have an ALAC lead. In this case, you've got Patrick. It is possible that there could be a co-chair relationship, but we want the work happening closer to the edges. So if you're willing to take that role, Evan, that would be excellent.
- Evan Leibovitch: I had actually toyed around with suggesting myself for the role of NCUC liaison which had gone missing, but I don't know if anybody wants it at this point.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well actually, we can discuss that when we get to it, okay? Can we now go down to Future Structure and Governance of ICANN? You can read it.
- Unidentified Participant: Just one second. Just so you know, we have a spot for chairs, plural -- or one, obviously - - vice chairs, rappator, and ALAC's focal point.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's a carryover from the Summit. We do not need a rapporteur for these working groups. (Inaudible) can be the leader.

- Unidentified Participant: Do you want to have a vice chair?
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think that's a little formal outside of the Summit requirements. Evan, your opinion on that, is (inaudible) the only one ensconced in a position now?
- Evan Leibovitch: I think a chair is a good idea. I think when one of the working groups has an immediate action item to work on that it's responding on, having a rapporteur as wordsmith to go along with things obviously help things go better. But each of these working groups is going to go through periods of clam and periods of frantic action, so you need more people as the demand required.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If I could guide you, and any other chair here who's taking these roles, I think I've-- my suggestion would be you simply establish who will hold the pen on that document at any given time. And that stops this structural nonsenses that I am the this, I can't be the that.
- Into the microphone, please.
- Unidentified Participant: Thank you, Cher. I was agreeing with you that the way to approach the working group is to simply decide who holds the pen. But also, the role of the rapporteur is a little bit different from just taking notes.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. I mean this is a carry over from the Summit, but tidying it up is important. Thank you.
- The next one is the Future Structure and Governance of ICANN. Current chair is Sebastien Bachollet. Are you still willing and able to continue to serve in that role?
- Sebastien Bachollet: I will reverse the question. If somebody want to take the role, I will give in without any trouble. If nobody wants, or any want to do-- no, I think this the way I am already vice chair, I have a lot of things to do, then I have no problem to leave.
- I have one question more generic is there are two groups I think who could merge because there is not too much differences and we discuss the same things. And if we merge the transparency and accountability and the future structure and governance of ICANN into one single working group, then it may be somebody else who want to take the lead of this working group. And once again, if not, I will do it.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Adam, as one of the only people at the table from the other working group, your view on merging the clearly overlapping now two working groups?
- Adam Peake: I was going to suggest the same thing, and I'd be happy to take on the vice role to Sebastien in that which would--
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's the co-chair role.
- Adam Peake: Well, yes. Well however we wish to do it, yes.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent. Done. Remembering that the first job as chair and co-chair and lead will be for you to repopulate these working groups, reassume membership, and reorganize. Go ahead.
- Sebastien Bachollet: Yes, I'm' a little bit worried because Sylvia is not here, and Sylvia was very helpful in this-- sorry-- in the future structure working group. Then I will wish that we say that today, but we review that with Sylvia, and if Sylvia wants to take a role, we will-- I

suggest that-- whoever decide how we will organize this work, this leading of this working group, please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well providing one of you is also wearing the hat of the lead, so one person's responsible for feeding back into the ALAC what goes on. Go ahead.

Adam Peake: I was just going to say that I think we can assume that Wolfgang has quite enough work to do as NomCom chair, so we can say thank you and that'll do that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That would be a fair prediction, I think. Okay, so that leaves us the At-Large Engagement in ICANN. I actually think anything relating to that is really now as a committee as a whole, and I'd like to propose that that quietly goes away, or noisily goes away perhaps, as an established workgroup. Go ahead, Nick.

Nick Ashton-Hart: My only proposal is that you may wish to charter that working group with a continuing role in following the At-Large improvement process.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well that's renaming that I wouldn't-- I think we need have a hard stop and a reconstruction than we do more thing of one to the other. So I'd prefer to get rid of that one totally and have an At-Large Improvements Working Group, which for the beginning will be a committee as a whole until we have our next meeting and sort it out.

Okay. That then leads us to DNS Security Issues; a hot topic which will continue. I've seen a reason to bolt through it and get more people involved. I'm obviously about to offer Patrick the microphone if we can find one for him.

Patrick Vande Walle: Well first of all, I would suggest maybe to rename this working group to DNS Technical Issues. It's more general. It's less focused on security. I mean we can address security issues, but we can also address other issues like-- well, don't have anything in mind currently.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Trust me; I understand. Go ahead, Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Why not just call it the DNS working group?

Patrick Vande Walle: Well, DNS Working Group seems too vague. All we are doing here is more or less DNS related. I would even go to suggest to call it Technical Working Group, even leaving out DNS so that it could, for example, merge with and deal with IPv6 related issues.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And then it could even merge with some of the IDN issues. Let's call it the Technical workgroup. Technical Workgroup? I'm looking to James for some indication of--

James Seng: So I have not participate in the ALAC Working Group before, and very [constant] I will be nominated as IDN Working Group chair, which I assume that will be the case. So if it will be renamed as Technical Working Group, I fully support that and I will support to be the vice chair.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sounds like a perfect plan to me. Excellent. Thank you. Go ahead, Nick.

Nick Ashton-Hart: Point of clarification -- we're merging the IDN Policy Working Group with the Technical Issues Working Group? Okay, that's what I heard.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Well, in terms of working group, there's no reason why that can't happen.

James Seng: As I say, if I have not participated in ALAC working group before, so I have to take on the chair. I'll be happy to be a vice chair and then (inaudible) figure out where that can (inaudible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry; you're referring to the IDN Policy Workgroup, correct?

James Seng: That's right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. That's sort of the next tab off the rank, but not with technical issues. We'll change that. And I do have a proposal for how we can move forward on the IDN.

In terms of the chair, are we able to confirm for the technical issues, currently we have Lutz. Can we approach him and discover whether he's still willing to take that role?

Patrick Vande Walle: Well, I will ask him.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I would think as our liaison into SSAC, you're a natural fit for our ALAC lead there. But we will need to repopulate that workgroup, and that's where some of the ALSes who are ISOCs would be very useful as well. It's Gareth and Sebastien.

Gareth Shearman: I just wanted to volunteer to be involved with that working group.

Sebastien Bachollet: So does Hawa.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Fantastic. Thank you.

Sebastien Bachollet: And as we are merging the group with IPv4, IPv6 issue, I guess Olivier Crépin-Leblond will be willing he was chair of this working group--

Patrick Vande Walle: You think so? Well, okay. I'll add IPv6 to the menu and then know that he will come.

James Seng: So if IDN Technical Issues will be discussed in this working group, I'll be happy to participate in the working group, too.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. I'd really like us to actually get rid of the term vice chairs and use co-chairs where we possibly can if we need to have this sort of balanced role.

Moving down, the IRT really has become the name task force, and I think that's well populated. Yes, go ahead, Nick.

Nick Ashton-Hart: Sorry. Just trying to keep up here. Patrick, are you going to be the co-chair of this working group instead of being a vice chair with Lutz's chair?

Patrick Vande Walle: I will have to check what Lutz's intentions are. I would say that at this stage, leave it like that and we will update the spreadsheet once we have Lutz's answer.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But do take on board the fact that I would like to get rid of the term vice chair and have neither chairs or leads and co-leads or co-chairs. Because I don't want structure being developed in these things. We just need someone to take the meetings in hand and move the work on.

Patrick Vande Walle: Well, I'm happy with both. So if you like co-chair, well let's put co-chair. I'm more interested in the actual work that people do rather than the title they wear.

- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Which is why I want to get rid of as many titles as possible. Okay. Just before Vivek goes to record, you are involved now with APRALOs endorsement to be involved in the new name task force. But is there another one of these that you find yourself particularly attracted to?
- Vivek Durai: (Inaudible - microphone inaccessible).
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Understand, but which particular topic?
- Vivek Durai: I think the name issue task force, all right.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. We might use your assistance in IDN, but you are already part of the name issues task force, so we might use you with the IDNs as well. Thank you. I just wanted to grab you before you went to do the recording. Thank you very much. Go ahead, Evan.
- Evan Leibovitch: I think it's safe to note the IRT Working Group, effectively that's become the task force.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I think that's pretty much the case. So we just remove one and establish the other.
- Now this brings us to the IDN Policy-- (technical difficulty) -- in the IDN Policy Workgroup. I'm wondering if we could prevail, between you and I, we could prevail upon Hong Xue to see if she would be willing to lead this particular workgroup in terms of policy.
- James Seng: I would love to have Hong (inaudible).
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Who helped who isn't the issue, but if we can have you two in leadership role there, you therefore will be acting as the lead from the ALAC. What we do is what we want the workgroups to be working at the edges, involving the ALSes, but that we also want at least one ALAC member whose responsibility it is to liaise, to facilitate between the workgroup and the ALAC. So that's an easy role, one that fits perfectly with your liaison. So if you're up for that that would be fantastic.
- James Seng: No problem
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. And we've-- names is in there. What else do we need to do? Yes, Nick.
- Nick Ashton-Hart: The workgroup above IDN policy is the At-Large GNSO Registrant Rights and Responsibilities, which there's an At-Large Registrant Rights and Responsibilities Working Group as a standing working group.
- Evan Leibovitch: And it's co-chaired by Beau and I forget who the GNSO lead is. But Beau is definitely one of the co-chairs.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You're actually referring to the, within GNSO official PDP and review, which is Steve Metalitz and Beau, this is actually the ALAC workgroup where we're trying to get the feed in from the wider populous. So our list, though, this is Dani and everyone else can-- there is already an active workgroup there.
- Now Beau is already a lead in there. It would be very nice if we could have someone from the European quarter with their particular focus on the charters and the rights issues. I wonder if we could ask you to raise this in your region and see if we can find someone to also join this group.

Sebastien Bachollet: Well, it's Max Senges who comes to my mind spontaneously, but I don't know he started new job beginning of October. I can't tell about his availability for the time being, but I can raise this and find out if anybody else in case of will-- is prepared to join.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent. Thank you very much. Are we up to which part now? Have we done them all?

Nick Ashton-Hart: Is the ALAC focal point on that working groups, it's Beau, right?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct.

Nick Ashton-Hart: Name issues is Evan and Patrick.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead, Patrick.

Patrick Vande Walle: On the Registrants Rights and Responsibilities, we have indicated Beau as the ALAC focal point, but Beau is not on the ALAC.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes he is.

Patrick Vande Walle: Yes he is. Oh, sorry. I must be very tired.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Nobody's told me, if that's the case. Okay then. So, we've got ourselves covered there. Nick, do you want to double check everything? And is there--. Okay. Are we all right? Good. Is there any of the others? I can only see at the screen. So are we done now?

Unidentified Participant: Those have just become dormant, these three.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So those bottom ones are dormant. Excellent.

Unidentified Participant: There is not listed here the WHOIS Policy Working Group, which has been dormant due to the way in which WHOIS policy is currently in sort of limbo.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Actually, there's a couple that aren't listed there. And with absolute perfect timing, the one I noted wasn't still there and needs to be is the IPv4 to IPv6 transition one.

Sebastien Bachollet: We merge it with the Technical Issues.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh yes. So we make sure that Olivier is in that.

Sebastien Bachollet: We take care of that, yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. WHOIS? WHOIS policy; what an excellent question. Because there's going to be a number of WHOIS studies, and we're going to need to respond to those, it will be good to have someone pre-preparing the community, raising the issues, and working on those things. Can I have someone who's interested in doing that? Rudi seems to be interested in being involved.

Carlton, are you-- you've got the role of rapporteur, but it doesn't let you get away with not having a particular workgroup. Does this one take your fancy at all, or--? We're not doing leaders yet. Don't panic. Mike, mike, mike.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, Cher. I'm at least two of them. I was on the Future Structure and Governance of ICANN and the Registrants Rights and Responsibilities.

- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, we need then to make an outreach for four people to populate the WHOIS policy. It is in fact incredibly important. We also need to discuss do we need to establish a WHOIS policy liaison, just as we have an IDN policy liaison.
- Jose, you were previously the lead on the WHOIS workgroup. Is there anyone who you've worked with in the last couple of years who would come to mind?
- Jose Ovidio Salgueiro: Well not really because it really doesn't-- no one pops up here. But what you need is just to want to do it.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed. All right. Well, we'll do this as a to-be-determined.
- Then the only vacancy issue that I believe we have now is the relationship with the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Groups, specifically in the Non-Commercial Users' Constituency, correct?
- We've welcomed Bill as a liaison to us. And it strikes me that because we have now with Dave and who else? James, you're a member of the NCUC, aren't you? No, you're not? Okay. I know Dave-- I know you are, Adam. But we do have a couple of-- sorry, whatever. No, yes, whatever.
- We have a couple of people who are members. I was thinking that rather than just go through the process of some form of election, why not utilize the talent we have here and simply ask them to do the reciprocal role? Go ahead Wolf and then Adam.
- Wolf Ludwig: Well, I was informally asked by NCUC some days ago whether I would be interested to take the ALAC NCUC role, completing Bill's vice versa role.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead, Adam.
- Adam Peake: That is strange because I thought I was asked, but I'm not-- no, no, no; I'm-- GLOCOM is a member of the NCUC. I used to be the represent before it. I no longer am and I'm also not an individual member.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So the organizational has separated from you. Well that's fine. Okay. Well we're certainly not short of members of NCUC around the table.
- Let's ask the group, anyone have a particular issue with Wolf taking up that offer? No? Well no; he's well experienced, he's already in the engagement zone. And if he's willing to do this piece of work, I think he'd be exceptionally good at the job.
- Wolf Ludwig: Let me say, I'm not afraid to be sometimes in the line of fire. And I know Milton since many years. I know Bill since many years. And I think I can avoid further troubles, etc, and--
- Unidentified Participant: For what it's worth, I-- as I have worked for quite some time in close quarters with Wolf, I can assure you that he's good about being fair, firm, and yes, he's good at drawing a line in a way that other people feel they shouldn't cross, really, because it wouldn't be nice. Wolf is too good a guy. He's good at this sort of thing.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I have absolute confidence.
- Wolf Ludwig: I don't know what he's talking about.
- Unidentified Participant: Do you cross like that or like that?

- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. And to the audience stream, we're looking at--
- Wolf Ludwig: It depends on the daytime.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So to that end, I mean I have absolute confidence in Wolf's abilities here. And the fact that you've been invited is also something I think is very, very important. So if you would like to take that role, I can't see anyone else arguing. In fact, I can say nothing but support. So thank you very, very much for that.
- Now, is there anything we've missed?
- Unidentified Participant: Do you want anymore working groups?
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, that's certainly-- is there any working group, based on what we see coming in policy development that can't just be dealt with either at the whole or in an ad hoc system? I don't see any holes. Does anyone else see anything?
- Sebastien Bachollet: We decide about one, and you have to (inaudible) the one on CC - At-Large relationship. And it's another group, but just to add it on our list of the working group, please.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead, Evan.
- Evan Leibovitch: Given conversations that have been going on, for instance, with the CFO of ICANN and conversations we've been having about budgetary issues and that kind of thing, is it worth reviving a finance working group that would then deal with, or is this--
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We don't have a finance working group. We actually have a budget and finance subcommittee which is at a higher stage than the working groups. Which is fine, yes; it needs to be repopulated. But yet, I couldn't agree with you more. But it's not a mere working group. It's actually a regionally-valid subcommittee of the ALAC because it has to have that connection.
- No one has a burning to desire to separate out start planning or anything? I don't, but if you do, speak now or forever hold your piece, at least for the next few months.
- Okay, then we can move to some other issues. One of which is -- so I can stretch -- the matter of we have got four geographic regions represented with the elected representatives of the-- sorry, the elected officers of the ALAC. And we would be looking for a fifth, and we would now be asking the-- sorry, time. Go ahead, Adam.
- Adam Peake: If I left the room for five minutes, there's not going to be anything that would be voted on that you'd beat me up for missing or anything like that?
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No. we might end up with you chairing an awful lot of things and being on everything we discuss, but that's another matter altogether.
- Adam Peake: I have some 7:30 commitments that I promised. I'm going to tell them that I'm missing them.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. And we really are wrapping up. I must say, we are definitely wrapping up. Okay, quickly, everyone work out what we want Adam to do while he's out of the room.
- It now comes to the point where I would like to ask if AFRALO has decided whom they would like to send as the regional representative to complete the regional mix of the evicted officers of the ALAC plus one.

Unidentified Participant: (Spoken in foreign language)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Des?

Dessi Greve: Before the member was elected, so it seemed that the fifth one should be elected as the others were elected. But if you want AFRALO to nominate someone, it should take us (inaudible), but we have to talk to all the AFRALOs.

Sebastien Bachollet: But you have to remember in the ALAC that it's one of the three.

Dessi Greve: So we have three of them. So they have to talk and (inaudible). You have Mohammed, Hawa, and then Decolas (ph). And Mohammed isn't here. So at least--

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And Mohammed's indicated he can't take on the role at the executive level, so he's already recused himself.

Dessi Greve: Yes. So we still have Hawa. Okay, so I don't know.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hawa, is your English up to working in English back on the executive, because we will only be working in English on the executive. So you two decide, but we won't be doing-- Use the microphone.

Hawa Diakit : We will talk with Mohammed and come to.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. We'll need that decision within the next 10 days because we will be having -- I'm serious, [Vivek] -- we will be having our first executive meeting mid month, and we definitely want Africa as part of that. It's too important for us to not have your region represented. So please, come back to us with who of the three are going to be doing it. Thank you.

Okay. Is there-- (inaudible), can I get you to bring up the current membership of the Budget and Finance Committee? In terms of budget and finance, I as chair would have a (inaudible) on that. And APRALO is previously and continues to be happy to vest their regional representation into that group through me. We now will be looking very shortly on, for example, we have to replace Vanda.

The other two rules of procedure working group will be revitalized, but that will be under the control of Alan Greenberg and Carlton in their specific roles. And I'll work on that in next steps. And the other one I think we need to delete the planning committee is long defunct and doesn't need to stay there. Yes, go ahead, Nick.

Nick Ashton-Hart: In case anyone no longer recalls, the Planning Committee was a periodic working group commissioned to plan the ALAC and At-Large schedule at ICANN meetings. So it, yes, it wasn't terribly successful, it must be said.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think not terribly successful-- well, that's my looking at it, but the role has been taken by the executives since then, so we don't need a committee to be doing that.

Okay. Now looking at the existing Budget and Finance Committee, Adam has recently reaffirmed, in fact, at our last face-to-face meeting his willingness to be in that role. We do have-- and Alan has, I believe, reaffirmed his willingness to be in that role.

We do need, however, to have a replacement for Africa and for Latin America. So as an ALAC member, you again have three. You also need to discuss and get back to us in the same timeframe who will be involved in that activity.

Latin America and the Caribbean, I see it as an opportunity-- I mean Carlton, you're going to have a hell of a lot on your plate. Would you like to have a word with Sylvia quietly and see whether you want to fight it out, or do you just want to have someone put their hand up because I can see Sylvia's hand creeping towards. It's going like this-- Carlton, do you have an incredible objection to Sylvia taking on that role? It sounds so-- because I can see Sylvia's like, ooh, ooh, I'd like to do that. Okay. I think it's very important that that is well represented from people who are active in the region. And they do have to be active in the region.

Okay. Have we missed any? Nick, can you see anything we've missed?

Nick Ashton-Hart:

No.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

At which point, ladies and gentlemen, I declare it another marathon effort. And pass the microphone to Sebastien.

Sebastien Bachollet:

I'm sorry to take you two minutes, but I just want to-- it's a topic we will not discuss here because it will be the next conference call, I guess, but I need to tell you that since the beginning of this week, Olivier was not supposed to be there. Because as a NomCom appointee, he was supposed to arrive today.

And among the work he'd done during this week, without per diem and without any other things, it's something we need not only to tell him that he reward that, but also we need really to think how we will do that in the future.

My-- that's my point of view, but I guess for other people, it's important to know that we think that the Nominating Committee must participate through the all ICANN meeting, and if they can deliver work like Olivier does during this week, it will be great.

I will not tell you how we organized to decrease the costs for him on that issue, but I think it was not fair. It's not fair from ICANN what's current situation. And I wanted to say that today because it's the meeting and now going on. Thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Go ahead, Adam.

Adam Peake:

If it's relevant -- and sorry to walk in late, but certainly I think it's very much appreciated what Olivier's done -- but if there's interested in the background of why NomCom people were actually brought to ICANN meetings in this way, it was George Sadowsky. And also when I was supporting George, the idea was that a lot of the NomCom members might not be the most experienced in ICANN itself.

They had to get a good knowledge of the full range of things that were going on in ICANN, and that attending an ICANN meeting at the start of their term was an ideal opportunity to do that. So by only allowing people to come toward the end of the meeting actually undoes what the original purpose of having people attend was.

The original arrangement for NomCom members was that they all traveled business class to a single meeting, got off the plane, worked for about five days, got back on the plane, hence the business class time to travel. And the arrangement then became you will attend two meetings, travel economy, and that was how it split up. So now we seem to have the worst of both worlds.

But the original idea was that because we do tend to live in our silos in ICANN, even if you are an experienced ICANN person, the idea of attending a meeting at the start of

your term is really to get experience across the full range of ICANN activities, and that was the purpose of this jewel, come at the start of term arrangement.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And to that end, while it's raised, in the review of the NomCom meeting -- and I think that's all very good to raise it in the review of the NomCom meeting -- when we do our regioned response to the review of the NomCom, this a matter that I think we need to take more than seriously. And we need to make very, very clear that it is doing a disservice. To my mind, it's neutering the role. And I look towards all your support for the right words missing to make that very, very clear that it's just not good enough.

I'm now going to call for any last words. I feel a little like I'm making a blessing a dying body here, but any last words to this meeting? Anyone want to raise any particular points, any particular pieces of business? Go ahead, Adam.

Adam Peake: I am speaking a lot. Something, and I've heard a couple of comments from people saying that they're worried about Nairobi as a location for attending meetings. It does have problems. There's a northern border where you may get all kinds of things, but you're going to go to the northern border and get shot by Somalis and things like that.

The city of Nairobi is safe. If you've been to Johannesburg or Cape Town or Rio or Sub Paolo, you're going through the same sort of experience. You have to be sensible, but it's a great city. I've wandered around it and been drunk in it and I still haven't been shot yet. But there are places you don't go.

Evan Leibovitch: How many cities have you been shot in?

Adam Peake: Shot at. Shot at. I was approached with a knife in London, so it can happen everywhere. What I'm trying to say is it's no worse than a lot of the world. And don't worry about it. We should be sensible and we'll be fine, I hope.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead, Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Well, I just hope for ICANN's sake that it gets through this meeting okay because I started looking at a couple of the air itineraries, and from Toronto to Nairobi there were at least a couple of the itineraries topping \$8000.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead, Nick.

Nick Ashton-Hart: It has been noticed that for people travelling from the West Coast of North America that it is two 12-hour journeys.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Jose.

Nick Ashton-Hart: Well then you might have 8 hours and 12 hours.

Jose Ovidio Salgueiro: Just for the safety thing, I just wanted to say that I was held at gun point at the Mexico meeting, and I'm still here alive.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed. We can find danger in all sorts of places. And I think a lot of it is lack of familiarity and fear mongering.

Ladies and gentlemen, particularly the regional leads, the role I've seen you all play in these workshops, in these feedbacks, in these public forums, in these review committees has been absolutely marvelous. And it is showing to everyone, not the least of all me,

that the aim of getting this policy development process, the main focus of all of this that's going on, is hitting where it's meant to be, which is at the regional level.

We as an ALAC are an aggregation of all those voices. The fact that it's your voice that's being heard, your views being seen, and you can carry with that a huge amount of kudos back to the member constituencies you represent, the ALSes, and those that haven't been able to join you here.

And I do want that on the public record because I just think literally in the last six months or so, we've gone from crawling almost to puberty. And this is pretty exciting stuff. We've gone in quantum leaps of growth in professionalism and in future. So huge thank you to all of you.

Busy days ahead. Very, very short timelines on a number of policy developments and public comment pieces between now and the end of November. And I look forward to working with all of the new people, as well as continuing to work with all of those that think they might get out of our control in the future.

And with the Nominating Committee, we look towards you and Olivier to keep very, very close with us. I mean we know Hong works closely with us, but we definitely want you all to as well. And mentor the others to do the same.

So big pat on the back. Big thanks to all. Big good day, good evening, good night to those listening on the stream. And can I be clear with great pleasure at 7:58 PM on Thursday, the business of the ALAC and regional leads closed.