

ALAC and Regional Leadership Working Session 1_20091028_EN_261001

Sebastien: [In progress] -- never say that we support the ICANN (inaudible). What is written here is that ICANN needs to speak among various region, language, culture, function and responsibilities. And if we don't list all, it's not all that we put three points. And first, if we decide that whether it's in US, but we don't care where it is, and it's not one of the elements to allow the other to be something else, then effectively why to put this list.

But why to put this list is because very often in the discussion with people within ICANN, they think about three or four elements and not the all list. It's why we set up this list, this quite long list, is to say the internationalization of ICANN, it's not just headquarter, it's not just the chair and the board member, it's not just -- but it's all that. And we have to take all that into account.

That was the discussion in the working group in Mexico, and I don't see any contradiction in what you say and what is written here. Nothing is written to say, hey, guys, we need to change the headquarter. But if the headquarter and it is written the headquarter, we'll stay in US. Okay, it's one point for US and how you have point for other region. Nick?

Nick: On a scheduling point, your coffee break began two minutes ago. Those of you who feel strongly on this subject might wish to talk over coffee and come back in 12 minutes.

Unidentified Participant: And what about those of us who don't?

Nick: Then you can just enjoy the coffee.

Sebastien: I would like really very much to go to the end of this presentation and to see whether there are other points. There is one point where we add to the -- and should you consideration of GAC advice on matter of public policy, we want to add and should you consideration of ACs advice, that means ALAC and other ACs. Okay.

Okay, I don't say that Section 2.8 not need to include into the documents. If you can't make any joke in the ICANN life, it's a pity, but I will put it out, okay?

But when everybody say I see about everything, you need to send a signal that it's not feasible. At the end they change into IRB, but I still feel that we need to tell the people that there is something wrong in the nomination of those working groups, and so on and so forth. Alan -- Adam?

Adam: I'd put a large smiley in that, if you want, but I didn't think -- I mean, from a serious point of view, I didn't think we were putting things that were meant to be humorous in. I understood the intent of it, I just didn't think it was appropriate if we are making a

recommendation to the Board that we put something that is either lighthearted or satirical, or whatever.

I do agree with you that it is confusing to have multiple names of abbreviations, especially people working in second languages, or people who are losing their memory, like me, that it's almost impossible to know what we're talking about sometimes when we've got IRT meaning three different things. But if we're going to make that point, then let's just make it.

Sebastien: Okay. It's well taken. It was supposed to be withdrawn in the documents sent to you, but I didn't do it. That was my mistake. Okay. Section 3.4. It's about the travel and the meetings. There is a document saying to improve participation by extending outreach. Project should be given to some regions. The board -- then the staff size of the board should consider recommending ICANN staff to continue (inaudible) Belgium and Switzerland and report back with a detailed (inaudible) and discuss benefits to the board and committee.

We say that we disagree with this position. We don't want to have one meeting per year in Belgium or in Switzerland. We don't think that because their government there, they could be for each year the place. It was the same thing we say a few years ago about (inaudible). It's not because (inaudible) that we need to have one meeting per year (inaudible). That's the same thing, and we don't think that the governments who are in Belgium and in European Commission in the parliament or in Switzerland (inaudible) international organization. (Inaudible) in charge of the discussion within ICANN and it's not solved a lot of problem.

And then the question is about meetings. We know that there are two regional meetings going on for all the constituency, and what we say that we need to have the three yearly meetings and we would like to have two regional meeting for the region in the region where the three meeting are not held. And Adam say that it's too much meeting.

Adam: I do think, if we're asking for two more meetings would be, as it is written, asking for two more meetings would be an overload for both ALAC and everybody else.

On other related discussions, we've been saying when there are regional meetings being held and there are often regional meetings being held specifically for the contracted parties, the registries and registrars, then we should be informed of them and, as appropriate, invited to participate in them.

So, I think we've got sort of ALAC positions that are ongoing at the moment. When we're discussing that particular aspect of the regional meetings, it's not exactly jelling with this recommendation.

So, I wouldn't like to see a recommendation of any additional meetings coming from ALAC. However, I do think whenever any regional meetings are held, there should be transparency about those meetings being held and, if appropriate, all members of the community should be invited to participate in them, i.e., they should not be closed to any particular party.

Sebastien: Really, I thought that our goal was to have general assembly in each region each year, but maybe I am wrong, and if you want to change this document, make a proposal. But each region -- when the yearly meeting is not held in Europe, we're trying by any means to have one regional meeting, and I don't see the point here. Evan?

Evan: We've already had discussions regarding some of the other meetings that ICANN has had outside of its regular meetings. I was hoping that there might be a little bit more

coordination and maybe some conversations held this week that might help resolve some of these issues and take advantage of the fact that ICANN is already doing this. And maybe we can save some -- you know, make some efficiencies by trying to pool some of these things together.

Sebastien: In the second sentence, all the original meeting must be open to all constituency and support must be provided to those additional regional meeting. It says, too, but if it's already organized, it doesn't matter, it's okay, let's go to those meetings.

Evan: If I could suggest, then, I would break that into two different points, because they're talking about two different things. I wouldn't lump them together into one paragraph.

Sebastien: Patrick?

Patrick: Yes. Just one remark. Based on the prior conversation I had with Rod earlier, after the problem Evan had and others had to run the original meeting, Rod told me that the meeting format was being reviewed and that in the future, indeed, all other parties would be welcome to attend these meetings.

So, I think that, indeed, we should leave the door open for other parties to participate in these regional meetings even, as Adam suggested, might be overload for us. But that doesn't mean that we should have full meetings with all the ALAC members at every regional meeting.

Sebastien: Carlton?

Carlton: Thank you, Chair. Just an observation. When we say regional meetings, we might be careful to have the right definition. That goes for everybody. Because, for example, there are meetings that are probably supported by ICANN but not sponsored by ICANN that are held.

For example, there was a meeting in Washington DC to deal with the IRT proposal. I don't believe it was an ICANN meeting itself, but it was certainly supported by ICANN. And I've seen in other places where there were comments about a regional meeting supported by ICANN in which ICANN interests were blocked from attending. So, it might be useful for us to have the same definition of the regional meeting.

Sebastien: Wolfe?

Wolfe: Yes. To me, according to the formulation we have here, it's not yet clear enough what kind of meeting do you mean by this, whether you mean the series of ICANN meetings, like as there was a consumer meeting in Brussels, I think, earlier this year, which was also in coordination with ICANN. Or, I'm not even sure if it was organized by ICANN in Brussels.

So, this would be an example of a relevant meeting for your EURALO. But I don't know whether you think what we discussed on another level that general assemblies of large organization should be covered in this part as well. This is still unclear to me.

Sebastien: The goal here was for the second sentence and on the paper it's (inaudible). It just my cut-and-paste in this document for putting these two sentences in one single paragraph. It's to say that when there is a registry/registrar meeting in Rome or in Toronto, it must be open to everybody and to us [if practical]. That was the goal of this sentence. No other - other meeting for other part of -- other outreach, we may be thinking that we need to be involved.

But it seems to be original one year meeting for those constituencies, why that for the others and specifically for (inaudible). Can you go to the next slide? This one, the next one, okay.

Okay. In this I tried to (inaudible) about 3.6, and we already discussed this. I don't think we say somewhere that we want -- quite a move from (inaudible).

Okay, let's go to three more slides, where it's red. Here. And here it is a question of the proposal to establish a special ICANN committee vote requesting a board reexamination of the board decision.

We put into the table the question on how it will be done for the moment. In the document in front of us, we don't know how it could be called, how this reexamination. It means that anybody in the community, even though I can say, "Hey, guys, I want to," and then we in AC would have to spend time on that to decide that it must be a reexamination, and then go to the board. And we think that we need to have an explicit way to push that to motion. Because if not, it could be -- it could take a lot of time and effort from other people and for us specifically. Yes?

And then you can go, keep going and asking for reexamination. We need some rules for that. It's not yet done and that's in the proposal.

And the second point, it's even, I think, more important today than before the end of the GP8, we need to have a full picture of the bylaw change, and the consideration in project and the possible following of evolution. Because we are doing change in one little piece, one page, one little piece, and nobody has the full picture of this evolution than what is requested here.

And the last point refers to the bylaw change proposal and we read to it in the first red lines what I already say. And the second, if ICANN implements the previous proposal and further -- other activities may be an IRB is not [at the moment mandatory].

But in any case, if ICANN decides to have an IRB, it's really necessary to be sure what IRB is doing and saying for. Because you have an IRB, you have an IRB panel, you have an IRB provider, and ICANN tell you readings that commence in detail. Sometimes you don't know which one have to do something. And if it's not clear what the provider must do and to whom may (inaudible), it's a major risk for the organization as the committee is set up today.

That's why we insist on this point. Thank you. I guess that's the end of the transition, yes.

Okay, we are supposed to go for the coffee. Can we agree on something here? On the point that was raised by (inaudible), the IRT piece will be erased from the document. What do you want to do with the list of proposals for the more internationalization? So, points, you want to delete them or leave them? That's one point. I need to be sure that I kept all of them. And, Adam, did you find a place where we can add your suggestion of publication of policy briefing material?

Adam:

In the original document it would, I think, be under Section 2, which is -- excuse me -- sufficient accountability to the multi-stakeholder community. So, somewhere in the sections that are referring to Section 2 of that document.

I don't find anywhere specifically that it's referring to board meetings, because it goes on that section and talks about frameworks as a principal and accountability, independent review.

So, I think it would just be a general response in this Section 2, sufficient accountability to the multi-stakeholder community, and then saying the briefing materials for the board should be made available.

Sebastien: I guess we have two solutions. We could put that just in front of 2, Accountability, and that is it?

Adam: Yeah.

Sebastien: That's a good way to do. Or we introduce it within the 2.5, make (inaudible) document is [accessible and stable], and we say that even more we need the document, not just to be (inaudible), but we need those documents existing. But let's put it in front of 2. I will add that into -- then it's 2, Accountability. I will add the sentence.

Okay, then that's one point. Two points. Adam, the one about the least-- what is your feeling, members? My personal point of view is to leave it. The position of some of the speakers was to scratch this list and -- do you have any point or may I call for a vote? Adam?

Adam: Two things. One, is it possible to add -- this would be a sort of friendly amendment, the word "gender," where we're talking about diversity, so that we actually say gender in there as another principle. It's already -- oh, no, it's not. Put gender in there as another principle of diversity.

And then I would personally prefer to have the bullets removed. However, if they are to be retained, then say something like, "For example, from among the following," or "of the following may be considered," or something like that. Rather than give the impression that we're suggesting these are definite things that might happen, but some examples of the types of things that might happen to encourage diversity.

Sebastien: I have no problem with gender and the list was with a lot of three points, and it was (inaudible). Okay, I accept your gender. For me it was -- okay, I don't know why it's not up right here, but, okay, let's put --

Adam: Could we have, for example, but not limited to, so as to show that we're not basically just (inaudible) at those points?

Sebastien: I think, really, we spend too much time on that and I will suggest that we delete the points, we add gender, and we leave the last point, the splitting of function and responsibility (inaudible) should not be done in a way. But we deleted .1 to .9 in the presentation. And we add gender.

Okay. I guess we take all the points raised by Adam and hopefully by other. I hope that it's acceptable for you. I will try to do with the (inaudible) staff before tomorrow, final document, and I hope that we could reopen the vote. And if the three who already vote want to cast another vote, just come to the staff and discuss with them, to see how it is possible to do that. And I would like to thank you very much, and now we are late, late, late.

Unidentified Participant: [Speaking in foreign language.]

Sebastien: [Speaking in foreign language.] Okay, we will finish this document. Let's go to the next point. If you want coffee, you go for coffee. Yeah, go ahead.

Unidentified Participant: Yes, good morning. I wanted to update you on some flight schedule rescheduling. It is actually the current -- the newest schedule is up on the left screen. For those of you, while you are getting your coffee, we are going to be showing the new revised At-Large website, and then at 10:20, we will be having our first two staff presentations.

So, at 10:20 we are going to have a presentation on new gTLDs overarching issues. In particular, the prevention of malicious abuse. That will be given by Patrick Jones and Carla Valente for 10 minutes, and then there will be a discussion for a further 10 minutes.

At 11:00, we will have Kurt Pritz giving a presentation on IDN fast tracks, in particular, three character limit and variant tables. That presentation will be 10 minutes with a further discussion between 11:10 and 11:20.

Following that, we will have Patrick facilitating a discussion on education issues for TLD managers. So, I'm going to have Matias show us the new At-Large website.

Matias: Good morning, everybody. The At-Large website is a project that actually started a long time ago and I've already showed you a navigation scheme that we came up about a year ago. Actually, it was at the Paris meeting. And what I'm going to show you today is the implementation of that navigation format, which took a long time, but it is now ready. And you can see it on the left-hand screen.

So, while the horizontal bar remains the same, which you are all probably familiar with by now. The vertical navigation bar that you see on the left-hand side now has a different layout, and the basic idea is that people --

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Matias: Is that okay? All right. And you will see that there are new sections on the left-hand side of the screen, which will make it easier for people to get to the section they're most interested in.

So, for example, if you are a member of the At-Large Advisory Committee, you could click on the "Resources for Community Members" on the At-Large Advisory Committee, and you would then get to a subsite for the members of ALAC, which has its different and new navigation scheme on the left-hand side, where you can see the meetings, the statements, the current members. And this is information that we think is particularly useful for the members of the At-Large Advisory Committee.

However, if you are a member of ARALO, you might chose another point of entrance, and you would click on the "Region At-Large Organization," which will given give you options that are specifically tailored for the interest of the different regions.

So, you will -- when this version is final, you will get news that are specific to that region, and you will get navigation items that are key for community members from the RALOs.

While this is a test version, the version will go live shortly after the Seoul meeting, probably the week after the Seoul meeting. And we invite you to play with it and to discover it yourself. I think it's probably the best way for you to do it.

Nick: The old menu will be available underneath the new one, so if at any point you aren't quite sure how to get where you want to go, you can always get there the old way.

You will also find in many cases that when you choose a menu option, it takes you to a Wiki page. So, finally you have one site where you can go and it will take you to all of

the places that you would want to go to, instead of having to search or founder around. Though over the course of the next few months, increasingly you will find that you don't go to a Wiki page anymore; you end up going to a page that has been migrated from a Wiki into the site.

So, the Wikis won't vanish, but they'll be used for collaborating. What are Wikis actually designed for? So, once a meeting is over, the agenda won't be in a Wiki anymore; it will get moved into the site, because you don't edit the agenda after the meeting is over, and that sort of thing.

Unidentified Participant: One thing that a lot of people normal ask is, which are the members of the RALOs? And there is an easy way to find out this?

Matias: Yes. Will non-staff people continue to have the ability to do some editing once it's migrated away from the Wiki? I've actually found it quite a bit of value to do things, like edit agendas, and things like that, to be able to do them myself, rather than having to bother staff to go through. There has been a number of times where having editing abilities on the Wiki has been useful. Is that going to be maintained with the transition?

Nick: It will be maintained. For example, up until a meeting closes, you would be able to edit the agenda. And then it would move because it's been static, right, because it's happened, onto the main site. The idea is that at some point it would actually be possible for some volunteers, at least, to be able to post your own news items, for example, news related to your region's activities.

You can imagine that there is a fair amount of security that has to be built in under the cover in order to allow a fairly large group of people to edit a live site. So, that will just take a little bit longer, but in the meantime we can use Wikis as a way to migrate things. And, of course, you could always send an announcement to us and we would get it posted if you needed.

Evan: Right. I was just thinking, first of all, have there been any security issues with the status quo with using the Wikis? Have you run into any security problems with social text so far? Anyway, I'm just saying, it has been very valuable to be able to edit pages, things like the process for appointing the director or, as you know, I've been able to do things since we've done the voting process, and being able to explain the voting process. I think it benefited from having the ability to have some volunteers go in and be able to do that. And I'd really like not to lose that ability.

Nick: Yeah, we're not intending on reducing your ability to do anything during this period. So, yeah, we wouldn't post anything until it really is static, because it's over.

Matias: No, I think if somebody is interested in this issue and wants to see more of the new website, they can come and see me over the lunch break --

Nick: Or wait a week.

Matias: Or wait a week. I think we will now give the floor to -- is Carla already here? I see Margie. Patrick is here. Oh, okay. So, I think we can now start the presentation on the new TTLE program.

Margie Milam: Hello, everyone. I'm Margie Milam, ICANN staff, and Patrick Jones is here as well. And we're going to talk to you about new gTLD program, specifically, the malicious conduct issues. So, I'll turn it over to Patrick, and we'll have questions as we go or at the end. What do you prefer?

- Patrick Jones: Well, my preference would be to take questions -- to hear more from this group rather than have us speak. So, I think I'm going to be really brief with the slides and really leave it up to you to ask questions for us.
- Margie Milam: That's good.
- Patrick Jones: All right. Okay. Then I'm going to get started. Malicious conduct work has been proceeding along with the development of the applicant guidebook. We've been throughout this whole process identifying issues through experts, receiving public comment through either the comment forum on the versions of the guidebook, along with the consultations that have been conducted in New York, London, Abu Dhabi, and the consultations to occur later in the year.
- And then summarizing the comment and providing an opportunity for feedback on that, and then incorporating it into the explanatory memoranda and applicant guidebook.
- So, at this point we're -- with the slide on -- where the sources of information has come from as it relates to malicious conduct. This is a lot of work that has been going on for quite some time that dates back to version 1 and version 2, which are now well over a year old, to the consultations that occurred in the middle part of the year. And then comments received from experts from the anti-phishing working group, the CIRT communities, the Computer Incident Response groups, and banking/finance associations worldwide, along with participants from the Registry Internet Safety Group.
- From this we have identified several key issues. First, how to ensure that bad actors do not operate in any registries or new gTLDs; how to ensure that integrity and utility of registry information is maintained; how to ensure that more focused efforts are used to combat malicious abuse; and then how to establish some kind of enhanced framework for dealing with abuse in this new process.
- So, we've identified some steps, including denying applications based on a history of financial fraud or misconduct. This is one of the comments that was received in version 1 and version 2 of the guidebook that ICANN should include. Some strength in vetting of applicants based on the background and look specifically for histories of bad behavior related to cybersquatting, disclosure of previous involvement in EDRP cases, and then look at approaches to establish criteria based on prior criminal conduct.
- This has occurred probably in the registrar space with registrar operators that have been engaged in criminal activity resulting in de-accreditation in a couple of examples. So, it's using examples like that and bringing it up to the gTLD space.
- Unidentified Participant: Just in this point, are you going to check the company? But what I'm seeing is people change and move names, but when you see is the same group of the people. So, there will be an idea how to check those people, because the idea to move is something. People go and change groups. I don't know if you have conditions to check persons of this kind, profiles on that.
- Margie Milam: Yes. My understanding is that we're looking on doing due diligence on the entity and also people behind the entity, to make sure that they don't have involvement in some of the bad activities.
- Unidentified Participant: Yeah, we have seen a lot of movement on this kind of thing, haven't we?
- Evan: Sorry. One of the things that's been brought up within the North American region is the difficulty of ICANN of enforcing problems that are already occurring. When you find

people who are bad actors, who either lied or withheld information that has subsequently been discovered, ICANN is really, really slow and sometimes still doesn't act on them.

I mean, we've had Stacy at our meetings multiple times and it just becomes a real big problem in running after people. Is there anything that you're doing in the current process to strengthen the ability to turf people who lie when they come to you in the first place?

And the other thing to do with the verification or whatever, it's one thing for people to verify their information at the beginning, but one of the things that has always been one of the big problems that we've identified is simply the accuracy of things, like Whois data, and what measures are you enforcing on the part of registry operators and registrants to enforce as we go forward with the new gTLDs? The people are not putting Wrigley Field as their address, that we've got -- whether or not you're dealing with escrows or forget the confidentiality issues. I'm talking about the accuracy of what's there in the first place.

What are you doing to ensure that this is going to be done better for the new gTLDs than is done for the current ones? And, also, are you going to make it easier on your own enforcement people to be able to deal with things after the fact?

Margie Milam: Sure, Patrick, I can address that. Evan, some of the issues that you're talking about relate to more of the registrar side as opposed to the registry side. And I believe you may be aware that there is an ongoing effort to amend the RAA and At-Large is involved in that.

As part of that work, ICANN staff has developed some recommendations to enhance its enforcement abilities with respect to exactly some of these issues. So, we're looking at this as a two-pronged process: One, dealing with the registry side, and that's what Patrick is talking about; and then the other, looking on the registrar side to see where the gaps are, to try to come up with better contract provisions. But that will take some time.

Evan: Is the onus on the registrar or the registry regarding accuracy of ownership data?

Margie Milam: The onus is on the registrar. It's in the registrar accreditation agreement, the language that relates to Whois and any accuracy or verification requirements. And there aren't that many in the RAA right now and it's difficult to change those, but ICANN is looking into what amendments would be appropriate to enhance that.

Unidentified Participant: I have a question. So, you actually denied application if they violate certain -- I mean, make financial fraud, in cases where they had some bad behavior. But what of the ongoing monitoring of those changes?

Patrick Jones: That's definitely going to be part of the ongoing compliance process, and the compliance team is going to be enhanced, and it will be an effort for more staff so they can address either issues like the one that Evan raised about the ability for ICANN staff to quickly address issues that are raised.

I think there is also some perception issues around how quickly ICANN staff is reacting to issues that are addressed, and I'd rather leave that to David [Giza] and Stacy Burnett from the compliance team. But I think in some cases ICANN staff is acting, it's just being able to communicate that in a better way with the rest of the community on where they are in the progress.

Evan: My only concern was whether or not there were loopholes in the current way things were being done that constrains the compliance people that you can then fix and make their lives easier going forward.

- Margie Milam: That's the RAA process we're going through to try to help them have the right tools to deal with these problems.
- Nick: For what it's worth, Compliance is coming in to see you all on Tuesday, and that is intended to be part of what they talk about, is not only compliance now, but new tools to facilitate compliance under the new gTLD program. So, you may wish to keep your questions on that subject until David is able to answer them directly.
- Patrick Jones: So, if there aren't any further questions at this point, I'm going to move ahead, and then I really want to leave it open. Is there another question over here?
- Adam: Yes. I wondered if you've found any international standards for behavior of directors and officers of companies? Because we looked around for some. How either reasons for disbarment or accreditation as a director of a listed company. There don't seem to be any international standards. The international chamber didn't seem to have any. So, I wondered if -- not only for reasons why somebody should not be a director of a company, but for how long, what period, those sort of penalty declines.
- Margie Milam: I'm not aware of any international standards or any analysis on that. Certainly, if you have any information submitted during the public comment period, we'd be happy to explore it.
- Adam: I'm just saying that it's always nice to refer to -- I know ICANN likes to refer to other people's standards of work, because that means that you don't have to set international standards yourself. But I'm sure some business school somewhere might have it. I know that ours doesn't, because I did ask our business professors if there were such standards.
- Nick: The Institute of Directors in the United Kingdom has quite detailed provisions on director conduct and misconduct, training programs both in person and electronic for directors and the like. So, it may well be that those -- the requirements to remain a member in good standing of the IOD may be useful to draw from.
- Patrick Jones: I just want to highlight that provisions related to director conduct and misconduct aren't new and in fact, were -- that language did appear in some of the original ICANN gTLD registry agreements. I think, for example, the .aero, .coop, .museum era agreements had that language in there. And for one reason or another that I'm not privy to, the reasons why that language wasn't carried forward in the more recent agreements, it's an idea that is being brought back in the latest version of the base agreement.
- So, just to keep moving forward on the different mitigation steps that are in the latest version of the applicant guidebook in the malicious conduct memorandum. We've included language for requiring DNSSEC appointment, requiring applicants to include in their implementation plan how DNSSEC would be introduced and offered upon startup operations. There is a prohibition on wildcarding, so synthesize zone records.
- And it is my understanding there will be a more detailed paper issued on this topic either after this meeting or shortly -- there's another paper that's in the works on wildcards and nonexistent domain records. So, look for that.
- There is also language on removal of orphan "glue" records. The requirement for the Whois data, centralized zone file access has also been recommended as an option and requiring registry level abuse contacts and documented abuse policies, and offering the availability of an expedited security process when a registry learns of abuse that is occurring within the TLD.

So, I think one of the final areas of malicious conduct paper is a new concept on high security zones designation. Do you want to explain that a little bit?

Margie Milam:

Yeah, this is a voluntary program that is being suggested where a registry may want to designate themselves as high security, and then they go through additional checks to be able to earn this designation.

David Giza and Greg Rattray conducted a webinar about a month ago explaining it, trying to get input from the community on what they think about this program. And essentially the goal is to establish a common set of standards, and it's designed for TLDs that want to deal with malicious abuse. Think about banking or financial TLDs. Those are the kinds that might be interested in this.

It's not a requirement for the new gTLDs. It's simply a voluntary program for registries that would like to participate in them. And it allows them to require specific security measures that also apply to registrars.

There will be separate scoring relating to the applications, and it will be focused on the registry operators, the registries actually providing the back end information. And essentially they're trying to demonstrate that they have an effective security program that complies with a certain set of standards that are being developed.

Unidentified Participant:

Well, I would like to come back to the previous slide, where you talk about the requirements for DNSSEC deployment for new gTLDs. I have noticed that the incumbent gTLDs, notably .org, that .org was the first to launch a DNSSEC [test bed], and they are moving forward well, but slowly, because they still do not have all the elements to go for a wide deployment.

So, in view of the fact that established registries still move forward slowly, is there not a security risk of messing the whole thing up with requiring brand-new TLDs that have no experience yet on the market to start deploying DNSSEC from the start?

There are some processes that are still not clear. For example, [ARCAN] domain name registrant proceed with signing his domain with the TLD key, etc. What's the role of a registrar in this?

So, in a sense, requiring a new gTLDs to deploy DNSSEC right from the start, to me, at this stage seems a bit early.

Patrick Jones:

So, you're going to start to see some of the existing registry operators come forward with their DNSSEC implementation plans. We've already posted on ICANN website requests from New Start to implement DNSSEC.biz. And just at the beginning of -- or late last week VeriSign submitted their request for introducing DNSSEC in common .net. I understand there is a third gTLD registry that is going to be sending in a request implementing DNSSEC in their TLD later in the week. So, potentially by tomorrow or the next day we'll have three existing gTLD registry operators coming forward with their plans.

And you're going to hear more about this, so I think there is already an effort to address it within the existing space, and to take some of the lessons learned from current operators in the ccTLD space and apply that forward in DNSSEC introduction.

A lot of this also relates to signing of the Root Zone and that schedule is supposed to be on track for next year. So, the timing, while this is included as a recommendation for new gTLDs, it's already underway to address it in the existing space.

- Unidentified Participant: I understood it's a plan, the plan how in doing some time. It's not required (inaudible) when they started. I understood it is something people need to apply with a plan, and how long they will implement that.
- Patrick Jones: So, think about the timing of where we are, and while we're not talking about dates right now, it's not likely that we're going to have new gTLDs entered into the Root Zone two months from now. So, there is --
- Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)
- Patrick Jones: Yes. So, I think we were near the end of discussion. Maybe just want to point out some of the recent documents that have been released in advance of this meeting. In particular, the explanatory memo on malicious conduct, and the explanatory memo on the voluntary high security zones designation program.
- I think what you're going to see next is we're continuing to listen, receive comment. Version 3 of the guidebook is open now for comment. So, if you have concerns or think that the recommendations on malicious conduct are good, or see additional efforts that could be done, please send them in.
- Please also note that later in the week there is going to be more opportunity to discuss this area, particularly tomorrow, and there will be a long dedicated session on malicious conduct with Greg Rattray from the security team. And there will also be upcoming sessions in Latin America in November. There is one set up for November 24 in Sao Palo, and on November 27th in Buenos Aires. So, at this point, questions?
- Margie Milam: Evan?
- Evan: I know this is going to be debated later in the week, but we've got your ears right now, so just allow me to offer this up. I had the pleasure of spending my [time] here reading the deck from cover to cover and saw the -- no, that's not to be applauded, that's to be pitied.
- Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)
- Evan: Thank you, I'll need it. And I was very happy to see the voluntary high security provisions that have been added to it. But the preamble to that was an issue of instilling public confidence. And for that it sort of saddened me that the one thing that we've been talking about here in terms of public confidence, such as Whois accuracy? I don't mean to be beating a dead horse here, but it sort of makes me wonder why that wasn't built in.
- If you're trying to say we're going to give a brand to a registry that says they're taking extra efforts to instill public confidence, accurate Whois data should be front and center in this.
- In the Canadian ccTLD, CIRA, makes extra effort as a registry to verify the accuracy of the ownership data on behalf of the people who own those domains. They don't leave it to the registrars. And it really sort of astounds me that you want to have this voluntary designation that is designed to instill a little extra public confidence, and those that go for that extra effort. And it sort of astounded me that this really, really critical piece of the puzzle was left out of that. And I really would like you to address that, since you're aware of it, you understand the issues, and why you would have this branding and not make such a central part of this, part of that designation. If your goal is public confidence, to me, this is one of the first things you've got to put in.
- Margie Milam: Yeah, but the Whois issue, I mentioned earlier, is complicated, because it's registry and registrar. I mean, if we're starting with a clean slate with no existing contracts, it may be

easier to get to kind of the model that you're suggesting. But a lot of the things that relate to accuracy are in the RAA, not in the registry agreement. And so I understand your frustration, but it's difficult, because --

Evan: No, I get this. I'm talking about things you can ask the registry to do. If you're talking about verification -- and we're not talking about old; we're talking about new, with the new application. So, I don't want to muddy that water. We're talking about the new gTLD registrations coming onboard. This is part of the new deck. This is not the legacy stuff. I understand.

But moving forward, what I'm saying is, don't push this off as saying it's a registrar issue. There are things that registries can do to ensure that the Whois data and that the ownership data on behalf of the stuff within their registry is accurate and complete. And there is real life examples right now of registries that are taking that extra effort.

So, I don't accept what I consider to be a passing the buck to the registrars of this. And if you really want to have something where something is designated as a high confidence, high security registry, I really think, if you don't build this in, you're basically not fulfilling the mandate of this high security thing. Because you're preamble of saying you're trying to build public confidence. If there is no public confidence of an accurate Whois, then a lot of the other things are not going to be as important.

And I'm saying from the body here that is dealing -- that is supposedly on the grass roots, the number one issue here that I found to do with security is accurate Whois. You leave that out and your intention of having higher public confidence in this voluntary designation will really not accomplish what you intend.

Patrick Jones: Before I take another question, because maybe there is one down at the other end, I would question that we -- it is built in. There is language related to the public -- the display of thick data, and I'm not sure we're passing any buck on accuracy. Compliance is going to be built into this. And part of the ability of an applicant to succeed with what the string that they are proposing is their ability to follow along with the policies in the application. So, I think it's going to be built in and that we're not passing any kind of buck on accurate Whois data.

Margie Milam: I don't think we're requiring verification in the manner that Evan is suggesting, though, and I'm not suggesting that it's incorrect to ask for that. I think it's something that I would encourage you to submit comments specifically on the security, the high security zone, because I imagine that's -- you're not the only person that has that concern. And because this is the first time that the program has been suggested, now is the time to make those clarifications.

Part of the problem is we have a Whois policy, and some of the things that you're suggesting may change existing policy. And so there is always this tension between does the new gTLD program completely revamp the policy, or is that something that goes to the GNSO? It's very complicated.

Nick: Nothing can stop you from recommending whatever you think you should like to see.

Evan: I know, but I'm not the only one in the room that feels this way, am I? Is this something that other people share?

Unidentified Participant: I totally agree with Evan. I think without an accurate Whois program, this whole high security verification program is an empty shell. It's meaningless. Why would an organization put themselves through trouble to have to go through additional verification checks and so on, if at the end of the day it cannot actually provide any commercial

incentive to users to register with them rather than with someone else? This is internal security stuff. Well, you would have to expect every registrar and registry to have a minimum amount of security anyway within their systems.

Going for the high security zone, well, let's hope that all of the registrars and registries are in the high security zone.

Unidentified Participant: If the cc has all those facilities, why not the others, please?

Nick: I was just going to say that I think the Whois debate is a bit more complicated, isn't it, which is why it's been going on a while. I don't entirely agree, because I think we're ignoring privacy issues and all the other side of the Whois debate that has been going on for the last 12 years. And so it's not just that we want the public confidence that would come from having Whois data available, it's also from having Whois data protected, which is part and parcel of that whole debate.

Evan: Sorry, I said nothing about availability. I'm not talking thick versus thin; I'm talking the data that somebody has on the ownership, whether it's in escrow, whether it's protected, whether it's available, whether it's private. I'm only speaking accuracy here. I'm deliberately staying out of the thick versus thin. All I care about is that the information that is on record to somebody available to law enforcement or however you want to play this out, that that is accurate. I'm deliberately avoiding the thick versus thin here. I'm not talking about public accessibility to the information; I'm just saying that the information that does exist must be accurate, and I can't understand why there is even a debate on this.

Vanda: More questions? Okay, thank you. Let's at least applaud our --

Margie Milam: Thank you very much.

Sebastien: May I suggest that, Patrick, if you are available to start now is a discussion you were supposed to start later on? Because we are waiting -- we are 10 minutes ahead of schedule. That was not my dream when we finished the first point, and thank you very much for having done that, and Kurt will come at 11:00. And if you can start, maybe you will have some more time after Kurt. Maybe we will have to split your presentation into parts. Sorry about that, but the floor is yours, and I am sure you will manage well. Thank you, Patrick.

Patrick: Thank you, Sebastien. Well, the goal of this point of the agenda was to talk about what is titled "Education Issues for TLD Managers." I am referring to a previous e-mail of mine some two months ago. It was an issue that happened with .pr, TLD. .pr has been one of the pioneers in DNSSEC. I wouldn't say deployment, but at least production test that, if we can call it like that. The key is available for everyone.

But right now, because there are -- because the root is not signed, currently only a few people manually import the .pr signing key in DNS resolvers.

So, what happened, actually, going through the history of the case is that .pr changed their signing key on a very short notice. And because currently all the '80s processes of importing new keys into DNS resolvers is essentially manual.

Obviously, when this happens during a period where people are not available because the information was not sent out to the right people at the right time, in some cases you would get a narrow one trying to resolve the .pr domain name and it would fail to be resolved by the DNS resolver of an ISP, for example.

Well, at this stage it was not a big issue in the sense that it is (inaudible), so people do not expect it to work 100%, and at this stage, because not many people are already using DNSSEC, there was no great harm done.

Where it could become problematic is at a later stage, once the root gets signed, TLDs will get signed, and then after that the main names will get signed. I do expect big TLDs both generic and country code, to do the right thing, and to have a robust implementation.

What I'm more concerned about is all these smaller TLDs, mainly ccTLDs, which are still being run as, I would say, in a nonindustrial way, I would say, by people who volunteer to do that. Sometimes they volunteer full time and they get paid for that. But they are basically small operations running with, for example, if I take a ccTLD, I know very well the .lu, for example, there are currently five people working there. They manage about 50,000 domain names. I don't expect them to goof that DNSSEC deployment, because I know those people and I know that they have all the information they need and all the expertise needed. And if they don't have the expertise, they can hire the expertise.

What I'm more concerned on these ccTLDs, that we never see in ICANN meetings, because they cannot justify the cost of traveling for one week to Seoul or somewhere else. And I'm wondering what ICANN is going to do to talk and to educate these small TLDs in helping them deploy DNSSEC in a manner that won't be a threat to the stability of the Internet.

DNSSEC is something which requires some expertise. Obviously, a lot of things can be automated. There are issues for TLD operators. There are even more bigger issues for domain name users. Are they going to do that, etc.?

So, my question was more of we are talking about something that is quite -- that requires quite a lot of expertise. We are talking --

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Patrick Jones: Okay. Okay. I'm fine. Thank you.

Sebastien: Sorry, Patrick, to interrupt you like that. It's not fair, but as we have Kurt for 10 minutes. You will restart. It's like, I guess one vote we started two days ago and we're restarting (inaudible) now, I hope. Thank you very much, Patrick. Carlton, you wanted to say something before we go?

Carlton: Just to Chair. I don't know if it's just me being very hot, but I'm sweating over here. I mean, it's really very -- oh, you have one, bless you. It's really very hot, and I'm afraid I'm going to get sick if this continues.

Unidentified Participant: You should try it in front of fan for the projector.

Carlton: Where is that? Where is that?

Sebastien: Okay. We will take care of that. Thank you. Kurt, thank you very much for coming to our ALAC meeting and regional leadership here today. We are a lot. Very few are missing, and we are very happy to have your presentation today. Thank you.

Kurt Pritz: Thank you. Good morning, everybody, and thanks for having me, and thanks for bending your schedule a little bit to accommodate mine. I know you requested Tina [Dehm] to speak and I'm a poor replacement.

So, this is a very brief presentation and it's a very deep issue, so I wondered if we want to take a second first to understand what anybody at the table specifically wanted to get out of the presentation. Not that I change the slides at this point, but everybody has varying levels of understanding of the three character issue and the variant issue as it pertains to IDNs, including me. And so if anybody has a point or a question they want answered by this presentation, you can bring it up now or we can have the questions later, whatever you want.

Cheryl: Let's just go with the presentation.

Kurt Pritz: Okay, thanks. Do I need to be within -- talking between me and the -- yeah, go ahead. Let's see what these slides say. So, we're coming to fruition on a couple of big processes. One is the IDN fast track process. It's very exciting for, I think, all of us sitting at this table and in the ICANN community, that the board is going to consider launching the Fast Track Process at this meeting.

And, additionally, a lot of work has been done with the new gTLD implementation, the publication of another guide book, and the establishment of a working group, in particular, to consider the issues of variant management and the three character issue. So, that's what we're talking about here.

So, I'm just going to talk for one minute about the three character issue, and that's that current practice currently requires that all two character codes be interpreted as ISO 3166-1 country codes, and they are reserved for ccTLD use.

And in gTLDs, there is a three-character requirement. However, with the introduction of IDNs, there is a situation that many meaningful words can be expressed in some languages in less than three characters, as I'm sure everybody sitting around this table knows. And that would sort of hobble the use of IDNs in those scripts.

So, the objective here is to determine a set of rules so that gTLD strings of less than three characters can be registered in some cases without interfering with the rules in the two character codes, or as specified in the RFC. So, I'm just going to verbally summarize the results of this in a second.

And then the other problem we're trying to resolve is for variant characters. So, I don't know if the people sitting around this table, how many know what a variant TLD is? Most people do. Well, that's excellent, because I'm not sure I understand it.

But an IDN table is a table that will display alternate character sets in a single language. And so that a variant character is a character where a single character has two or more representations. And in many languages, these characters can look very, very similar. They have different Unicode code points, but to the eye you wouldn't be able to discern the differences. So, a variant TLD is one of those which has one or more of these variant characters in it.

So, the result is, if variant TLDs were delegated, this may result in user confusion, but -- because you would have two different delegations that look exactly the same that resolve to different places. But excluding them may disenfranchise cultures where one area uses one character set and one region uses another character set.

So, ICANN has recently formed a working team to develop recommendations for the three-character requirement and variant management. So, this group has been at work in the time period since the Sydney meeting, which is a relatively short period of time.

I'll tell you that -- there is no slide about this -- but I will tell you that the team has arrived at a recommendation for the three-character requirement and cases where that can be relieved. So, they are recommending -- and the next step is to have the broader community discuss this -- they are recommending that two-character names be allowed in new gTLDs in areas where those characters are clearly not confusable with country codes. That means they're not confusable with two letter ASCII names.

They also decided that the release of one character names, there was not necessarily a technical impediment releasing one character names, but there were policy issues associated with that. And so we're recommending additional policy work be undertaken before releasing one character name.

So, when you see the report, you're going to see that there is a recommendation to have two character registrations in gTLDs, just so long as they're not confusable with the ASCII names.

So, that's sort of the report of that, and three character names, and I'm just going to talk about variants from now to the end, unless James or somebody has a question.

James: So, when you talk about one that's policy consideration, or concerns about one character, what are those specific concerns? Could you elaborate?

Kurt Pritz: Yeah, one concern would be that how to allocate single character names, even in -- so, how to allocate single character names where single character names might be very, very valuable.

So, in certain languages there are many words that are single characters, but in other languages there are not. And so to take the step without some consideration of allocation methods for what might be, say, valuable beachfront real estate should be considered by a policy team before they are released.

So, that was one of the discussions, and I don't know, to tell you the truth, if that makes it into the notes of that team. But that was one of the policy questions. And that's just one that came to mind.

So, this working group discussed the definition of variant, and so in certain scripts it clear, variants are nearly identical or identical characters, so that's clear in other scripts. Whether you identify -- simplify Chinese and traditional Chinese as variants, or different languages is a question.

Evan: Kurt, in the discussion of variants, is this also dealing with the fact that, say, somebody could say the word McDonald's with an umlaut over the "o" and try to use that for phishing? I mean, is this a separate issue, or is this part of what you're dealing with?

Kurt Pritz: Well, there are two issues, really. One is -- and they both have to do with user confusion. But a variant occurs when it shows up in an IDN table. So, TLD will furnish an IDN table that identifies more than one character set. If you scan down those character sets, you can identify the variants that are different characters representing the same.

Evan: Or you could say there is a lot of words in the Latin alphabet that you could say totally using Greek characters.

Kurt Pritz: Yeah.

Evan: So, I'm just saying, is that within the work you're doing here?

- Kurt Pritz: Yeah, and I think that's slightly different. I think that comes under how to address the issue of user confusion, say, in new gTLDs. And that's why, and in the new gTLD process there is a task to determine if two applications are visually confusing with one another, or visually confusing with additional TLDs. So, that's sort of separate from and broader than variants, because variants are defined within an IDN table and user confusion is identified across all TLDs.
- Vanda: Alan and James.
- Alan: In talking about variants, it doesn't meet the definition that we're using for it, but it's often useful to recognize that in a Roman script we have variants, they're called upper and lower case. And they are two different characters that have the same meaning and we treat them the same. And we have similar things in these other scripts, and the problem is it's not such a simple correspondence, and how do you react?
- James: This is not a question to Kurt, but just a point of information for the rest of the member. There is a lot of confusion between what is considered visually confusing versus what is considered variant. In this case, when it comes to IDN, IDN variant has a specific (inaudible) to says the two characters are equivalent within certain culture or linguistic context, and that does not deal with the visually confusing characters. So, it's not talking about McDonald's with an O with a dash, but rather specific linguistic equivalents within the same character.
- Kurt Pritz: So, yeah, I'm back. So, we just discussed the definition of variants, and then as a preliminary step, considered whether blocking or reservation of variant TLDs is necessary to prevent user confusion. That's the sort of threshold question. But then when delegated, an important aspect is to ensure that the user experience using TLDs should be good so that a process for delegating TLDs has in place methodology to shield users from user confusion. So, what users see are the single -- to them, the single interoperable Internet.
- So, determine under what circumstances TLD variants might be delegated, and the responsibilities, then, of the TLD operator to whom the variants might be delegated. So, that's their work.
- There you go. So, this is sort of repetitive, but -- so, what problems are we trying to solve? Well, if we delegate variant TLDs, this will allow broader participation. So, if there is one region that uses one character set, another region that uses another character set, and there are variants within those character sets. Then blocking or reserving one of those character sets will sort of disenfranchise part of the community that uses that alphabet, because the users can only type in one set of variant characters. Then the other balancing, though, is if they are both delegated, then the user experience may degrade because there might be user confusion, so I kind of already said that.
- So, where is this group right now? Well, there is a short-term solution and we want to get a longer term solution. And so, if you think about it, there is desired variants and undesired variants. So, when a proposed top level domain requests a delegation, it might also request that the variants be delegated to it, that that TLD wants both those delegations.
- Absent a technical solution right now, the interest of that TLD operator are best protected by at least reserving that name so that no one else will get it, and that when a long-term solution is in place for how to manage this, then that TLD will get the delegation.

The other solution is if the TLD applicant does not require or does not request the variant TLD, and that could be so for many, many reasons. And so in that case the TLD, that variant TLD would be blocked in order to prevent user confusion. Yes?

James: Okay. So, there is actually a user perspective or rather end-user concern on (inaudible) variants that (inaudible) which I thought that -- I know that ALAC did not have a large discussion on it, so I'd like to point out specifically, it is possible for end-user to register an IDN, and that from that variant table generate anything between 2 to 30 or even more possible domain names that is considered equivalent under the variants.

So, the fact that if there is no proper mechanism that is being done at ICANN on how to handle variants, and that will take it down [within IDN specific] or IDN gTLD. That implication would take it down to registry, would take it down to registrar and to the end user.

So, when end user comes to register domain name, one may discover that they may have to end up paying one time, two times, potentially 10 times for a name, and that depends on the names that are registered if you are to take variants separately, consider separate application. And that's a danger if you do not handle it properly at ICANN at this moment in time.

And I think that it is something that a large committee should really be concerned in looking about what is the implication. Personally, the ideal scenario is that a registrar going to register a name should pay a fixed fee, whether it's \$10, \$15, whatever, being set by the market, and regardless of numbers of variants he gets or whether -- in the TLD and the variants of the TLD should be a fixed fee, rather than the potential multiple times piece that we are looking at this moment in time.

Unidentified Participant: And that is a bigger issue for gTLDs.

James: I understand that the ccTLD, at least from -- if they are having a little bit of trouble to relocation of variants at this moment.

Kurt Pritz: Say that again, James?

James: I understand that the ccTLD fast track, the issue of variants is not resolved at this moment.

Kurt Pritz: Right. That's exactly right. We have a short-term solution, and then in the longer term, if you can go to the next slide and last one, I think, is to enable a delegation of variants that avoid user confusion. So, for the cognoscenti, you know, DNAME is a solution that is discussed that may or may not work, or there are solutions that the TLD level perhaps, where TLDs agree to abide by certain rules if they get the TLDs in order to generate a good user experience.

So, these discussions are -- solutions are being discussed with the idea that the interests of the local top level domain operators are protected while we work together to get to that final solution. So, I don't have a thank you slide at the end. So, I should have a thank you slide at the end and --

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

James: Speaking as a Chinese, is kind of excited about that we cannot get both our traditional and simplified Chinese let's say in the fast track (inaudible), both the traditional and simplified version variant of that, because that is equivalent to saying that we are not able to get .cn in upper case and lower case.

Kurt Pritz: So, I'm not sure in the fast track process that you can't get simplified and traditional Chinese delegations. They are not visually confusing. They can be classified as different languages, not necessarily as variants of the same. So, I think that there is a means for delegating both of those in the Fast Track process while we work out what to do in the new gTLD process.

Vanda: Anymore questions? Any other questions? (Inaudible)

Kurt Pritz: I know Tina Dehm is disappointed that she is not able to be here for this, and she is certainly the staff expert on this. But the working group that is working on this also is quite knowledgeable. James is quite knowledgeable. But if you have any questions, feel free to contact me or Tina at ICANN. And, again, I appreciate you changing your schedule around for me, and I'm really happy to be here and to present to you guys, and am willing to come back any time on any subject.

Vanda: Okay, thank you.

Sebastien: Patrick may we -- can you resume your presentation?

Patrick: I will press rewind and start again. Okay. So, I was trying to explain that with the upcoming DNSSEC and IDNs, to lesser extent, there will be issues regarding our smaller TLDs, especially those who are not attending ICANN meetings and similar will be able to actively deploy this technology.

Right now, there is some effort done among others by the Internet Society, the Internet Society has an education pillar under which they run ccTLD workshops. These workshops seek to address and train ccTLD managers about issues like how to deploy DNSSEC, although it remains at quite eye level from the presentations available on their website.

Or there are similar workshops -- for example, in November 2006, it was a joint workshop organized by ICANN and the Internet Society in Dubai, mainly targeted at the Middle East ccTLD managers, where they talked about things like DNSSEC, but it remains at quite eye level or updates about the IDN program. That was in 2006, and as you have noticed from the presentation we had, right now things are evolving very fast.

So, the question is always that how can these people get up-to-date information? Right now, I was mentioning the ccTLD workshops organized by ISOC, but right now ISOC organizes one workshop a year per continent. And obviously if the root gets signed as promised, I would say, by the end of this year, starting from next year people will expect the ccTLDs to start deploying DNSSEC.

Okay, I have no issue with VeriSign or NeuStar deploying DNSSEC. They will do it right. I have no issue with DENIC deploying DNSSEC. I know they will do it right, because they have staffing, they have the resources. But the question remains a ccTLD having maybe 10,000, 20,000 registrations being run partly based on volunteer efforts will be able to actually implement DNSSEC.

So, my question and maybe it's a question that ALAC could mention to the board is, what does ICANN plan to do regarding educating smaller TLDs, and especially those who are not part of the ICANN community?

With that, these were few remarks to open the discussion, so I'm willing to and wishing to hear from the room how they feel about that, and which issues, if any, they see. Or, if they do not see any issue with that.

- Vanda: Okay. Thank you, Patrick. Just a comment. When in the beginning for the ccTLDs, there was a lot of issues that has not come among all the small ccTLDs. And what we had in that time was some regional, more strong cc's to support them, as we did with Africa, so with some Latin Americans, because Brazil starts first.
- And I believe that most (inaudible) solution to do that, because someone in the region has more understanding about the problems and maybe language and something. And that will be more easily to deal with than wait for a long line for some staff on ICANN to support that. Maybe, I don't know, but it's something that must be addressed. In the beginning, that was the way that worked well.
- Adam: Thank you, Vanda. My hand was up in the (inaudible) Room when you were presenting before Kurt's part. So, yeah, I think it's very important issue you're talking about and ICANN should try to do more. I suppose it's a problem of sovereignty comes in a little bit, that how much does ICANN or how much is ICANN able to feel it stepping into what can be a sovereign realm?
- But strengthening ccTLDs is something I think we should probably propose as one of the kind of -- you know, we have these workshop afternoons, often on a Wednesday afternoon. And I know that there is some discussion about this particular issue being raised as perhaps a topic in Nairobi, and that would be particularly relevant. It's a meeting that would be held in the developing region.
- So, if that comes out of the Kenyan delegation's proposal, the I would suggest that ALAC could support that as being, let's have a series of workshops on the Wednesday, or whatever particular day it might be. And saying, yes, strengthening ccTLDs would be a very good topic for an ICANN meeting and going forward.
- The sort of specific question is what would be the cost involved? I mean, what are we talking about to strengthen ccTLDs? There is sort of evaluation of general costing would be quite interesting study for someone to do at some point, and I don't know whether that would be a ccNSO study or an IANA study under Ken Davis, or whoever.
- But looking at -- you know, you talked about Luxemburg, how much would it cost you to strengthen the ccTLD in the way you think appropriate? And then it would be different for other ccTLDs generally. But trying to understand costs involved and resources needed would be interesting.
- Vanda: Thank you, Adam. Rudy?
- Sebastien: Yeah, go ahead, Rudy, and I will make after my comments.
- Rudy: I think this is a good question for the ccNSO, and actually we'll have our meetings with ccNSO, we would ask them if they would join us in trying to set up this kind of workshop, and have a workshop organized from both sides. As we know that the ccTLDs are not always looking at the problems as we are looking at. Maybe my colleague from ccNSO can highlight a bit what he thinks about it.
- Unidentified Participant: This colleague from ccNSO is the operations manager for probably the smallest and weakest and least wealthy cc in the world. I don't have a comment to make right at the moment, but I'm happy to see it brought up before the ccNSO, yes.
- Adam: One of my question is, do we have or can we have the plan of the ccNSO strengthening themselves, DNSSEC and whatever other subject? Because I think it could be very

useful. I know maybe if we put together the plan we know, we can have information. But it would be interesting to try to have this information from all around the world.

Because, not to be too pessimistic and maybe I am totally wrong, but I read somewhere that we need to have all the TLDs going to DNSSEC before any new TLD. And if we wait for the last cc to go, maybe it's better if some action, specific actions are taken there and not just waiting for them to decide to go. Because I can tell, for example, that even in the not so unwealthy TLD and with usually good planning, they are planning to go to, and it's .fr, I guess it's for end of next year. So if it takes one and a half year, then how much it could take for others? Thank you.

Unidentified Participant: Please note that I am responding as the liaison from ccNSO and not in my position with ccTLD. I have made a note to report back from this meeting the suggestions just made to the ccNSO and I will do that. Personally, I think it's something that does need to be followed up, and there are certainly ways of dealing it, some of which we have looked into.

So, yes, I will report back to ccNSO, and I'm sure that after our meeting your liaison, Rudy, beside me, will let you know what the ccNSO response is. Thank you.

Rudy: Maybe just a last comment that this question has been raised in Sydney already, what is the attitude of ccNSO and ccTLDs in regards to DNSSEC, and there is no response back for the moment. They didn't answer the question, as they said that there is no global decision from ccNSO at all about the implementation of DNSSEC.

Unidentified Participant: (Spoken foreign language)

Patrick: Thank you, Carlos. So, any other opinions, comment. James?

James: So, let me give a little bit perspective on China. I had the pleasure of meeting (inaudible) several weeks ago and one of the concerns about DNS implementation, they are the second largest TLD in the world right now. Other than the cost and implementation (inaudible) to national security laws (inaudible), and China has very strict (inaudible) laws, there is a little (inaudible) of misunderstanding of how that DNSSEC implementation would upset or indirectly (inaudible) the security laws within China. I think those concerns come from misguided understanding of DNSSEC, but it is a real concern within China, and I believe that it may have concerns to some other countries that I may not be aware of.

Patrick: Thank you, James. Well, I think that the issue we try to address here is one of offering an education opportunity rather than trying to decide what on issues like sovereignty or national security. I understand that in some countries these are sensible issue, but on the other hand, I think that what we should focus on is how can we positively help people get it done? Now, if they don't want to do it, it's their business, but at least we should offer them an opportunity. And if they can, for example, it's just an example.

If ICANN could organize three workshops in the regions that need it most, I would say Africa, Latin America and Asia, for example, if ICANN could offer regional workshops with some tutorials, how do you sign your zone and how do you sign -- and how do you get the ICANN root key in to sign your zone? That would be very helpful, and from that stage on, then the ccTLDs can build their own experience or exchange experience. Maybe it would be good, indeed, as Vanda mentioned, to have regional leaders who understand better the local context.

But still I think that regional leaders are helpful, but it's still a very new technical domain for which we need input from experts in the field. And I'm pretty sure that you will find

in organizations which are not-for-profit. I'm thinking about NLnet labs or Internet Software Consortium. I think these people would be willing to help if they were given an opportunity to help. And obviously for them it would be more rational to teach at the regional workshop rather than teaching each ccTLD manager separately.

It's also for them a question of resources. So, what we need is an optimal way to use resources, ICANN resources, expert resources and so that we can minimize the cost, as Adam said. Obviously, the costs are not the same for all ccTLDs. They have different models, but they still need the same basic information.

Unidentified Participant: [Spoken in foreign language]

Adam: Thank you. I understand the question that James -- the point that James was pushing through with regards to some countries having misconceptions of DNSSEC. I wanted to turn the table around and actually ask James whether he thinks that if ICANN implemented the ideas that Patrick put forward, do you think that would answer -- that would provide an answer to those countries that are concerned about DNSSEC?

James: Actually, I'm not trying to do the debate of what -- whether we should have DNSSEC or not, or whether we're trying to do the right thing or not. But I'm saying that this is the problem that China is having an issue, not just about -- it's not just about where to get the root zone (inaudible) and now to get it signed (inaudible). But there are policies, policy considerations that interact with local laws and that intertwine a little bit with technology. And I see that -- I hate to use the word, but I do see it as an ICANN role, doing the application process, to help them to understand the issue and how to get them to explain to the local authorities in order to achieve DNSSEC. That could be part of the application process, it could be a private discussion, or it could be through various means including ALAC participation. But I do see that as a concerted effort within the ICANN community to help everyone within the community to implement DNSSEC.

Unidentified Participant: Do you think that it would help to also have workshops for the GAC?

James: (Inaudible) The GAC representative from China is not the person in charge of the security. It's a different division.

Vanda: Most of the countries, there is no technical people out there. So, to take the message to the ones that will decide the political issues, it's something different. I believe in many case it's a matter of high level presidency or CEO, to talk with the people from policy issues. It's not related to technical issues of how to implement them.

Unidentified Participant: But I think what James was saying was that not only is there a misconception on the technical side of things, and Patrick was specifically speaking about technical workshops. James was mentioning the idea of having political workshops, policy workshops. Now, if that could also be implemented with GAC members, then I think everyone would benefit from it.

Vanda: Yeah. Could be. Could be.

Cheryl: And just a thought along those lines, it's probably something that we could approach ICANN with, its international relations and its regional work, which it is doing with various governments, to sort of integrate part of the proposed packaging.

The other thing is, those of us who are going to leave this table and join the ISOC table later, perhaps it's something that we can switch hats and see if there is not some mutualism and some co-working opportunities that we might be able to explore.

Certainly that would make some of the budget and resource issues a lot easier to manage. But we probably have the technical expertise coming from where it's best from, which I would propose is not just in ICANN, but should be in an ICANN/ISOC hybrid model. And your political approach more predominantly from the ICANN part with ISOC support.

I just think we need to have conversations at a couple of levels. And while we've been doing this, I've been certainly seeing what I consider between chairman of the ccNSO, the international relations director, Nick Thorpe, here, and Pat [Graham], and talk at this level, just to test the waters while we continue on with your proposals. I think it's important that we do do so, though.

Sebastien: Yes. I think we need to extend beyond the technical part. Because when I read the presentation made by (inaudible) at the user committee level last month about DNSSEC, it's written in two sentences. It's a request by the public authorities. The second line, it's we have to define the business model. That means that beyond the political issue, beyond the technical issue, there is also a question of business model. And if we don't want to be where we are with IPv6, we really need to handle that today. Because I think it's less difficult than the IPv6-1 business model.

But it's still a problem, and when the large ccTLD like this one asks this question, it says the merit to try to answer, to help the other answering this question, too. Maybe the answer will not be the same, but at least we need to figure out that it's an important question. Thank you.

Patrick: Other question, remarks? Sorry about that.

Unidentified Participant: My only question is, what's the next step? What do we do with what we have discussed about today? How do we translate that into a message we want to forward to the board?

Unidentified Participant: My suggestion will be to have a formal position of little text from our group saying that we are thinking that it's a very important issue and we would like very much that ICANN move to technical, political business issue on DNSSEC, and that we are ready to help to any means the organization may think.

It's not a text I suggest to you, it's not at all. It's my bad English, but to say we need a motion from this group. We don't need it straightened. We can decide that on another meeting along the week, but if we can ask Patrick and someone else to help him to write a short motion on that, this is my proposal. Madam chair?

Cheryl: Can I suggest that we ensure that particular action -- that that item is on our wrap-up meeting for the Thursday? So, any text that we approve at that meeting can be enshrined in the report of the At Large advisory committee to the board of directors of ICANN the following morning?

Patrick: Okay, we'll try to do that. Anyone who is willing to help with the drafting is most welcome.

Cheryl: And I assume those of us who also wear the ISOC hats are going to take that approach as well. And obviously there are nicks, and there is a multi-disciplinary approach here. And I think the voice of the ALAC should say let's work smart here on this, and to the benefit of all the end users. Thank you, Patrick. That was excellent.

Sebastien: Next up was supposed to be the break for lunch. I was with -- it's too early, and we have 10 minutes left. And with my vice chair colleague at the end of this week, we suggest that we will start the point, what about the entity does obviously provide for individual

Internet users, is to give you the presentation we have. It's a lot of -- it is some questions and I think that you will be able to think about and not to answer straight on. It's to help reflection, and you will be able to discuss among yourself and with your colleagues during your lunch, if you wish, on the topics. But I hope that you will discuss other topics, too.

And we will put the presentation, if mister driver of the laptop can make the presentation on the ICANN from GPA to AOC from the joint project agreement, who is -- what is the AOC, it's --

Cheryl: (Inaudible)

Sebastien: Because it's French it's [foreign language], that means if you want a good wine, you need to have an AOC wine. And I hope that ICANN will be an AOC one like it's (inaudible) -

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Sebastien: (Inaudible)

Unidentified Participant: Right now it's [GRAPA].

Cheryl: Okay, ready?

Vanda: No, not yet.

Cheryl: It was there a minute ago.

Sebastien: No, it was the other one. Yes, here is the one. Okay.

Cheryl: I can read it really clearly.

Vanda: I have no problem with that.

Cheryl: The first ones I've been able to read from the screen all day.

Sebastien: Okay. Then we prepare that and I will make the introduction and she will give you the list of questions. We tried to embed it, what are the question we would like us as At Large and ALAC, and then RALO leaders to answer today, to help what is the future?

And it will also help, I am sure, in the discussion we will have to about the future of the evolution of the ALAC and At Large organization itself, because there are some relation between both issues.

Then we really would like to encourage you to expose your idea on the following questions, and let's go to the questions.

Vanda: Okay, go ahead. So, there is some questions that raising many forums related to these new AOC, and what it means and what are we going to see in the future. So, the first one, how will GAC deal with the new role if there is any new -- I believe there is -- they have in this new environment?

The second one is how to improve ALAC/GAC relationship in order to assure users voice to be stronger. To be more considered, but to be strong. If GAC will have a better and a stronger hold in this, we need to get together and at least have empowered voice with that.

So, the third one is if this new environment ICANN to be real international in a short period of time, it's -- I believe just a step forward. But there is a lot of things that we need to talk about, that to understand that what means to be international. And (inaudible) in a more practical way for us to relate this process.

Well, I believe ALAC should push in that direction, but I believe it's more from the GAC side that will be some real step forward, new process. Because most of the international issues right now in the world we live is under United Nations. There is no -- like just give you an example of how it works. To get .inc, icann.inc, yeah. To get .inc, you need to pass through a process inside the United Nations.

So, this role of GAC in this new AoC, for my point of view, it's important step to put all governance together and from this point to take to the United Nations to approve the idea to have ICANN as international organization. So, that is the reality we are living in this process right now, to really have an international organization.

Wolfe: Thank you very much, Vanda. I just have to press report from Germany in front of me saying that there will be kind of a modification following change from (inaudible) to AOC, that GAC will now in Seoul also be modified, becoming "now government oversight committee." Whatever this means (inaudible) --

Vanda: Yeah, yeah. Well, from the beginning we started to discuss this, and one suggestion that I have made some months ago was to have an open letter for all governance that want to, to sign up in order to have a hand on that. What is the complaint from the governance on the Internet issues in the Internet governance is not have this feel of control in some way the Internet. This Internet becomes more and more important and the governance are dependent on that. So, there is a weakness feeling from the governance to not have your hands on this.

So, this AOC, in my point of view, is given this first movement in that direction, to give the governance the sensation, the feeling that they have power on that. And not only United States is learning that. That's the idea that ICANN reads behind this AOC.

It's for most of the governance, maybe it will not work, because they don't believe they really will have power on that. But, anyway, kill, in my opinion. Kill the IANA, become independent if they're going to have this sometime. It's most of the governance will not get this feeling so well.

So, but anyway, it's something that most of the governance will address that and probably in our meeting with GAC, we should express this idea about what's going on and what they are think about that and how they plan to change their role to really represent, let's see, the governance point of view.

What we see now is in the last -- in this last week we had the ITU meetings in Geneva, and while we saw that a complete different approach and much more tough -- no, much more aggressive approach from ITU to get back from the beginning of (inaudible).

So, once it's kind of -- for me, this means that the AOC really reach the point because of the reaction of ITU. When you see the reaction of ITU against again the ICANN because they believe they will lose power on the Internet issues. And then the governor will lose power. That's why they could rid in the AOC that the governance is receiving much more power on that than they have before. So, that's some points of view.

And the last one was what is the big picture of the change ICANN needs to go to? And I believe I said what I understand, they have some discussion with (inaudible), but I said

what was I learned during this process. I talked with many people around in the United Nations and the governance as well, and I really understand we need to pass through this process under the United Nations, to really go to be an international organization as such.

That's -- well, let me stop the talk and give the floor to anyone.

Sebastien: No, we'll not give the floor to anyone. We will get the floor for the lunch and we will allow you for lunch. You have one and a half hour. You are supposed to be back at half-past one. We are just on time and I will give back the floor to our (inaudible) chair. Thank you.

Cheryl: Thank you both, Vanda and Sebastien, for the amount of work you have done this morning. I see a couple of hands coming up, so we'll have a quick roundtable, because I think it is important. But you do have homework over lunchtime. There is homework notes behind handed out now by staff. Not only should you be discussing the (inaudible) and exciting rules of AOC and the internationalization of ICANN in a post JPA environment, but you also need to come back from lunch all ready to decide which stations you will be representing us in, and we will try to do that in short order.

I think I saw Jose's hand first, then I saw Darlene. Is there anyone else on the speaker's list? Okay, in that order. Thank you, Jose.

Jose: Just one quick thing. Can we leave our computers here?

Cheryl: I have absolutely no idea. Is that what you were going to ask, was it, too? Could I ask, is the room secure over lunch or what? We'll get back to you on that. It doesn't look like it is, so -- Well, my suggestion will be nobody is moving forward saying, yes, it will be, so I would pack up your goods and chattels and put them somewhere secure. Thank you all. I think it's been a very productive morning, and please --

[Lunch break]

Cheryl: We might just start a process at this point in time, and those who are in the (inaudible) room and for the sake of the transcripts will understand that there has been an unavoidable delay for some of our members returning to the room, which means that those of us that are in the room will actually get to speak first. I'm assuming that we can also just allocate. So, all the things that we don't want to do we'll leave to those people who aren't here. I think that's a fair and democratic thing to do. In fact, it's very undemocratic, but I'm enjoying it.

First cab off the rank tomorrow will be the IRTT Part B Work Group, which is an open meeting. Evan will be going to that. Who else will be going to that? Rudy? Carlton, did I see you wave your hand there? Thank you. Carlton, and, of course, staff are taking this, and Wolfe. Fantastic. I will undoubtedly drop in if at all possible.

ISOC open meeting, gee, I think Patrick just might be there. Now, if you could just share with us, Patrick, you're going to be discussing more of the works in progress and the reviews at that open meeting?

Patrick: (Inaudible)

Cheryl: Okay, thank you. I would like to think that because there is some internationalization involved on that, Patrick, that we should also put James into that mix.

Patrick: (Inaudible)

Cheryl: Okay. So, in James' absence, James is put into that.

Unidentified Participant: Cheryl, could I just go back. Who is going to be on the first one?

Cheryl: Wolfe, Carlton, Evan, Rudy. Okay. So, running parallel at the same time is the ISOC open meeting. At the moment we've got James, Patrick, thank you, Dave. No one else wanting to put their hand up for security, or perhaps it's the early hour of the day. Thank you very much, Gareth, and I think that's now solved.

That brings us, then, through to the -- obviously, you'll all be there for the opening ceremony. That goes without saying.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Cheryl: Okay. Okay. New gTLD program. There is a rush. There is a rush. Okay. So, I see -- sorry, yes, I could see Pavan. Are you getting names of people as you're putting up their hands? Can you see --

Unidentified Participant: Yeah.

Cheryl: Okay, that's fine.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Cheryl: Yes, it is Pavan and Dave. Fantastic. I also assume Evan will be in that one, and Sebastien. Thank you. And we'll have Patrick as well. Okay, fine. Carlton and Dave. Excellent. These are the minimum required. The orientation session for new and returning ccTLDs. I don't think any of us need to be there other than Rudy. Okay, Rudy, go ahead.

The Post Expiry Domain Name Recovery meeting is a compulsory meeting for everyone. All ALAC and regional leads will be at that meeting. I will accept their certificates and I'll expect doctor certificates, and the doctor certificates I will probably use my professional judgment on whether or not I believe them.

Now, because all of you will be at the other one, the IDN ccT Fast Track workshop, James will be attending. Is anyone passionate about joining him and we'll give you leave from one to go to the other? Nobody is passionate about it? Fine.

I will actually be at the IDN ccTLD Fast Track workshop, because I've been in those work groups since Paris. So, that's another reason why in the Post Expiry Domain Name Recovery, which is a work group that both Alan and I are currently involved in, it's essential. Because this is, as Alan will tell you, one of the few times where we've got such a consumer focus interest, that we've got the opportunity to have a review and a PDP being done. And we've just not got the people, and I'm hoping you'll all be inspired to join the work group and continue on after that meeting.

So, we've captured everyone, then? Okay. Registry/Registrar Separation discussion. Main room that overlaps with Trademark Protection and New gTLDs, so we will need to -- Dave, which one are you after? Okay. So, Dave into the Separation, Adam, I saw Pavan, I see Sebastien, and -- sorry? (Inaudible) Okay, so, we've got everyone for that.

Those who will be going to Trademark Protection, New GTLDs? Okay, so, Sylvia, you're going to join us in the Fast Track, okay. Excellent. Trademark Protection and New GTLDs? Gee, what a surprise, Patrick. We will say Patrick, we will say Evan, we will say James, we will say Olivier by definition, we'll say Carlton.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Cheryl: Carlos isn't here, so Carlos will be put into that, as well, in fact, Jose. So, there we go. They're expected to be in those ones.

There is no competition for the Malicious Abuse and New GTLDs, so thank you, Rudy. That's another one where I would think, because we will be needing to have the briefing and information from that, that will be -- all are expected to attend. So, if we can put down everyone, everyone humanly possible and still breathing at the time. Yes, go ahead.

Unidentified Participant: Just a quick question. I notice that that one is in Crystal A, and the one right after that that is an overlap is in Crystal A. Total overlaps, yeah.

Cheryl: Please use your mike.

Unidentified Participant: There are overlaps between Malicious Abuse and new GTLDs, and Malicious Conduct and Consumer Protection. And Trademark as well, of course.

Unidentified Participant: On the official schedule, I don't see this Trademark Protection meeting. It doesn't appear in -- no.

Cheryl: That is the additional one. The others are in the same room, though, aren't they? Yes?

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Unidentified Participant: And there is also the issue that this schedule doesn't seem to be up-to-date, so it would be great if once you've allocated everybody we could have a printout of how you have allocated, because that may be more accurate than the prints we're getting from ICANN. Then you're taking down -- you're listing up who goes where right? So, if you can print that for us, that is probably a better record than this schedule that is coming from ICANN, which isn't as up-to-date as whatever you are working on.

Cheryl: For the ones that are scheduled to be in the same room, they are following on each other, so I don't think that's a conflict. It's the one that you were pointing out, Patrick, that isn't there, which is the Trademark Protection and New GTLDs.

Unidentified Participant: All work that is happening in Room A, Crystal A, it's one after each other, but even if you look in more detail there are mistakes and just if the people are in the room, stay in the room.

Cheryl: Yeah. In fact, if I was running it, I would be locking the doors, but they won't let me do that sort of thing for some reason. Moving to the Tuesday session.

Unidentified Participant: Cheryl?

Cheryl: Yes, go ahead.

Unidentified Participant: Starting at what time for that one that is one after the other? Is there one missing from -- the Trademark Protection is missing, or it starts at 1630?

Cheryl: It looks like on the paperwork that I have in front of me that Trademark is supposed to start at 1530.

Unidentified Participant: But somebody just said that wasn't even on the schedule.

- Cheryl: It's not. It's not on the official schedule.
- Unidentified Participant: Right.
- Cheryl: And it may simply be that it's in Room B rather than Room A. Yeah.
- Unidentified Participant: Okay, thank you.
- Cheryl: What we will, however, do is, because we'll all be gathered together, we can use the Skype check to just cross-check and confirm if there are any changes. Staff will probably be made aware of in the morning. Go ahead, Rudy.
- Rudy: Yeah, I think that maybe just the error is that for the Malicious Abuse and New GTLDs, that the room is Crystal B instead of Crystal A, as the meeting stops at 1630 in Crystal B.
- Unidentified Participant: No, but if you look at your official schedule, there is absolutely nothing scheduled for Crystal B after lunch, except for the IDN reception.
- Cheryl: So, we'll basically all hang around the ballroom for the whole afternoon and people will eventually work out where they're supposed to be, but we will have everybody covered.
- Tuesday, we've got a whole lot of our own compulsory meetings, and that's a very long day for us all. But there are in fact the ccNSO members meeting, which obviously Rudy will be attending. And the NCUC meeting, which does anyone wish to attend? Adam, you're going to attend that. Adam and Dave, okay. Sorry? Both of you, okay. Okey-dokey.
- Remembering that, of course, this is the cross-constituency day, so there is a long agenda, so you may be in a position to pop in and pop out. But your expectations are to be in our meetings when we're having them. And we've got a full Tuesday schedule, so your priorities are, with our Tuesday schedule, when there is nothing scheduled, then over to the NCUC, if you -- yeah, okay. It's just that sometimes it's not clear that our Tuesday is a major meeting with a lot of briefings and a lot of discussions that we have to go ahead with.
- That brings us to Wednesday, and what do we have clashing on our schedule here? We've got very little on our Wednesday schedule, is that correct? There are one or two things.
- Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible) review, isn't it?
- Cheryl: Yeah. What time is that one?
- Unidentified Participant: Eleven thirty -- eleven. Reading glasses first.
- Cheryl: Okay.
- Unidentified Participant: Just one thing. If you click on the agenda item on the agenda, you will see this spreadsheet and you will be able to see (inaudible). I can't show it on this screen because it's too small.
- Cheryl: Just to follow-up, as I said, we've got a packed day Tuesday, but those couple of people who won't be -- when you've got a moment (inaudible) -- you've got your LACRALO meeting in the morning. We then have from 2:00 to 3:30 the At-Large Names Issues

Task Force, and I would suggest anybody who is involved in the new gTLD group should probably make themselves available for that activity. That is in the Astor room.

So, anyone who has given themselves an interest, that is obviously Evan, Sebastien, Patrick. Who else is mentioned? No, the At-Large Names Issues Task Force. Who else will be attending that? Sylvia, will you be attending that? I'm sure I heard the fact that you'll be attending that between 2:00 -- on Wednesday, 2:00 to 3:30. It's on our ordinary ALAC schedule. The At-Large Names Issues Task Force.

Dave, I'm thinking perhaps it might be very useful for you to be there as well. So -- no, no, it's in our ALAC agenda, in our ordinary ALAC agenda. So, now, knowing that you all will be occupied between 2:00 and 3:30 there, let's look at what else is happening on the Wednesday. Sorry?

You've got your regional At-Large Secretariat's Meeting running from 4:00, and you've got the EURALO meeting. It's the only thing on our schedule for the Wednesday.

So, going back, then, to the main schedule, GNSO Council meeting, always fun. Drop in and out, that's fine. But what we do need to look at is the Strategic Planning Consultation. Thank you, Adam, Gareth, Dave. As many of the ExCom who can be there will be there.

DNSSEC, I'm suspecting that Patrick will be putting his hand up for that. Important last time I checked, Patrick. Darlene, thank you. Carlos, thank you.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Cheryl: Okay. So, Carlos is interested in the Strategic Planning, not the DNSSEC, okay. Thank you. Okay, okay, Hawa into DNSSEC. Thank you. And obviously those who are involved in CcNSO have issues, that they'll be going there.

The reviewers of NomCom which starts at 11:00, which, of course, means that anyone who is in the DNSSEC will be still in the DNSSEC. So, review of the NomCom? Adam? You'll have just half an hour for a cup of tea. Dave, you're going to have to escape from nothing, or you're not doing anything else before that. Okay, so Adam and Dave.

Unidentified Participant: Is it okay -- like, I put my hand up for the workshop or DNSSEC, but I was thinking of breaking and then coming over to the Review of NomCom, is that okay?

Cheryl: Yes, yes. No, that's fine. Yes, go ahead, Adam.

Adam: Do we have the NomCom review people coming to speak to us? Is it on our agenda as a specific issue? Okay, because I think we do have issues we want to raise with them. So, okay.

Cheryl: Well, of course, this particular workshop is an opportunity for doing that, which -- yeah, yeah. Okay, anyone else for the Nominating Committee? Okay, Sebastien and Wolfe. Fantastic.

Unidentified Participant: Just one of the issues I think we do have to raise, which is not in the NomCom Review paper is recall of NomCom appointees. I know that Evan is quite passionate about that, so stick him down --

- Cheryl: We'll stick Evan down there and the other thing is, of course, that is something that we've discussed with the NomCom for the last two years running and it's still not in it. So, they shouldn't be surprised to have that brought up again.
- Okay. That brings us to a tutorial on the RAA. Anyone who is planning on joining RAA Group A or B will obviously want to be there. So, obviously, I'm assuming Beau will be there, but we do need more people in both the RAA Group B and RAA Group A work groups.
- So, I'd like to consider that anyone who is available -- in other words, anyone who is not involved in the review of the nominating committee or already committed to the DNSSEC should be coming along to the tutorial on the RAA agreement, if at all possible.
- The board review, presentation of the final draft report. We will need to make some form of comment on that, so it would be a good idea if several of us could come along to that. Thank you, Adam. Thank you, Sebastien. However, I think that's probably one that would be useful for you, because you can work directly with Sebastien in terms of import.
- Jose, as a parting gesture from us, you'll be operational in that particular piece of work, so you can go to the board review. We put you down for a couple of other things, too. We worked on the principle if you weren't sitting at the table to defend yourself, we'd give you jobs.
- Jose: Sorry, but the thing is, I went to registration and it took me three times, because they -- Evan couldn't spell Venezuela right.
- Cheryl: That's very sad. Very sad if it was a difficulty with registration, but there were a few people who phoned in names to put against things, but we've made best guesses, and I think we've only given you one other job, so that's not too bad. Yes, go ahead, Gareth.
- Gareth: I just want to volunteer for Root Scaling, because I was in that one in Sidney as well.
- Cheryl: Terrific. In terms of board presentation, Carlton, do you want to go in there or Root Scaling? Okay, Carlton is into this, mainly because it's pieces, policy development that you're going to have to nurture, and that's a very soon piece of work. So, it's probably important that you're there.
- Carlton: Yes, can you have me to the Root Scaling with study results, please?
- Cheryl: Shall do. Root Scaling. James, great, and Hawa. Thank you. Registration Abuse Policy Working Group. It's not a how-to guide, I'll hasten to add.
- Carlton: Just one question, Root Scaling Study is from 1:30 to 3:00, and we have the Name Issues Task Force starting at 2:00; is that correct? Yeah, so I won't make it to the Root Scaling Study.
- Cheryl: Well, you could start. But it's probably best if you don't -- half an hour, they would probably delight at starting that long anyway. Okay, so we take your name off Root Scaling Study. Can we have someone else going to the Root Scaling Study? Carlos? Root Scaling Study Results. No? What are you going to, then?
- Carlos: (Inaudible)
- Cheryl: Get back to me, then, Carlos. Go ahead, Adam?

Carlos: [Spoken in foreign language]

Unidentified Participant: Well, I just wanted to mention to the attention of Carlos that we have the Name Issues Task Force starting at 2:00, in which Carlos was quite active.

Cheryl: You'll be involved in that one, yes.

Sebastien: Patrick?

Cheryl: Carlos, I can help you here. It's the Names Task Force from 2:00 to 3:30, so you're in that one then.

Sebastien: Thank you, Patrick.

Cheryl: Sylvia, Root Scaling Study? Yes? No? Okay. Thank you. Go ahead, Adam.

Adam: I have a question yet. Do we have a briefing from the Root Scaling Study? We mentioned that on the last ALAC call. Was it possible to arrange that briefing?

Unidentified Participant: We have the Root Scaling Study Report on the main ICANN website.

Adam: We were asking for a briefing on that report, and I think it's been arranged that there will be. So, it's not that important that we duplicate that particular meeting in that case, perhaps, or not. I mean --

Unidentified Participant: I wouldn't skip it, no.

Adam: Well, I'm going (inaudible) --

Unidentified Participant: Yeah.

Cheryl: Okay, then. That brings us to Registration Abuse Policy Work Group. Watching the overlap there, people who are in the Board Review will be free providing it finishes on time. No one involved in the Names Task Force or in the Root Scaling Study would be able to attend that, however. So, Registration Abuse Policy Work Group, I'm suspecting that Beau will want to be involved in that. Evan, no, you can't be, sorry. You've got the other one. Who is going to put their hand up? Thank you, Jose, that's excellent.

Let me see. Registration Abuse really needs more of a focus. Can I ask some of the regional people who may not be committed at this time? Who isn't committed? [Andreas], what are you doing at that point, from 2:00 to 3:30? Good. Thank you very much, Andreas, appreciate that. I think that's important.

Okay.

Evan: Even more so, because so few NCUC people showed up last time. There was the meeting -- when there was the Sydney meeting, it was just Beau and me, and that was it from the end-user representation there. So, it is important. Otherwise, the domainers get to define what constitutes abuse, which just seems so strange to me.

Cheryl: There are many strangers in the world of ICANN, though, Evan. Many strange things indeed. So, that's one, of course, if anyone else finds themselves free, it would be very valuable for you to be there. Dev, what are you doing on the Wednesday -- sorry, yes, go ahead, Rudy.

- Rudy: Yes, well, I can jump in for that meeting, if someone will back me up in the ccNSO meeting, if there is anything important.
- Cheryl: Thank you. We'll add you to the [name], and thank you Wolfe, that would be nice if -- Dev, what have we got you doing on a Wednesday? I don't think we've written your name down.
- Unidentified Participant: Sorry, the At Large Names Issues Task Force.
- Cheryl: I (inaudible), my apologies. Vivek, which of these in the morning session will you be wanting to attend? Perhaps the Registration Abuse would benefit from you as well, I think. Thank you, Vivek, I appreciate that. Anyone else for that one? If not, we shall move on to the SSAC Review.
- Now, anyone who is involved in the Name Task Force is still going to be involved in that meeting, and we have a fair amount of commitment into the Registration Abuse Policy. Is this one where we really can't cover it effectively? Patrick, I'm less concerned because we have a liaison into the SSAC than I would be if we didn't have relationship. What's your view of needing to have somebody in that room?
- Patrick: Well, I think we could skip that meeting indeed. It's more often information of already available material. So, I don't think there is anything new that will pop up from this meeting.
- Cheryl: Thank you. I'm glad my suspicions are borne out there, because it is important that when we have a liaison, we've got an advantage role. We shouldn't have to duplicate those things.
- The next and particularly important one, and let's just look at overlap. Anyone involved in the Names Task Force, which disappointingly is a whole lot of talent that I'd also like to have in the room for the Board Committee on Public Participation is not going to be able to attend, because it runs right across the same time. But anyone who is involved in Board Review and, again, all of these parallel ones are a bit of a challenge. I think the Committee on Public Participation, Sebastien, what are you in? You're going for that one? Thank you. Sebastien, I'll be there. 3:30, most of your other meetings finish at 3:30. Is there anyone else who can come to Public Participation?
- Evan: What time is the task force over?
- Cheryl: It finishes at --
- Unidentified Participant: One hour later. Completely overlaps.
- Cheryl: Yes, total overlap, unfortunately, yeah.
- Unidentified Participant: It's really bad for lunch, as well, that day. It's looking like be careful to actually trying to schedule eating.
- Cheryl: If you're lucky you'll be able to, yes.
- Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)
- Cheryl: All right. We'll put Alan, Sebastien. Obviously, I'm going to be there, and if anyone else feels that they can be freed from one of the other meetings, then do come across. The Internationalized Registration Information Whois Data, again, runs straight across that. Now, really, we went to the Sydney, is it reporting now? Can you give me some

information on whether it is just up to the reporting or is it still planning stage for the International Registration Information?

Unidentified Participant: Still planning stage.

Cheryl: So, we're not expecting a great deal more than perhaps what we saw in Sydney? Well, perhaps, James, if possible, if you just go so you get yourself up to speed on that, and perhaps, Patrick, if there is any pre-briefing, simply because it is internationalized scripts that they're talking about. What doesn't fit perfectly in the IDN, your IDN (inaudible) role, there is a nexus there, and at least, then, we've got someone in the room and it will be fresh for you. It won't be fresh for the rest of us. Go ahead, Patrick.

Patrick: Well, it's not really IDN in the sense that it has nothing to do with DNS, but it is about translating one language into another. So, in that sense and displaying non-ASCII characters. So, in that sense, well, it has some common background with the IDN, yes.

Cheryl: And certainly with all the IDNs we hope we're going to get, there will be great influence on the information in the scripts in the Whois. Right, so I think that one, if we can just have for James, that will be fine.

The next one now, is everyone going to be clear from their other commitments by 4:00? I think so. Yes? So, at the end of public participation and with all the other workshops on the Wednesday clear, I think the SIC Forum on GNSO Improvements and Restructuring is another one of those where I expect to see just about everybody who is still breathing in the room. Specifically, I see Patrick, I see Dave. No, I don't see Patrick.

Gareth: No, you don't see Patrick, because we also have a EURALO meeting at that time. So, you won't have the European --

Cheryl: Yes, looked at it and then improperly forgot that it starts at 4:00. So, no Europeans in that. Thank you, Gareth.

Unidentified Participant: What time does the EURALO meeting start? Oh, it's 5:00.

Cheryl: I'm looking at the schedule and it says 4:00. Heidi, go ahead.

Heidi: The EURALO meeting starts at 1700, 5 p.m. We have 90 minutes. The last 30 minutes will be an outreach marketing event, discussion.

Cheryl: In fact, what I was looking at was in error. I was looking up and seeing 4:00, and it was actually next to the Regional Secretariat meeting. So, we've got -- can I get -- when will the Regional Secretariat be finished? They're finishing at 5:00? Okay, so that's not going to help with them on the GNSO Improvements.

Is it possible for some of the people who find themselves free to just commit to coming to that room, if possible? So, that's a 4:00 start. If you're not involved in the Regional Secretariats meeting or the EURALO meeting, if you can attend SIC Forum, that would be excellent.

Evan: So, does that mean there is not going to be anybody from Europe at the Regional meeting, the Secretariat's meeting?

Sebastien: No, no, no. There is no problem. The Regional meeting is before the EURALO meeting. So, the Secretariat meeting is 4:00 to 5:00, and the EURALO meeting is 5:00 to 6:00.

- Cheryl: Now back to Adam's point, wondering whether or not people are going to have time for lunch. You also need to look if you're going to have time for a cup of tea or a drink of water, looking at this Wednesday schedule. At exactly the same time there is a Board Presentation to Draft Final Report. I think that's one of those that if Carlton can dash across to the last half hour, that's about the only thing that I can suggest there. And it probably will be something to just pick up the end of the questions might be worthwhile. So, that's one of those that we don't actually put a line through, but Carlton (inaudible) get there. Go on. Go ahead.
- Patrick: You say that it's a Board Review and GNSO Improvements. These two lines are together. Board Review Presentation from -- in fact, it's just one single meeting, this one, these two lines.
- Cheryl: Well, that makes it easier, but I wasn't aware of that.
- Patrick: Sorry, because here it's Board (SIC) Forum on GNSO Improvements Restructuring, and that's going from 4:00 to half past 5:00, and that's one single line.
- Cheryl: Well, that's actually better, because that means, Carlton, if you can join us for the last half hour, we already have people available in that room. So, that's excellent. In the Crystal B.
- Now, who is Data Accuracy Study? Your Name Task Force finishes when? She says, having already forgotten. It goes to 4:30, doesn't it? 4:30, not 3:30 -- 3:30. So, people from that can go to the Data Accuracy. So, Evan, that frees you up for that, does it?
- Evan: No. Because there is the Secretariats. So, I'm freed up to go to the RAA drafting, but that's afterwards.
- Cheryl: Right. Okay. Well, we might just have to give that one -- perhaps we have been involved in the ordering of those studies. We've been in the selection and the prioritizing of those studies. I think --
- Evan: And given what was said a little earlier today, it seems like we have a real significant interest that needs to be brought to that table. Like I say, I wish I could be there, but as long as some -- you know, Adam had requested and I put out on the Skype to everybody the proposed wordings based on what we were talking about earlier, about Whois accuracy. I mean, if that can basically in some form be resolved and put through, then that's something important that can be brought to that, whether I'm physically there or not.
- The thing is, of course, that's basically what this particular meeting is about. This is about discussing the study that is proposed on Whois accuracy. So, it's actually a test bed, a third-party test bed study that's coming out of the GNSO. Go ahead, Sebastien.
- Sebastien: Maybe Olivier, who is not regional (inaudible) and is not participating in the Board Review Committee maybe could go to the Whois to be our eyes in this meeting.
- Olivier: Yeah, that's fine, I'll do it.
- Cheryl: Excellent. Thank you. Okay. Is there anything else for Wednesday? Yes, go ahead, Patrick.
- Patrick: Yes. At one point, remark to Matias from Schedule IC for the Internationalizing of Registry Information, you put myself and Dave. I won't be able to attend because I'm in the Name Issue group. And I think we mentioned James, is that correct?

- Cheryl: Yes, we did. Yes. So, is there anything else on Wednesday?
- Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)
- Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)
- Cheryl: Nothing else for Thursday?
- Sebastien: We don't have a band for the night?
- Cheryl: If anyone who has music skills or musical instruments with them, Wednesday night is a music evening, so the opportunity is there for you to flaunt your talent. Thursday morning, board breakfast. Everyone is invited. It is not on the public schedule, but whether or not you are an ILAC member or a regional lead -- go ahead, Evan?
- Evan: Is there a possibility that we could put a little bit of extra planning into the board breakfast? Because I always really feel that we don't accomplish what we could. I remember in Sydney we had something where some tables there were one ALAC person and a whole bunch of board people, and just the opposite at some other tables. Maybe this is too informal for planning, but I really wish there was something more we could do with that.
- Cheryl: Well, of course, we don't know who is going to turn up from the board until they walk in. So, what are you proposing as a way forward?
- Unidentified Participant: Yeah, maybe to follow your suggestion, Evan, even if we don't have the name, it's to say that there are two seats for a board member at each table and not more than two seats. I know that it's complicated for you to learn that, but it's important not to have just board together and us together, and even to have this multiple regional occupation at each table. I know that when you wake up at half past six to go for lunch -- breakfast like that, it is difficult for us, too. But if we try to be on time and to sit down where we need to be, it will be easier.
- Cheryl: Of course, I thought we made great effort in Sydney to ensure that we didn't have clusters of people, the board was spread around. But, yes, it would be nice to make sure that we had a better regional spread as well. Go ahead, Adam?
- Adam: I'm still -- I think I mentioned this before and very much in the minority. I'm still uncomfortable with the breakfast arrangement. I think we may get more out of having those three or four board members visit us in a formal way and we prepare agenda items for them, a more structured interaction, if we want policy to be done.
- As happened I think three meetings ago, I'm just not sure that the breakfast gives us the full value that we want. It's nice to meet the board, it's good to talk to them and chat with them, but I just think from a -- can't speak English, which is disaster. No, no, I mean, I can't speak any language. I'm progressively nonlingual.
- For actually exchanging policy discussion, I don't think we're making the best that we could do, and I just wonder if we should think about going back to having them come to this room for a scheduled period of time for which we have prepared particular issues we wish to discuss with them. But I have a feeling I'm in the minority on that.
- Cheryl: (Inaudible)

- Unidentified Participant: Just as a point of information, those meetings don't happen anymore because there was widespread dissatisfaction with the value that they got from both board members and from the community they visited. In no small measure, because you only got to see two or three members of the whole board; whereas, with breakfast you get a considerably larger number. So, if you were to request a meeting with the board, what you would get is two or three people, who then go back to the board and characterize the meeting to other board members. Yeah.
- Cheryl: And just to point out that what was happening was we were ending up with a report card situation as opposed to any form of policy discussion. And we certainly, yes, it was the way it was done, but we weren't the only community to be dissatisfied with those outcomes. Patrick, yes?
- Unidentified Participant: Do we know which room it's going to be?
- Cheryl: Charlotte, which is where about, Heidi, do we know? Okay. Yes, go ahead, Olivier?
- Olivier: That's strange, because I received a note that there is a NomCom breakfast in Charlotte on that day at the same time.
- Heidi: On the schedule it shows the board breakfast being in Belle-Vue.
- Unidentified Participant: Actually, it is Belle-Vue. Does it say Charlotte? I think it's Belle-Vue, I believe.
- Cheryl: Well, I'm glad it's Thursday, because hopefully we'll know where we're having breakfast by then. Okay. We will all be breakfasting. It will be nice if you were early, bright-eyed and bushy-tailed. It would be even nicer if we had the majority of our people seating with two or three blank -- sorry, blank -- empty chairs at the table when the board started to arrive. So, Evan, I think that would go to addressing some of your concerns as well.
- Okay, then, on the Thursday there is that public forum. I expect we'll all be here. Yes, go ahead, Jose.
- Jose: I have the breakfast with NomCom, and since I'm leaving ALAC and being new in NomCom, I think I'd rather be there. So, just to let you know.
- Cheryl: Understood, and we'll note the fact that you're in transition. Thank you.
- Jose: Great. We don't need to invite you because I like breakfast, because you already (inaudible) --
- Unidentified Participant: I thought I was going to photocopy myself.
- Cheryl: Well, that's only reasonable. We gained work on planning, I promise. Back, then, to the Public Forum. Obviously, that's all hands to the deck there. And then the Internet Governance workshop is again something I think most of us will be very interested in, but certainly specifically I see Gareth, I see Wolfe, I see Darlene, I see Dave, I see Vivek, and I see (inaudible). So, specifically you're there, but most of us will be.
- The other choice, then, is the IANA IPv6 Showcase, which some of us would actually be interested to see, but I must say I think our priorities will have to be the DNS Abuse Forum. Don't be too sad, Olivier. You could be the person we sent to the IVP (SIC) Showcase, if you like. A little reward?
- Olivier: Okay. Thank you very much, Cheryl.

- Cheryl: The rest of us will be in the DNS Forum. And then that brings us to the 1715 final event for the day, which is the Security, Stability and Resilience Activities Update. Patrick, what's your take on that?
- Patrick: I think it could be interesting for informational purposes, but nothing more than that. I mean, there will be no discussion or no decision taken. Just a presentation.
- Cheryl: So, anyone who is still hail and hearty during the end of that day and wishes to be in the Security, Stability and Resilience Activities Update will do so. Are you going to be attending that, then, Patrick, or not?
- Patrick: If I'm still alive, I will.
- Cheryl: Okay. You'll probably find me in that same room under those circumstances. You're right, yes. You're right. Delete all about ICANN Security, Stability and Resilience Activities. You can't be there because, as Sebastien pointed out, our wrap-up meeting starts at 1700. So, we move straight from the DNS Abuse Forum into our wrap-up meeting.
- And on Friday, those of us who are left, we'll be attending the Reports and the Making of the ICANN Board. And those of us who are left means if we don't see you've got your flights planned for a time in that morning, then we do really expect that you'll be at the meeting and stay for the reports and the meeting if the ICANN board. I have to wait to have one day in Seoul to look outside and perhaps walk or drive somewhere to my Saturday, so do you, too. Go ahead, Adam.
- Adam: I know that Vanda is involved in this, but there is the ICANN Fellowship going on every day. Is anybody -- are we doing anything with them this time around, saying hi from ALAC or other such things?
- Sebastien: This time we are saying hello to them, but this time there are more doing one-on-one sessions on ICANN. We staff more than with member of the constituency RALO -- I'm sorry, (inaudible). But, yes, we are coming to them and talk to them about At Large in general at one of the breakfasts. Even if it's not official, we will be going.
- Adam: It's not organized by the ExCom or is it open to anyone who wants to volunteer to interfere or --
- Sebastien: It's a fellowship program organized and I don't know who is invited, but we are following that. I don't know if it's open to everybody, because it's lunch -- breakfast.
- Adam: It's up to them to decide.
- Sebastien: It's their organization, not mine.
- Adam: Okay. If you need anyone to volunteer and do anything, I'd be happy to.
- Sebastien: I will notice that to them.
- Cheryl: Thank you very much. Okay. All right. Nothing else, we will circulate that, obviously. Yes, go ahead, James.
- James: I have a question. Do we need to attend the Friday 2:00 to 6:30 p.m., the At Large Executive Committee meeting?

- Cheryl: If you're part of the Executive, yes, you do. But, like many of the meetings, you're welcome to explore what we're saying and be in the space. You'd probably be fairly crazy to do so, but in fact, a rolling camera in there, it will be recorded, so you don't have to go, but feel free to be welcomed if you do want to attend.
- Nick: The phrase glutton for punishment comes to mind.
- Cheryl: Okay, then. That brings to a rather tortuous end, our first attempt at that. I still think this process is rather important, but I'm disappointed at the amount of time it takes. In fact, I'm horrified with the amount of time it takes.
- For Nairobi, or in future meetings, not just in Nairobi, can I ask that some of us start allocating ourselves far earlier in the process. I know it's difficult, but to spend this amount of time saying who is going to do what -- either that, or we'll just allocate and you can argue against your allocations. We're just not working quite fast enough. Nick, then Evan.
- Nick: The only caution that I would say is that the schedule tends to change up until almost Saturday, unfortunately, and so you can allocate yourselves earlier, but I think you may then find that you become more confused and then have to spend time unallocating and reallocating because of classes in the schedule. That's the only caution I would --
- Cheryl: Evan?
- Evan: Yeah, I was just going to suggest that the Google docs idea of doing this is so good. I mean, the idea of perhaps putting this up -- granted what Nick said carries a lot of weight and a lot of this obviously shifts. But hopefully we can have some idea of who wants to go where. So, even if some time shift, as long as where it shifts to doesn't have a conflict, at least we have an idea of who wants to do where. And maybe if you put something up a couple of weeks in advance of the meeting, the people who have an active interest in something will put themselves up, and then basically you just fill the slots with everyone else.
- Cheryl: I'm certainly happy to do that. Okay. Now, moving on to the next item on the agenda. If we look towards the very important topic of what opportunities -- sorry, we've done that. The At-Large Review Implementation. Nick, you've briefed -- sorry, go ahead.
- Sebastien: I think for the question of time, we will not come back on this issue, I guess. But feel free to (inaudible) to myself, to come to us and to tell us what you think, and if we need to find sometime later to discuss the question we ask you before the break, it will be useful. But I think that the other topics are also important and we are, as a question of time, I think it's better if we go to the next item. But feel free to discuss with us (inaudible) subject because they are important. Thank you.
- Cheryl: Indeed they are. And, of course, they all spent all of their lunch while I was standing up getting registered discussing this matter, I'm sure. We should have asked them for their feedback, indeed. Okay. So, moving on to At-Large Implementation. There has been very large pieces of paper presented to us, so I'm now going to hand over to Nick.
- Nick: Yes, in keeping with Alan's earlier comment that anything like a project plan rapidly becomes unreadable unless it's printed on a billboard, we've gone for the A3 version in this instance, which hopefully is reasonably readable. I won't try and put it on the screen because you would get, like, four words in one column and it's not worthwhile.
- After you all finished your vote on this, it was sent to the SIC and I spent about 10 minutes on this subject with them on Saturday -- yesterday, that would be. Of course,

you're seeing the SIC on Tuesday to discuss this and the selection of a director by At-Large.

All I basically did was hand them the version that you are looking at here and stated what the process had been to date. Noted that you all were going to review this and that it was clear that the relative priority had yet to be determined by all of you, of all of these various elements, which was an important outstanding item.

And at the same time, after this meeting, based on your conversations amongst yourselves related to this, and also your conversations with the Structural Improvements Committee, we would then get a project manager to actually come and flesh out the various pieces of work in this document so that a budget could be prepared. And then, of course, you'll have a really fun, very large set of documents like this.

But we will -- I'm very aware of the fact that this could become a boring and time-consuming exercise, and I will try always and provide you with short summaries rather than giant documents to wade through. In any case, there you have it.

So, for what it's worth, there are some elements here which are clearly self-contained, meaning that they are entirely related to At-Large, or ALAC. There are a good proportion of these that actually cross other parts of the community.

I have a meeting with the director of Organizational Reviews, Marco Lorenzoni, because all of the reviews that have been done all have a sizable proportion of their recommendations which relate to communities outside of the one being reviewed. And, in fact, many of the reviews contain similar recommendations about other bodies. So, we actually have a considerable and increasing body of overlapping organization-wide improvements that are being recommended and agreed to.

So, with respect to those points, obviously your input is always essential. We will try and come up with a way that actually integrates like-for-like across different parts of the community so that the burden on members of the community in reviewing improvements of that kind is lowered rather than everyone trying to tackle things independently.

Evan: Nick, in just following up on what you're saying, when is the best time this week going to be to engage regarding the meeting issues rather than just say something at the public forum? Is there going to be some time other in the week? There were two sort of overlapping issues to us, one of which is holding -- is bringing more At-Large into the regional meetings.

There was the more immediate thing that bothered me at the beginning about the lack of publicity and the appearance to have closed, secret meetings that were happening regionally. I don't personally want to let that particular issue die without at least hearing some more from ICANN people. What is the best way to engage that this week?

Nick: Those subjects are within the purview of the board's Public Participation Committee, which is having a public meeting the day and time of which escapes me at this moment.

I know for a fact that they would welcome any thoughts that people have on meetings and the nature of them, what they are intended to achieve, where and how they are held, and all the rest of it.

Evan: Which is in direct conflict with something I'm at, so maybe I can talk to some gentleperson who might be able to convey my interests.

Patrick: I will be there, and I will bring your thoughts, if you want me to do so.

Cheryl: Go ahead, Adam.

Adam: About the schedule, Nick, you mentioned that there would be project planning for budgets. What's not really mentioned is project planning for times and dates and implementation. Is that also part of what's being considered by the project manager person?

Nick: Well, yes, that would be absorbed to capacity. In trying to change things is often overlooked, I find, in organizational development, and I think we've all experienced -- the changes proposed in the (inaudible) review compared to the changes proposed in the GSNO review are very different things. That doesn't mean that you can't consume a lot of community time in any case.

So, what we shall try to do is really -- the priority should be set by all of you as to what it is most important from your perspective to do when. And where there is a cross-cutting set of recommendations that affect multiple communities, the staff will have to come back and say, well, okay, these four communities or these three communities are affected. Here is a way that they could together tackle this, again taking into account that it not take over the work of those bodies.

So, we're very much happy to be led by all of you in doing this in such a way that it provides maximum value without becoming a burden and consuming all of your time. Because developing organizational processes is probably not why most people get involved in policy development environments, in my experience. I suspect you all would like to talk about substance more than you talk about process. I could be wrong.

Adam: At the same time, we don't want to waste our time talking about things out of order or because we need to know things. For example, if we're obviously going to spend a lot of time talking about how to select a director, should be directors, but never mind. And we need to talk to people like the general counsel, to get his understanding of where it fits, how it fits in the time scale of ICANN general processes.

So, there are things we need to know first before we begin discussing policy as it were, I think. We need to be basing our policy -- what we're discussing and what we're trying to implement on real facts and how it fits with legal issues or whatever it would be for ICANN.

Nick: You'll notice that the one thing that does not appear in this process here is the selection of a director. It's quite deliberate in that that is a stand-alone process, because you're coming up with a process, but it relates to another body exclusively, really. So, I thought it would be advisable not to link the selection of the director with the 90 or so other thing that are in here, because there was no actual rationale to link the two in any case.

Cheryl: Back to your point, though, Adam, we've referenced specifically to the selection and processes for appointment of a director. We have in fact made sure the general counsel's office is involved. For example, any questions that were raised and continue to be raised on the Wiki for that space that has any legal ramifications at all, and all questions raised at the one community call we've had so far, general counsel has said they will give us informed (inaudible) back on. So, we are using that process to make sure that we are getting the advice during that time.

Adam: No, I understood the reason for it not being included. I was thinking more that this was part of the review. And I think from EURALO, in particular, we had a point that I don't think we're completely satisfied with the notion that the recommendation was for two directors and we're now down to one, and that there may be merit in continuing to request

the liaison continues while the voting director exists at the same time. And this is something I'd like to discuss at some point as part of this problem, because I think it is part of the review. You can't just take it completely out of the review process.

So, I don't think we should give up and simply accept we've only got one director now. So, you see what I mean? There is some linkage, but I do understand what you're saying about it being a separate process, that particular one.

Cheryl: Well, we certainly wouldn't want to hold up the progression --

Adam: No.

Cheryl: -- on the first while we were discussing the second, either.

Adam: Except do we wish to accept it (inaudible) from the board which -- it doesn't really give us -- anyway, that's a discussion to have. What I'm trying to say is that we should continue to discuss this, and I think EURALO wishes to make the point that we should continue to discuss this so it is related to the review. Although I do understand completely and I agree with the rationale Nick explained for taking that one seat out. But it's sort of complicated.

Cheryl: Okay, did I see Evan before Alan?

Evan: I was just going to quickly respond to Adam in saying that it's not an either/or. I think we can go ahead with what we've got on our plate right now with the knowledge that we can and should go back to the board and say guess what, there is one little bit of the recommendations that you didn't fully implement, and now let's ask you to do that. But wait on doing that until we've completed everything we have on our plat here.

Adam: It could be a long time, and by then we've lost the -- I'm sorry I interrupted, but it could be a long time, and then we've lost the opportunity, which is now, while we're considering the review, to make this continued argument, and maybe we should be trying to do both at the same time.

Cheryl: In parallel. Nick, is that a point that is on that matter or can I go to Alan?

Alan: I don't remember if I read it or I heard it from a SIC member. I think it was read, that there were people on the SIC and the board who didn't think we should have any board members. There are some who thought we should have two, and one was, and I am quoting verbatim, a compromise. We may not like it, but it is a compromise. If it were my call, I would say it's an interesting debate -- interesting thing to raise once quietly in this meeting, and then not mention it again until after we actually have someone sitting on the board. Because until then, the decision is not made.

Cheryl: Well, certainly I look forward to having EURALO consider that and discuss how they do or don't wish to pursue this, because I would like to think that what we don't risk is holding up the implementation process that we got in -- trained now. Keeping the communication channels open, absolutely. Keeping the conversation going internally, perhaps, equally well. But what we do not want to risk is, oh, well, you're not happy and we can still say no.

We do have this whole implementation process. In fact, how the implementation process works out might give us leverage to argue for a liaison, depending on which of the forms under Section 5, I think it goes A to G now, doesn't it, come into play. We can argue perhaps better or worse for what EURALO is proposing, depending on what the outcome is. Alan, go ahead.

- Alan: Friday or sometime thereafter we'll hear who is on the new SIC for the coming year. I would suggest you make a list of the names and start talking to them, and start feeling out what their position is before you try to coerce them into changing it. It's going to depend, to a large extent, on those people, and until we see what the weight is -- not the weight -- what the feelings of those people is, is it a close decision or are we lucky to keep the one? You might not want to put a lot of pressure on them.
- Adam: You really think they're going to go back on the one decision? You really think they can risk that, given the importance of multi-stakeholderism? Is that evolving throughout the whole of this confirmation of whatever it is? I don't think they're going to do that.
- Alan: I don't think that's going to happen, but there are people who would like to see a --
- Adam: (Inaudible)
- Unidentified Participant: I think we need to know that they're more lucky to have one of us on the board than us having the luck of being on the board for the very fact that ICANN needs that in order to be taken seriously.
- Alan: I came out of another meeting to have the discussion on implementation. We're having a meeting on the board director at 5:00 today. I would really like to go on with the original topic so I can get back to the meeting of talking about how PDPs work in ICANN.
- Cheryl: Thank you for the point of order and it was, of course, Adam's and EURALO's point that there was an X between the two. We've explored that long enough, actually. I agree with that. Let's get back onto the agenda. So, back to you, Nick.
- Nick: I would make one note that during the meeting with the Structural Improvements Committee, one of the directors who is also a member of the Public Participation Committee noted Recommendation 9 and translation processes, and in particular noted that a draft translation policy does exist, went through two different public comment periods, and remains in sort of limbo state. And they immediately decided, well, we should pick this up.
- We should take into account the last year's worth of experience and see if we need to make any modifications and get on with it. So, in the case of one recommendation, this actually might go a little faster than I'd expect and not require a whole lot of project planning on my part.
- Cheryl: Nick, could I ask, with these documents in our hands now, our next step would be to discuss their priority, would it not?
- Nick: Yes.
- Cheryl: In which case, I think we should open the floor for people to put forward what they think are our prioritization of these tasks. You've all got your very large pieces of paper in front of you? Go ahead, Alan, and then Sebastien.
- Alan: I would have suggested that instead of having trying to do that here, that we come up with a process by which we not only can prioritize them as a group, but understand how we fill these out and how we start fleshing them out, rather. I'm a little bit worried just about process, in that we have a spreadsheet here that is almost impossible to handle, since I don't have a printer this big. And we're going to be adding and modifying things to it. I'd like to understand how we're going to carry this forward so we understand what's going on.

It's unwieldy enough as it is that I suspect there has been fewer people than should have read it and thought about it, and I'd like to understand how we're going to go forward and prioritize them. And I don't think on the fly here with, I suspect most people not having fully processed it is the right way to do that.

Cheryl: Go ahead, Sebastien.

Sebastien: Yes. I will be more direct than Alan. I would very much like to know who read into detail this document. Because, no, no, I really think if we want to work on that issue, and it's unreadable document, I know, but the number of people who make comments on that document struck me. I was only one, at least on the Wiki. You may have find other ways, hopefully.

And my second point is that I really -- I don't want to reopen the vote because we already vote on that, but I really would like to know who decide to take some of my comments and not the others. I will be happy to know for the process.

Then I think if we want to work on that one best way to not delete that -- to not delay that, sorry, too long is to find a subgroup working on making a proposal for the overall group. Because it's quite an important job in front of us and to find what is a priority, frankly, they are a priority for the RALOs will not be the same as ALAC itself. And maybe we need to find what is a priority for each level of the organization. It's one of the reasons I suggest in the document to put four layers and not three layers. Because we talk about four layers, the ALS, the RALO and the ALAC, but we are wrong. We are four layers. We have our members. The members of the ALS who are the first layer while we are here, and if we don't talk about them, how will we reach them? How we will involve them, then we can stop our work and go shopping.

And in the content and in the way to work< I think we need really to organize this three, this four layers, not just the three we see, the four, and to see what we can do for the end-users member of our organization and for one region at least individual members.

What we do at At-Large -- sorry, at ALS level of the organization and what we do at the regional level, and what we do at the worldwide level. That's four levels and maybe the topics will we will have to handle will be different order and then we will have to reconcile all that after.

It's not a very easy and short work, but it's mandatory. Thank you.

Nick: Just, for what it's worth, I laid out this document this way simply because I couldn't think of another way to put the information together that wouldn't produce a very long, wordy narrative-type document. I wanted to come up with something that was relatively -- that was the shortest possible while making clear what the connection was between the various elements and the report itself. If there is another way that you would like this to be presented that would be more effective, I'm happy to do it. I just had to come up with something and I tried to come up with something that was shorter rather than very extensive.

Because I remember the GNSO Board Review working groups, its reports on GNSO improvements were sort of these massive, wordy documents. I just thought, well, this is not the most exciting thing to read to start with. At least it should be kind of short.

On the other point, I would say, Sebastien, I did actually -- I was the incorporator and I incorporated all of your suggestions. The one that I think you're referring to that I didn't incorporate is because the outreach to the outside of At-Large was actually another part

of the plan right above the section that you were talking about. So, if I had incorporated the one thing that didn't get incorporated, it would have actually made a whole other section somewhat redundant.

And you can actually see this under item 4, where you have engagement, which is designed to engage the internal At-Large community, outreach and recruitment, which is designed to reach outside of the At-Large community, including to the members of ALSes and the general public. So, that's why it got incorporated in that way.

As to the three levels that you see on page 1 under item 3, where it says, "The ALS/RALO/ALAC structure," all of the recommendation descriptions that you see are the verbatim text from the At-Large Review report. And that's why I didn't change those.

Cheryl: Is that what you wanted to say?

Unidentified Participant: Thank you, Chair. I wanted to make --

Unidentified Participant: I actually think this is a very good attempt at putting together this report, because it includes the comments. The comments that have been made on this document is more extensive and been going on for a lot longer time than the last time. And a lot of those comments are included in these notes on this document here. So, I wanted to record that. I truly believe that this is a really great effort at this feeling what would have been a wreck of a document. And I can see the comments I see reflected in the verbiage here, comments that were actually made from inception on this report. Thank you.

Nick: I figured if I didn't want to write it, you probably wouldn't want to read it.

Cheryl: Alan, go ahead, then Adam.

Alan: All of my comments on the formatting and the inaccessibility when I'm in the middle of an ocean notwithstanding I do appreciate the amount of effort that went into this and I'm not trying to minimize that. I do have some thoughts which we can talk about offline on how to format it a little bit differently.

What I would propose, however, in terms of actually addressing the problem of how do we go forward is, I think we need to categorize things of things that can be done purely within ALAC, things that are going to require careful thought and design with or without other people. So, try to categorize who is going to do it. Whether it should be done by the ALAC as a whole or a subgroup. You know, try to propose how we go forward on the various 117 tasks, or whatever there are here.

And then assess -- and I think that's almost a prerequisite before getting staff in and looking at resources, things like that. Now, maybe someone can help in that content. But I think we need an overall plan to understand who is going to do it, what kind of time frame is reasonable. We don't want to be put in the GNSO position of spending all of our resources on implementing the plan and none of it on doing work. So, we have to try to divide the work wherever we can.

Nick: On that point, the review of the GNSO had every project completing in six months, when it was approved, and, of course, it's still going on. And I have actually had people within the organization say, "Well, when are you going to be finished?" And I said, "Well, we'll get back to you. We have to decide what it is that people want to do and then they have to decide how rapidly they are willing to do it based on their other objectives as volunteers. So, we'll get back to you. Once they've decided their timeline, we'll get back to you." And people have said, "Oh, that sounds like a reasonable way of proceeding, okay."

Alan: For better or worse, the GSNO was a cataclysmic one that had to be done basically with a lot of things coming together at the same time. Very little of ours is like that. The next review where they say we're going to look at the overall At-Large structure may well be like that, but that's next time, where most of us won't be here.

Cheryl: I think most of us will make very sure we're not. Adam, go ahead.

Adam: Just a picky point. I think there are actually five layers, not four, because as the ICANN community from which we're meant to be taking the users who are missing into account. So, the point is that users get to input into the community and the community gets to return that information back to the user. So, I think we've got five layers, if that makes sense.

But the point about this document, I think it is very good. And, Nick, the only thing is that it's going to get more complicated, because there is going to be a response, which means that you'd have to add a sort of additional column on the right-hand side of the spreadsheet as we go forward with our recommendations and response.

So, I think you're actually going to have to return it to a linear format, and I think that vertical sort of comment and response and the NonCom Review is actually quite good and well laid out in the way that it addresses that.

So, I think this document, it actually -- it was hard to read, but that was because we didn't really have ways to print it, and things like that. But now you can actually get (inaudible) format, and that was good. But you are going to have to add something. We're going to grow it this way, and I think we're actually going to have to start going down the table. So, it does need re-thinking, but that's just not something for this meeting.

Cheryl: Go ahead, Alan, then Wolfe.

Alan: The magic word is called indenting. You can identify different categories of things by indenting them and having them basically under each other, not just separate columns, and that will collapse it a lot. Typefaces also help.

Cheryl: Wolfe, go ahead.

Wolfe: I have one suggestion to make. It's a recommendation number 4, Educating and engaging (inaudible) as it should be an immediate priority. Compliance should be a long-term goal.

As I participated spring to summer in the European Development Building Program on Internet governance of the (inaudible) Foundation, and I found it extremely useful. And I participated along with 20 other people from European countries, most of them from Eastern European countries. And I was discussing this (inaudible) the director of (inaudible) Foundation and (inaudible), who is also involved in EURALO from Romanian ALS (inaudible). And we both were working on the proposal for (inaudible) Foundation to design a similar capacity development program for ICANN ALSes.

And (inaudible) was very fond of this idea and he gave more or less a mandate to [Adela] and to me to design program like this, and then he will discuss it with us. And then I think by the end of the year, at the beginning of the coming year, he would like to suggest it to ICANN, to make this kind of a corroboration. To do more about capacity development of ALS people, to get them better involved in the RALO structures, to get them more pinpointed to specific issues of Internet governance, to give them a broader understanding. Because, as you may know, some of our ALSes in Europe, some of them

are very concentrated on privacy and other issues. But the broader understanding of the complexity of Internet governance, which is very useful to understand the complexity of ICANN as well, may be very useful.

Nick: I actually started talking to [Yvonne] about doing tailored courses for various ICANN communities as part of the various -- because there are education and capacity building elements to the GNSO Improvements Plan. It is going to be a common thread, and he's always been interested in proposing those plans, it's just been a question of, okay, what are you going to ask him to design? We would have to come up with what is the objective design. So, yeah, I've had him in mind for a long time and recommended him internally to my colleagues.

Wolfe: I appreciate if it is even considered in a broader context. I personally, I would not see myself, my input for the time being to design it on a broader scale for other constituencies. But as I know the RALOs, I think, in the meantime quite well, and I know a little bit about the way of thinking and the way of functioning of those people, so I could concentrate on this component. And then after that you can do the rest with (inaudible), or we can start with this as a model, and if you see, okay, there are elements in it which are useful, then you can modulate it in an as-applied way which fits better to other constituencies.

Cheryl: Carlos, go ahead.

Carlos: [Spoken in foreign language]

Cheryl: Thank you. I'm doing notes, it wasn't organizing dinner, I promise. It was responding to inquiries. Did I miss someone raising their hand, then, to make another point? Go ahead, Carlos.

Carlos: [Spoken in foreign language]

Cheryl: Thank you, Carlos. Two points, we have absolutely no indication that the president won't be joining the board breakfast. I'm not sure where that information you quoted came from, because I've got no indication. I'm looking towards staff to see if they've got any indication that he will not be attending. We're expecting that he will in fact be attending. So, that's a null action requirement and if we're wrong or, of course, he breaks his leg on the stairs between now and then.

And the other matter which goes exactly to the point we had in our agenda and that Sebastien was raising, with the presentation he and Vanda gave just before lunch goes to the matters of discussion of what opportunities to see AOC provide for individual Internet end users. So, it is a matter -- not only do we have on our agenda, we have open dialogue already on, and it is in fact just not the item we're discussing now, but does need to be discussed. In fact, if we're ahead of time at all at the end of this agenda, it would be the perfect opportunity to come back to that.

So, let's look at this particular agenda item and say what do you wish to do right now in the remaining 15 or 17 or 18 minutes that we have before our coffee break regarding the documents you've got in hand and next steps on At-Large review implementation. We've discussed why we don't think we can prioritize them here and now. What can we do here and now? Opening the floor for suggestions. I'll go to Alan and then Adam. Thank you.

Alan: I would suggest what we have to do here is set our homework assignment and the targets when we would deliver, where each of us have gone through this document, made comments where we think -- I don't know about the rest of you. I went through this document, I didn't find anything exceedingly offensive, and trying to perfect it at that

point did not seem worth the effort. I think that has to be done now. So, I think we need to go through it. I think we need to comment on each of the items if we feel it warrants comment, and hopefully most of them will not, and basically prioritize.

And when I say prioritize, I would set a target of when do we feel this should need to be finished, if that's the appropriate word, or have focused a fair amount of energy on it. And trying to set up timelines of what has to be done before the next meeting, what can be done over the next year, what is going to take longer than a year. And we're going to have to figure out how we maintain the inertia on that to keep it going. And I would like to see that from everyone and try to then consolidate it together. It's a messy job, but it's a doable job, if people do their homework.

Cheryl: All right. Just before I move to Alan, that gives us in fact two different ways of doing this, because Sebastien earlier proposed a work group model. Is that the case? Yes, so we have the whole of ALAC doing the homework, and we have an ALAC work group to do the homework alternative. So, with that in mind.

Alan: I thought he meant a work group to do the actual work after we had prioritized it, so I may have misunderstood.

Cheryl: Sebastien, response?

Sebastien: I was suggesting that working group to make the work, because going through that, each one of them can do that, but who will reconcile how we will work? And I don't see the two proposals opposite, but maybe complementary.

Cheryl: Okay, let's see what Adam has to say. Go ahead, Adam.

Adam: I have somewhat similar thinking about it, is that we need to identify how we're going to actually do the work in the end. So, I was thinking that, yes, we do need to go through and identify what the priorities are and then start to assign ourselves to more specific working groups, which will be about going into more detailed areas of, you know, I'm particularly interested in this section, I would like to work on that particular issue.

And I was going to say that there is one issue that bothers me, and it's the one that Wolfe mentioned earlier, which says that compliance should be a longer term goal. I think one of the things that we should be trying to do is make that an earlier term goal. Because I think if we can show that, I think by compliance it means that the structure passing information to and from the user to the community is working, and if we can show that is working, then that's our justification for two board seats. Those are the justifications for saying that we do actually have a working At-Large.

Cheryl: Back to Alan.

Alan: I read the Review Committee's statement of compliance being a long-term object, that they thought there was a reasonable chance that if we do compliance now we'd end up without any ALSes, which might damage our case. So, maybe first we try to develop and then count them. I may have read that wrong, but that's the way I read it.

Cheryl: Go ahead.

Adam: I think probably the community looking at the ALAC, I'd probably start looking at the ALSes and say are they really functioning? And then we might get criticism for -- I think we're courting a bit of a chicken and an egg thing here.

Cheryl: Yes, I understand, but we're dealing with what the board adopted report is, and this is verbatim what it says. So, yeah, we'd be delighted if we finish all this work and in parallel we can start looking at compliance level of ALSes, which are entities that do work in their own right. The only thing you can be testing in terms of compliance is how effective they are operating for what we required them to be as an ALS. Use your microphone.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you, Chair. I've been saying this for a long time. There are ALSes that don't just exist because ICANN exists. They have already existed, they are doing work, and they happen to do a little bit of work that integrates with the ICANN agenda. Let's not forget this.

The other thing is, and I keep wanting again, there is a sense, I always get a sense that people don't believe that these people -- that they bring something because they have a duty to do it. They do not have any such duty. It is something they step into as volunteerism. And I hear compliance and all of this stuff, as if to say you're going to hold a big stick over their head to do the things that you think they should do, it's rubbish. It is rubbish. You cannot say because you do not -- ICANN was not there at the inception of most of these places. They're just not there. They do a little bit of work that involves ICANN on a voluntary basis. On a voluntary basis. You can't use a big stick on somebody who is volunteering. Please, let us stop it. Thank you. [Applause]

Cheryl: Adam, then Darlene.

Adam: I think you're almost right, except --

Cheryl: Sorry, and I do want it transcribed for the record, the term thin ice comes to mind, Adam.

Adam: Except I think the origin of the word compliance was on the simple criteria that all ALSes promised to follow when they become ALSes, and I think that is what is meant by compliance. I think that's what is meant by compliance, because that was my comment to the ALS Review, and I think I was the only one who made a comment about compliance. So, while we can't be sure, I suspect that that might be the thing.

So, when an ALS, and many of them do pre-exist and do other work, like Evan's, for example, across the table, an active, working organization for Linux users, you didn't create yourselves to be ICANN-related. But there were certain issues that every ALS said they would do to become an ALS, to be recognized as an ALS.

And that's the basic -- these are the basic issues that you made a commitment to follow when you became an ALS. And are many of those ALS in compliance with those simple criteria? I suspect not, and that is important.

Cheryl: So, it's a way to do that, to find that out, is to test it and, of course, capacity building goes hand-in-hand.

Adam: Exactly.

Cheryl: We understand your particular take on this. You entered the ALAC making this statement. It's not one that you will find everyone is necessarily comfortable with, and we would prefer to find out the metrics than make the assumptions. That said, Darlene and then Evan.

Darlene: I overall agree with what Carlton said as well, but to tweak a little. I can think of in the NARALO at least one ALS that it really doesn't even exist anymore and we can't raise them. They will not e-mail back and I happen to know these people personally, and that

they're not really doing it anymore. So, you have to take into consideration of nonprofits that do go poof in the night.

So, and also, it makes it more and more difficult to get quorum when we have to vote on something if you've got all of these ALSes that aren't active and aren't making any contribution to the list, and they aren't voting.

Cheryl: Thank you. We've of course, had recent resignations for very good reasons, and there is no reason why NARALO can't take that onboard as well. Go ahead, Evan.

Evan: I just wanted to sort of follow-up on what Adam was saying about before we start talking too much about the obligations the ALSes have to ICANN, we also need to deal about the obligation ICANN has to its ALSes. There is not -- the whole process of informing, engaging and outreach still has a long way to go in the other direction as well. So, before we start wondering why some of the ALSes aren't being as active as perhaps we might like, I think it's also a bit of a two-way street. And I just -- along the lines of what Darlene said, I think there is a way of separating this into the ones that just drop off the face of the earth as opposed to the ones that quantitatively don't give us everything that we demand of them.

Cheryl: Back to you, Adam, and then we'll move on.

Adam: Yeah, it's not just about [blanket] compliance testing, it's actually making sure that they're able to do that. And, Evan, you were the one that created that template of information for the ALSes, which has never been implemented, when you did that about two years ago. You know, a simple format of information flowed to the ALSes.

So, I think you cannot separate the two. You can't just simply stick a compliance lawyer on them and say you're not complying, you actually have to enable them to comply in the first place. So, it's not just the one aspect.

Cheryl: Well, thank you for the discussion on the particular concerns -- sorry, recommendation No. 4. Back to the proposal that we had for top-down reading, however. We have an amount of time left in our schedule. Might I suggest that what you do is go and grab yourselves your coffee, come back to the table, and we will use the remaining time in our agenda and our coffee break to do a from top-to-bottom reading along the lines that we were discussing earlier. Agree or disagree? Agree? Right. Go grab your coffee, do what is needful. We will reconvene.

[Break]

Cheryl: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Alan is about to return to the table and start us through the questions. We had a small discussion during your break, where Carlton, Alan and I tried to find a profitable way forward for spending the next 15 minutes of our lives on this matter. And what we've come up with is a melding of the three or so major directions that we took out of the discussion so far.

Recognizing that some of the discussion points and additional information, the critique of these comments will probably end up being done, if they're done within ALAC and the regions, will be done in a work group situation. We're simply going to look at whose job we think it is. Is it internal? If so, is it a committee as a whole, or is it work group activity? If it's external, we'll simply note that it's external.

We will set an endpoint, an aiming of time. This is a one month, three month, yesterday, 12 years down the track type of priority, and I should have used the priority. And will prioritize it. Obviously, some of these things may end up running in parallel. So, it is

possible, I suspect, for us to have more than one priority one. Thank you, Nick. Go ahead.

- Nick: If I may suggest a simplification. Rather than put a timeline on something and then find that you have way too many things that you want to do way too quickly. If you even started with a sort of low, medium and high level of priority, you could then see how many high priorities there were, and I think within that you would find some things that are, themselves, of a different priority, one to another. I just -- I'm very cognizant of the fact that it would be very easy to end up with all good intentions, taking on an amount of work that would rapidly consume most of your time.
- Cheryl: For something completely different. Alan, you are the one that particularly was looking at timelines. You want to reply to that, looking at a short, medium, long-term as opposed to a particular date?
- Alan: I agree with what Nick says. I like the idea of putting on what we think the target should be, and then assessing how realistic it is and modifying it, rather than the high, medium, low, which doesn't put any real -- I have trouble mapping that to work. Whereas, putting a timeline on it of what we want the target to be will yield as a result of that, is it realistic? Is it unrealistic? How do we have to modify it? What other resources do we need?
- Cheryl: Might I make a proposal, then, for us to perhaps look at a six-month, 12-months, or in excess of 12 months, which is just different nomenclature, but I think is a middle ground, okay? All right. Excellent. So, Alan, I think I've managed to make you stay and not go back to the GNSO, I'm going to ask you to take us through this now, while I take a small retreat, and I'll be back in one moment. Sebastien, if you can manage the speaking list, that would be very good.
- Alan: All right. I'm going to draw on Nick on some of these things, because I don't remember the details. The first item is amend bylaws, Article 11, Section 2.4.A, which is --
- Nick: Sort of a two-line thing: ALAC exists to represent the individual Internet community, short.
- Alan: It's our rationale. I think it is our duty to come up with the words for that. We don't amend the bylaws, but we come up with the words for that. I would think comments on high, low targets? Six months, one year, more than a year? You people want me to give you my position and then you could nod, or how do we want to do this?
- Patrick: My position is that we need to do that as quick as possible, because what we request in other documents is that we want to have a full view of the bylaw changes. We have to see what we have in front of us. And then if we need to make a proposal, the time to do it is in the next -- I would say before the next ICANN meeting. But if not, I say in the next six months, but no more.
- Alan Greenberg: This has the title "bylaw," but I think what it is asking is we should ratify what it is we believe we're here for. Yes, no?
- Patrick: Then it's for tomorrow.
- Nick: It relates to the recommendation that you see at the top of the page. That is what you would be changing the language to reflect. This is why I suggested that the staff could come up with a form of language that embodied these principles, because this is somewhat anodyne.

- Sebastien: Adam?
- Adam: Haven't we -- part of this we just agreed in a document we voted on in the proposals of position descriptions. We haven't got one sentence in there, but as you say, it seems to be something that staff could come up with. It's sort of -- and bylaws always take time, so why not make a target for something like this for Nairobi? I mean, actually implementing a bylaws change takes time because it has to go through public comment, it has to go through the board's decision-making process, and so on and so forth. So, if it is reasonably simple to do, then get it on paper as soon as possible, because it still won't be done for nine months.
- Alan: What I'm hearing is short period of time that we should do our part of it. The whole process may take longer, that's not our responsibility. Staff should draft something, ALAC should discuss. I see one thumbs up and no one else give any indication to.
- The next specific items are what we just discussed. 1.1.3 -- well, we've just discussed 1.1 and all of its subsections, I believe. Okay, sorry. I'm still not quite awake here. Okay. 1.2. Review proposed IIC post JPA accountability mechanisms to ensure congruence with the recommendations. Comments?
- Patrick: We have everything on? We will be restart the vote on, but once again one thing we say in this document, in this position is that we need to have a good overview of all the bylaw changes, because with the AoC it will be more important than anything else. But then it's underway.
- Alan: Time frame? I'd say this is a one year one. It's going to be based on things that come out of the AoC as we understand it more, and I don't think that's something we're in a position to do immediately, as I read it. Nick, you're looking as if you disagree.
- Nick: Well, there are sort of two steps to this. One step is that currently the bylaw changes related to improving institutional competence which are currently under review, and reviewing whether those are congruent with the recommendation, which you can see the full text of it under the notes, by the way, across from 1.2. And then there is defined further steps. So, I think not that the AoC has been agreed, you can obviously see a number of further steps in relation to how the review mechanisms of the AoC are constituted.
- So, I think it's sort of a two-step thing, and one part is a longer, maybe a year from now. Over the next -- well, I think the review bodies of the AoC are supposed to meet annually starting a year from the signing of the document.
- Alan: But the point I'm making is you look at the actual notes there, it talks about the president's strategy committee, which doesn't exist anymore. It's talking -- it's implicitly talking about the new review committees under the AoC, which are not yet structured. And presumably there will be a process over the next [10] months of creating those and saying exactly what they're going to be doing. So, I don't see this as a less than six-month task, because I don't think we have the input to do it until later.
- Nick: There are a couple of aspects on that. ALAC has a mandated role within those review committees, so those have to be considered and what that is. And then this is the broader role of how the civil society participate, which will be sort of a broader [remake] of the At-Large and how the At-Large would participate in those review committees. So, yes, it would be a long-term piece of work, and it relates to the discussion we've got to finish, which Vanda and Sebastien were going to lead this morning, I guess.

- Sebastien: It seems that what I saw in the website that the new president will appoint new member of the Presidential Strategy Committee, and it was something that was going on and on. Then the question is what we want to achieve under this and not the normal work we have to do in the future. And maybe the new Presidential Strategy Committee and its outside of this court today except it impacts us in the short-term, but I don't see it coming with some change in the next year. And if we can do our work in the next about that, it will be great.
- Alan: I just don't see we can dispatch people today to start working on this. Well, I think completion a year from now is starting sometime in the future, when we have the input.
- 1.3. ALAC engagement in ICANN structural improvements programs. The individual items are review whether additional processes are required. Above those already in place within At-Large. Review whether additional processes external to At-Large are required. After completion of the previous two, staff to report to the ALAC on the results.
- Nick: To be honest, when I wrote this down, you just keep in mind, I literally put down every jot and tittle that they recommended, and this is one of those where I kind of thought, well, okay. So, ALAC and At-Large should comment when review documents are put out for public comment. And they do, so exciting recommendation. So, that's why I made this kind of anodyne thing of it doesn't seem like there is really anything to do.
- Alan: I think I agree with you. I think there are some of these recommendations which we would just fly thought, because they are pretty obvious and I don't even think there is much to discuss on them, say, well, medium-term, long-term, short-term, it's ongoing.
- Nick: I had in mind that unless somebody felt strongly to the contrary, I would come up with a one-page document highlighting the various times that ALAC had commented on structural improvements reports and not recommending further action other than that you keep commenting on reports, and you would say that's lovely, great, and send it off to the SIC and that would be sort of finished.
- Alan: My inclination is actually at a lower level than that, or perhaps the opposite. I think on a regular basis we comment on too many things. That, yes, we can develop a comment on, but there is only so many things that we should be focusing on if we're going to do a good job. And some of those we just leave to the other people to do and hope they do it right.
- Cheryl: I think if I can, not from the Chair but as a participant, suggest that amongst that very good plan of putting a one-page document together, it would also be the link to our now ongoing policy comments spreadsheet, because that didn't exist when that review was on. And I think those thoughts are too easy for us to say, oh, we've been using it for a while. But this wasn't -- when these comments were made, that didn't exist, and we probably do need to hand that to the (inaudible) a little bit (inaudible).
- Unidentified Participant: Picking up what Alan just said, we then need to really think of a way to choose what to comment on. If we're going to choose on commenting on some things and not commenting on others, we can't just not comment on something because there is no time for it. We might be missing an important opportunity to comment on something that might be important.
- Sebastien: Yes, and to comment on your comments, and to reiterate what I said previously, people working on one subject and we don't want to put our end, but we want to have the results and we want to see the implication on that -- on the other part of the organizations. And we need to have another view of what is happening and what is the change on the bylaw. And that will be the only way to put ours in where we want and to be sure that at the end

of the day there is no misconception on the overall participation of At-Large in the structure.

Cheryl: I'm mindful of the time, and before -- what I'm wondering is, this document that is linked, which I haven't copied across yet to have a look at, it was a Google doc, correct? The spreadsheet is a Google doc, yes? No, it's a spreadsheet, okay.

I would just like to keep us on track. We did start some 15 minutes late, and if we can gain that back. I mean, it's up to you. You're the ones who need to advise me. The matter that is at 4:00 we were to be going on to is the discussion with the regional leadership here on At-Large travel support, facilitating EURALO general assemblies, and ICANN meeting attendance.

If you so desire, we could shift that from today's agenda to another part, or see how far we get with this activity. Which do you want to do, shift it totally or try and compress it into what time is left? Compress if possible? I see nobody disagreeing with that. Okay, that's fine. We will compress that, and that is something that probably the regions need to go back and discuss and come back to us after the Secretariat's meeting as well. Yes, go ahead, Evan.

Evan: Oh, I just thought some of this could actually be moved to the Secretariats meeting.

Cheryl: In terms of the travel support issue, yes. I think that would be an excellent plan. So, we should be able to compress, okay? Thank you. Just continue on. Thank you.

Alan: Extend the term of office of the ALAC chair and the comments say "and the officers, also," which I thought was in the original document. Yes, ma'am?

Cheryl: From a position of vested interest here.

Alan: Yes?

Cheryl: Whilst I don't think there was any discussion or debate that says this wasn't a good idea, I think this is something that we have as an implementation date in 12 months time, where a new chair, we've got elections going on. A new chair can be elected and they can have 12 months, and I'll obviously still be around in the ALAC, and in the second 12 months with me well and truly gone. I think there would be an argument for making that transition while we're -- you still have some chair experience.

Just from -- if I was taking on the role, I would like to have that past chair hand on shoulder, and we may need to look at some ex-officio role or something. But, to me, I think this is something we actually put in further down the track. Adam and then Nick.

Adam: So, as usual, I think that sounds like a very good idea. However, the only concern is that these are two-year appointments. So, if you appoint somebody for a two-year position when they're most likely in their -- you know, they've already done a year, you're either trying to -- you know, you're appointing them to a position that they may not actually have, because they won't be returned by their RALO or by the NonCom.

Cheryl: I could answer that, but go ahead, Alan.

Adam: What have I got wrong?

Alan: The board does it all the time. The board chair is nominated, and their term may or may not be extended or renewed by whoever it is that renews them, and so be it. If you're doing a bad job as chair, that may be a good reason not to renew you, and so be it. But I

don't think that we should only appoint people whose term goes that long. That restricts it down to a rather small number of people.

Adam: I can tell you from experience in the NonCom, it does happen in fact, and it is somewhat -- I wouldn't say it's unfair, that's not the right word. As I already said, I'm nonlingual. It does influence the nominating committee in ways that is perhaps a little bit not wholly appropriate, I suppose. Whether it would influence the RALOs in the same way, I don't know. It's human nature, as it were, is what I'm trying to say.

Nick: There is no objection, I take it, to Cheryl's proposal, that this be done at some point before a year from now in preparation for the election of the chair a year from now? And so you could actually make this a 12-month exercise. The actual change is a very small bylaw amendment, in case anyone is curious. Despite its other impacts, it's a very easy thing to do.

Alan: Having overseen a similar process in the last year, it didn't get done until we realized it was too late. I do suggest that we target it for less than that period of time.

And in answer to Adam's point, if we have someone who we think is being a good chair, then I think we want to influence the NomCom or the RALO to reappointment them. And if all of us whisper, "Get rid of them, please," they may listen to us, too. So, I don't think that's all bad.

So, I would suggest this is one of those that by the end of the six months we should have decided what we want to do and then worry about the mechanism after that. But sometime in the next meeting or sometime after the meeting, we should have decided if it's a good idea or decide to ignore it.

Next item. ALS/RALO structure. 3.1 says, Ensuring the existing structure does not present obstacles to effective communication operation and development. Review the data flow between the various layers and take into account that data flow and implement improvements.

I have some very targeted comments on this one, but I'd like to have someone else speak.

Nick: Don't forget, you can just limit yourself to deciding when you want it to be done by, rather than specifics related to it.

Cheryl: So in terms of resources, it is the whole of ALAC and regional leader issue in terms of time course? Start [analysis], Adam. Make sense while you've got the Secretariat's meeting, and then they get now regular meeting. Alan, then Adam.

Alan: If I remember correctly, the tone of this one was we don't necessarily think that the structure is all that good, but we're not going to attack it right now. The next review is the right time. Are we now five years between reviews? Was that -- okay.

So, this is to the extent that we can make it work better right now, we should try. I think that is an ongoing effort. I don't see that as a particular achievement.

So, I think this is an ongoing one that we should be focusing on on a regular basis. Next time we have a policy decision to make, we should try to make sure we can actually communicate it. I don't see this one with either an ending point or timeline.

Nick: I had sort of a secret thought which is now not secret. This is something that could be woven into some of the capacity building and community development related projects, anyway.

- Cheryl: That's a good plan. Any other points? No? Okay.
- Alan: Which is a good segue into education. Develop high level principals, draw up a plan to implement them, create and execute the plan.
- We've already talked a little bit about this earlier, that there is some work ongoing. I would tend to say this should be something with a target of a reasonable deliverable within a year. That may be a little bit too short, but I see no reason not to put a year and then review it as we go along.
- Cheryl: I'm wondering if we can get some specific feedback from the RALO leadership on this, because it really is in their bailiwick, I think. It's a huge amount of additional work at that part of the structure.
- Alan: Well, I was going to add that we talk about priority. There is another component to that of how much effort do we want to put into it. I would tend to class this one as high priority but low profile.
- Unidentified Participant: I think this is a topic which is going to request a lot of energy as it spread over languages and cultures. You cannot say that you are going to talk to Polish people in English. If you want to educate them, you have to educate them in their language.
- So, if you want to do education first, the thing we have to do is try to bring to the bottom, as Sebastien has been saying, the fourth layer of our structure. If we want to address them, we have to translate. And that brings us back to very initial question, how are we going to do that?
- Nick: It may help here. This particular recommendation was focusing on the obligation that the staff had to develop material of a differentiated nature that specifically serves the individual Internet user and At-Large, which represents it. It wasn't intended to be that you all were doing the heavy lifting related to this.
- The idea that I had taken from what the report said is that you would develop the principles and then say to the staff, now go away and come back to us with a plan for how you are going to provide information and by when, and in which format and delivered in what ways that would fulfill the need. So, I think it's less work for all of you, it's rather more work for us, this particular part.
- Now, there are other parts in this section which that is not true of, but this particular part was really, to be honest, was on the start to come up with the answers based on what you need.
- Wolfe: I think it should be clear what we are talking about. My first question is to Alan. To me it sounds like contradiction, high priority, low profile. It's a little bit contradictory to me.
- While I consider this as a priority, but we have to be clear on which level we are talking. What I was suggesting before was the level of multipliers. So, it's not the end users I think you had in mind, Rudy, when it was your intervention. And I think this is a rather different issue.
- I would put it like this. Let's first approach the multipliers, and multipliers for me are the people responsible of ALSes. They are the closest to us. They are more or less our reference points in particular countries.

And then we have to somehow assess the need of our ALSes and what are the situations in the particular countries. And, of course, it may be different, as we know, in European countries if you compare Western European countries with Eastern European countries.

And then when we talk about the end users, I think we need a type of standardized useful material, and after that it's up on us in the RALOs in the particular countries if we have, let's say two to three ALSes in Poland, then I think it would make sense to take the standard material and to make a translation into Polish. But for the time being, I would say it's too complicated, too difficult, too much time taking, time consuming capacity, consuming to start this most difficult work, which is for me empowerment of the end user. And empowerment of end user is a very complex process.

And this would be for me the medium long-term perspective, but I would first, coming back to what Alan said, when we consider it as a priority, I would first start with ourselves, with our ALSes, the representatives of the ALSes, and for me this people are not the typical end users, they are the multipliers. As they are already somehow involved and somehow empowered.

Cheryl: Rudy, go ahead.

Rudy: Well, I agree with you, Wolfe, but nevertheless they are speaking their own language, and if you want to help them, you have to think about the fact that your next step will be the language and culture issue. If you don't keep that in mind now, you'll have to rework what you have done initially.

Cheryl: Go ahead, Alan.

Alan: People are solving the problem; we're supposed to be talking about the plan.

Cheryl: Thank you, Alan. Go ahead.

Alan: I would like to comment, explain my high priority, low profile. If you take your typical low priority thing, you never get around to doing it. That's one of the reason I'm saying it's high profile. We need to start on it, we need to slug around on it, but it's not something we're going to put a huge amount of energy on, on an ongoing basis within the committee. We may try to get some staff people to work on it. So, it's something that is urgent that we not forget about, not put off, but it's not one of the high profile ones that we have to put a lot of energy into, in my mind.

Cheryl: Go ahead, Nick.

Nick: I wanted to say to -- this example may help, is, for example, for a long time there has been an initiative underway to get short introductions to ICANN issues produced, and it's been an enormous tooth-pulling operation. I can't even begin to tell you what kind of a tooth-pulling operation it's been internally to get those done because there was no mandate to do them.

This 4.1 gives you the golden opportunity to say, right, the board has now approved a set of recommendations, guys, just like we've been saying for the last three years. We need this and this and this and this in these formats and translated into these languages. Go away and within six months tell us how you're going to meet the need and when, and we'll tell you if that's soon enough for us. And if it's not, then we will have to go away and say, okay, we'll put a line in the budget to put more money in or whatever. That's 4.1, just so you know.

This is the golden opportunity to get what you've been asking for, because the board has now said it must be done.

Cheryl: Adam? Adam, go ahead.

Adam: So, how about we ask Nick at this meeting to draft as a resolution that could be sent to the board now or in the near future stating that. Thanks, Nick, you're brilliant. I love it.

Unidentified Participant: That will teach you.

Cheryl: I think we also need to make sure that we get the Structure Improvement Committee's agreement to our implementation plan, and the board's agreement to our implementation plan before. But we could get the basic pen work done.

I think this is one that, and I am now speaking from the chair position here, that makes perfect sense in terms of allocation of resource, that what we need is an interregional and ALAC standing subcommittee, which has the role of outreach and education material oversight. And what I'd like to do is put that proposal now for consideration of all at the table and ask the Secretariat's meeting to discuss it in a very full way, because it's going to be -- the major change will be in your way of doing things and how you're going to feed in.

But my vision would be you would have regional representation from -- and it doesn't need to be Secretariat, but from each of your regions you have the skill sets and experience to bring to the table on discussions, work directly with staff and other parts of ICANN, and we will obviously have at least one or two ALAC people in there as well, just to give it that whole sense of oversight.

And like the Budget and Finance Committee, I would see that as sort of a standing committee from now on, because this is, as Nick said, a huge opportunity. So, is there anyone objecting to mulling that over and considering it?

Okay, well, then, once we hear back from the Secretariat's meeting, we will then have that as an agenda item on our Thursday wrap-up and make a final discussion decision on that then. Thanks, Alan.

Unidentified Participant: Is that a six-month thing, then?

Alan: I thought the overall one was -- we said a year-end review.

Nick: For section 4.1 or for the whole thing?

Alan: For what Cheryl just assigned to Secretariats and the regions, I think that's shorter than six months. The overall 4.1 item, and I think actually 4.2 and 4.3 go along with it, is a longer one.

Cheryl: Ongoing I think, yes. So, start between now and six -- Hawa, go ahead.

Hawa: For this point, maybe we can have some draft before the Nairobi meeting for this point.

Cheryl: So, we should look at our first output in preparation for discussion at Nairobi. Make sense? One of the regions that would definitely benefit by this outreach. Go ahead, Adam.

- Adam: And the timing for getting that recommendation to the board saying we want resources from staff to do this, please? Yeah, I mean, just generally, what would the timing be on that? Again, so it's before the board for Nairobi, which seems reasonable.
- Alan: I think the question is, what's the process going forward? We have sent this to the board, to the SIC and the board; we do we assume that it has to get approval from them, or do we assume that we go ahead with it unless they object?
- Nick: There is a line in the resolution in July, when the At-Large Review Report was adopted. The last line which says that the board will review the implementation plan and budgets and approve them.
- So, what I had thought was, once you had decided the relative priority and all the rest, and we flesh out the implementation plan, even where that implementation plan may be you don't start working on something sometime after Nairobi. But in Nairobi we will be able to hand them, the plan and the cost, and you go on from there. But, then, not everything costs something.
- Alan: The implication is this outline we are taking as given unless someone says no or unless they refuse to budget -- to fund (inaudible) real funds. But we don't need them to approve this document before going ahead.
- Okay. Do we agree that 4.2, 4.3 fall into the same category? Okay, 4.4 is explore additional measures needed -- if the room temperature would go down a little bit, it would be a lot easier to try to focus. Either I have fever or this room is too high, or both.
- Explore whether additional measures need to be taken to involve individual users and the work of At-Large where such persons wish to contribute in their personal capacity. Can someone explain what this means?
- Cheryl: Patrick got there first, so have a go, Patrick.
- Patrick: Well, I think it means that there were in the past concerns expressed on the fact that the all ALAC/RALO/ALS structure is not really open to individuals wanting to participate in the process. For example, I remember that when we discussed the bylaws of the European RALO, some people said, well, we want to contribute but we do not want to be members of ALS, because we think our voice would be lost in the process. And so we postpone the idea of having some kind of integration into RALO for individual members to later discussion, which we never had. And I think this relates to this part.
- Alan: So, we send this back to the four RALOs that don't have individual members, and to the fifth that does, to review their policies, to report back in no less than -- or report back by Nairobi?
- Cheryl: Absolutely. Works perfectly. And at the same time, that aforementioned and potential outreach work group, the standing committee can also look at WIP 2.0 and other tools which can perhaps being in some more open dialogue and interaction.
- Patrick: I have just one question, and if you don't want to answer now. If somebody has some knowledge on the second life, I will be happy to know. Thank you.
- Cheryl: I don't have time for my second life.
- Patrick: I know, so do I.
- Cheryl: Terribly sad, my little (inaudible) is wasting away.

- Nick: I can only help you with (inaudible), I'm afraid.
- Cheryl: Alan, go ahead.
- Alan: 4.5 is leadership engagement development. 4.5.1 is build a position description for ALAC liaison and other leaders. I think we can say the first part of that is done. The second part of it, that is, position descriptions for RALO chairs in Secretariats, I would suggest, is a high priority, and we can discuss that when we talk about the rest of that later on this week.
- I object strongly to the wording in 4.5.2 and .3, focusing on sanctions instead of remediation and fixing the problem. As someone pointed out over there, I think it was Carlton, these people are volunteers. The concept of sanctions I don't think is quite the appropriate word, if we actually want people to be productive.
- Sebastien: I am sorry, but it was one of my remarks and the document didn't change on that, and (inaudible).
- Alan: And I accept liability for that, personally.
- Cheryl: That still doesn't mean, however, that in our outcome in our discussions that we can't modify to far more -- a sense of neutral language and recognize best management practices for volunteers. Which I think the language of the documents produced so far have been very careful to do so.
- Alan: As I was going to note, the document we'll be discussing on Tuesday does not use this word, and that's why this is called the outline of a plan. Okay, 4.5.2 is -- no, where are we -- 4.5.3, .2 and .3, Sanctions --
- Cheryl: (Inaudible)
- Alan: No, the first one in sanctions, the second one is factions, which may be something a whole lot better than sanctions, I don't know. Create and implement (inaudible) ensure that travel support is unavailable for ALAC leaders.
- My personal position on 4.5.3 which says don't provide travel support to leaders who aren't leading is -- I think we should take other action and take away their leader title.
- Nick: Just because my ears are burning, the original author of this document, I refer you to the note for 4.5.3, which was the genesis of this, because there were quite pointed statements in the review working group report related to travel support and the withholding of the same.
- So, I hope no one will read any great personal prejudices on my part in the design of the wording. And I'm quite sure that you could change the text to some other wording that was more conducive to yourself. I just would bear in mind what the review report actually said with relation to this point. So, there are many ways to skin the cat.
- Alan: Other than the word "sanctions," I have no problem with what you put in 4.5.3. I just think we should short-circuit the need for it by getting rid of leaders who aren't leading, and then you don't have to transport them somewhere.
- Cheryl: Oh, well, but I am tempted in some cases. Go ahead, Patrick.

Patrick: Well, it is just that if you say, well, we won't provide travel support to nonperforming leaders, that also means that they will be even less inclined to participate, because they won't be in a meeting. So, I think, indeed, that the best thing to do would be to replace them. At least we would benefit from input. Nonperforming people will not provide any input, so I think that is the thing we should address and not so much the trouble side of the sanctions.

Cheryl: Indeed, that is supporting what Alan said. Go ahead, Adam.

Adam: Yeah, I think we're getting too much into the discussion of the issues when, in fact, it is work we've already begun so we could properly put a timeline on it to be completed by Lima, and then move on to the next point. It's late in the day. No, no, Brussels. Brussels, Brussels. It's Brussels in the summer. I meant June.

Cheryl: The June meeting.

Adam: It's Brussels, it's Brussels, yeah.

Cheryl: Okay. So, timeline, June meeting, and that is a committee of the whole of the ALAC.

Alan: Sold, and I'm sorry I committed my own sin there, yes.

Unidentified Participant: Time for sanctions.

Alan: I suggest you kick me out of this role. You're a lot of cruel people.

Cheryl: Oh, yes, you have no idea.

Alan: Since we're getting personal, I already knew about you.

Nick: What's the song, "I've Got a Line on You" comes to mind?

Cheryl: And for the transcript and the MP3 recordings, we are all smiling and (inaudible) --

Alan: I've lost track of where we are at this point.

Nick: 4.54. You could skip over this if you want, because it is a cross-community thing.

Alan: All right. Let's skip over it, then.

Cheryl: Although we should note it goes back to previous discussions and how the working process, then, goes to the NomCom Review.

Alan: Well, yes. In fact, it's an interesting question and we're going to need some legal review on it. The plan that I put -- that will be discussed on Tuesday gives us the ability to remove someone regardless of how they got there. It doesn't say how they're replaced, but it allows us to remove someone. And, in fact, I'm told the NomCom current report says something about midterm removal and I don't know whether it says they remove them or what the exact terms are. Does Adam know?

Nick: That was me misreading the NomCom Review and I sent a follow-up saying that I misread the NomCom Review. There is nothing about recall in the NomCom Review document, and it is something we have to bring up this week. So, I misled you. In other words, I made a mistake. There is nothing about recall we have to bring it up, continue to bring it up.

Cheryl: It does go to an outside organization. But, of course, again, as I said earlier, we continue discussions where we have non-binding agreements with successive NonCom chairs. Providing we complain early enough and before their processes have gone too far, we can have some wiggle room, but we need something enshrined. Next point.

Alan: I think we've actually covered the rest of 4.-- the 4's; am I correct? Okay. 5. Strategic planning, ALAC processes. Review current process with At-Large, shall contribute to strategic and operational planning. Identify any barriers. Propose measures to eliminate any barriers. Operational planning, ALAC processes. Review current ALAC processes within At-Large to contribute to strategic and operational planning. Identify any barriers. That sounded very familiar.

And the last one is specifically to the fiscal year planning, which is now past, but nevertheless presumably implies for future years. Nick?

Nick: It's my sad duty to actually tell you that the strategic planning process begins at this meeting with a workshop being held on, I think, Wednesday. I should also highlight that that last point, it is -- we are indeed past the fiscal year mentioned here.

But the At-Large Review Report called quite clearly for an increase in the level of support ICANN provides to At-Large, which could include additional staff, but certainly included overall additional resources.

So, you may wish to think about how you weave this element in with the other elements of this project. Where something else would require an ongoing commitment of resources, it would fall within this.

Alan: I would suggest on these items that we need sometime in the next four months or so a dedicated either teleconference or time at Nairobi with people to be determined, to really explore to what extent we should be tied into the ICANN strategic and operational plans. It is quite clear, if we want additional resources, we have to have words in the plans which support us, or that we're doing something that supports other words in the plan.

I personally am not at all convinced that we should be tightly coupled with the planning process in general other than in support of our own needs, which is pretty much in line with the other units within ICANN that are charged with particular things. If it's budget implications, they need to work within the boundaries of ICANN budget processes and planning processes, but not necessarily be auxiliary strategic planners.

Nick: I would just note that under 5.3, the idea would be that you would review your requirements for resources over the course of this financial year. So, there is an underlying assumption that you would not have to finish deciding what you needed until the year was over.

And perhaps that means that ICANN would need corporately to provide a contingency in the budget for the following fiscal year on the understanding that that would then be used as needed based on what came out of your review over this year -- well, the six months of it left.

Cheryl: Patrick.

Patrick: Yeah, I agree with Alan, but one thing is that if we can be proactive in some subject, it could be interesting to introduce a subject through the Strategic Planning Committee. Because it will be in advance and then the other we'll know. Because at the moment we are a lot reaction, planning action. But it's difficult to do that and it's difficult to find it. But if it's happened, we need to be engaged into the strategic planning.

Alan: Let me be clear, I'm agreeing with the items Nick has under the action items on Section 5. I am disagreeing with what the report, the ALAC Review Report says in Section 5, that is, that we should be doing more strategic and operational planning of our own activities.

I believe we are largely a reaction-driven organization. We have some long-term plans and those we should be thinking about, like the ones we were talking about in engagement and education. But the bulk of our work, like most of the other groups, the advisory committees and the support organizations in ICANN are not plan driven. They are real life driven and reactional. And by the very definition they are. So, I don't know if anyone agrees with me, but I think they got those words wrong.

Nick: For what it's worth, I argued internally that it was unreasonable to ask At-Large to be a proactive, plan-driven organization, while the entire rest of indication was reactive and not plan driven except as it related to the budget and operational plan. And unfortunately that dichotomy didn't completely register with the review working group.

Cheryl: Evan?

Evan: I don't know if I have a real problem with it. Yes, we have to be reactive because some of what we do is driven the same way as the rest of ICANN is. But I also think that there are some real, real high level, big picture concerns. And attempts to try and move the rudder and steer the sheep in a very big way that is quite different from the individual's, please respond to this. There is some very, like I say, high level things that I know some in our grass roots want very, very much to try and steer ICANN generally in a slightly different direction than it currently is. And I certainly think attempts to do that can be plan driven.

Alan: I think what you just described are things where we want to try to influence the ICANN plan, which is completely in line with what we're talking about, not that we need a plan to do it.

Cheryl: So, time (inaudible), priorities? Olivier?

Oliver: Thank you, Cheryl. I do wonder, though, because have we not started drawing some plans by having those ALS -- the ALS summit in Mexico City, where we had several groups that looked at long-term objectives and proactive action, and some of the groups looking at strategic actions for ICANN?

Alan: I think there are aspects of what we do that require planning. I don't think we should be plan-driven.

Cheryl: Six months is the current bid. Go ahead, Carlos.

Carlos: [Speaking in foreign language]

Cheryl: Well, then, coming back to the time course, six months is the current bid, and I think that is probably a very good bid to go ahead with. And it sounds to me like there are some particular, dare I use the word planning, involved in our week and meet these needs. A whole of ALAC response? Yes? Good. Sold. Next one.

Alan: Item 6. More effort needs to be put into developing accurate cost models for At-Large activity. Review with At-Large what additional information is needed to be useful subsequent to improvements of financial reporting and last year. In planning for meetings ensure that At-Large representatives are provided equal treatment with other funded communities with respect to accommodations.

That latter one seems to have been addressed already. I'm not quite sure what the first one means in terms of the realities of ICANN budgeting. Maybe Nick has some insight.

Nick: I confess, I don't really know what they were on about with this. I think that the genesis was that a number of people that spoke to the review working group said that they wanted more granular financial reporting on what ICANN spends on the At-Large community. And that turned into this statement, which is hard to understand exactly what is meant by that.

But I think that is what is meant by it. And the idea there would be that if you all felt that more detail is required than is currently provided. For example, the budget this year now breaks down expenses by community in a way that wasn't the case before.

So, if there are particular -- if you're interested in particular types of reporting that you would put those together and then that would be conveyed to management, and there would be some way of fulfilling that request. I think that's what this is.

Alan: I know what it was originally. What I'm asking for is what is in fact possible. The genesis of this is ALAC said we want to do something. Answer comes back, sorry, there is no money. We're already spending a million dollars on you. Question: What are you spending the million dollars on? We can't tell you. And it will come up again in the discussion we're supposed to be having now, if I remember correctly, of what do we do with the remaining travel money?

Well, we say forget the remaining travel money; we want to fund another 40 person travels per year for regional meetings, or 100 travels per year regional meetings. We can come up with estimates. Someone comes back, sorry, we don't have the budget for that.

Our next question is, well, what are you spending it? Maybe we can find something that you shouldn't be doing? And we're continuing in this loop that somebody is making value judgments that we don't have the money for this, and we are not in a position to prioritize the things that ICANN is spending money on for At-Large in the most general sense, which is --

So, the review comments were because we expressed a frustration with being told certain things could not be done without any ability to aid in the decisions of what the priorities were. And maybe there is enough granularity in budget reporting now to address that, I don't know.

Evan: As one of the ones who was probably very, very active in talking to the BGC about this issue, I mean, basically what Alan is saying is right, and I would take it a step further.

Nick, as you know, we made a request for some outreach activities that NARALO wanted to be able to do. We didn't know when to submit it into the budget process, we didn't know how to submit it into the budget process. All we knew is, here are some outreach activities that we had come up with, that we had thought, in fact, was a cost saving move compared to some of the other options. And we had absolutely no idea to deal with this on a budgetary level.

And my hope is that this particular item will at least make a transition to something where maybe even down the road At-Large actually has some discretionary funds of its own. Heaven forbid we're allowed to do that. But I see this as sort of helping us on the way to that. Does that sound right?

Cheryl: I don't see anybody disagreeing. Allocations on time?

- Alan: I think we need to talk to Kevin and perhaps one or two other people and understand what is possible, and set our expectations reasonably, that these things are possible, that we should process in place to do it. If they are indeed not possible, we should stop having the discussion. And I think that is something we should do prior -- certainly within the next six months and probably a lot less than that.
- Cheryl: And with a new lineup of a fresh ALAC for the next 12 months and two years of allocations, one of the jobs we need to do in our wrap-up session is also look at who is populating standing committees, and that includes the Budget and Finance standing committee. And seems like a golden opportunity for that group to take this particular bull by the horns and start trying to ride her.
- Alan: No comment. I point out that we have our next meeting starting in nine minutes. Item number 8 is public comment periods. That is, the review recommendation was they be kept to 30 days, to the extent they are 30 days, but that we may occasionally request extensions. I would say that this entire item is something that we need to focus on. Nick wants to interject something quickly.
- Nick: Well, on an element of irony, the ALAC statement on public consultations, which will be ready to be voted on once I incorporate the comments that were made during the comment period. Actually, comprehensively, addresses all of the things in this section and some more things, too. And so it may be that the chapeau to that can simply say, look, here are our thoughts on how public comment processes could be made more effective, from our perspective. And we draw your attention to the various At-Large working group report recommendations related to making the comment process easier. And then it's for the board to come back to you and say, well, we can't do it for this reason, or we suggest doing it something differently.
- Alan: I don't disagree, but if we are ever going to get to the point of some level of bottom up involvement in this process, no common period is going to be sufficiently long to do that. And when we were doing the call for nominations for officers, I wrote a relatively long document on what I thought the report rapporteur should do in this coming year. And that is essentially take charge of the policy process with the intent of identifying things early enough that we can start discussions going way before the comment period starts. And that will also have the side byproduct of getting other people involved in working groups, and things like that.
- And so I think this is one we should put a one-year label on and reevaluate at that point.
- Cheryl: Current bid of 12 months. Do I have any increase or decrease offers? If not, going, going, gone. Twelve months.
- Alan: I did say 12 months and review. It's a longer process, but we need a target.
- Cheryl: Yeah. Okay. And ownership is the ALAC. Thank you.
- Alan: ICANN should strengthen its translation and interpretation processes. I think we can agree on that.
- Cheryl: Already done.
- Alan: Okay. Item 10, there are a lot of words there. ALAC as the representative body for At-Large, the primary organizational home for the voice of the users. ICANN -- I don't think we need to do anything there, do we?

- Nick: It's rolled into part one. They're very connected. 10 and 11 are very connected to part one, and really the action is incorporated in part one.
- Cheryl: And so, because we note those actions, can I suggest that they are things that really get started between now and Nairobi? So, they are almost immediate starts because they're preparatory? Part one went from now to six months, or before six months, did it not?
- Alan: I do have a comment on 11. Clearly, the relationship with the noncommercial stakeholder group is something that is currently in flux, yes, in flux. Pardon me?
- Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible) -- this came out of that little difficulty.
- Alan: Well, yes. They have been intertwined. Because this document was written as the various relationships were evolving. I have also been approached as of today and very informally from some people on the commercial users group, user stakeholders' group, to say perhaps we should be talking more. We may not be opposites to each other, and so maybe things will get better.
- I do point out, we did have somewhere on our agenda we were supposed to be deciding do we want a liaison to what group within the GNSO. Is that on our agenda sometime?
- Cheryl: (Inaudible)
- Alan: Okay. No, no, fine. We have four minutes to go. Are we finishing early? I thought I timed this perfectly.
- Cheryl: Alan, you still may.
- Alan: Item 12, ICANN should develop a mechanism for allowing the voice of those recognized bodies who represent consumer interest to be heard at critical points in key decisions and to provide input into policy decision processes. To be discussed, I think, is the right thing. Out of our hands at the moment. It may come back into our hands.
13. As the process provision of advice on policy as part of ALAC's purpose, ALAC should strive to provide policy advice on any issues that affect individual Internet users. Processes for providing advice on policies should be strengthened within the ALAC for the development of policy advice within the supporting organizations for requesting input from ALAC on policy issues, and from the SO's and AC's on the board to provide feedback on how ALAC advice has been used.
- Nick: This is very clearly a very broad --
- Alan: Yes.
- Nick: -- business.
- Cheryl: And things that have already started to happen. It's already a work in progress. Carlton, and then back to you, Alan.
- Carlton: Thank you, Chair. This is one that I still maintain, that it is in ALAC's interest to begin to cherry-pick issues that we can work on effectively to provide comments. It seems to me that we would be in a better position to comment on issues fully that will make an impact, on every single issue that we see come down the pike. I really believe that we have to choose winners here, not only the workload issue that becomes apparent here, but there are some of them we're simply not in the business of commenting on because we just don't know enough.

Alan: Well, I certainly support that. I think we must pick and choose the ones that we can really have significant input on and fix whatever it is they are doing that we're commenting on. And that's where we should be putting effort on. These are not always going to be easy decisions. Some of them -- we have something to say, but let's be honest, it may not really change the course of anything.

Now, on the positive side, I think the relationship with the GNSO at this point is very good. There will be a new GSNO. It's hard to say how it's going to evolve, but at this point we have been involved more than we certainly were in the past. We are now involved in a number of ccNSO issues, not necessarily driven by them, but we're more visible than they are, and I think the same is true on SSEC and a number of other organizations.

So, I think we are on our way to fixing that. The concept of getting answers back is a more challenging one. As an editorial comment, are there any more pages?

Nick: No.

Alan: Then I turn the chair back to the Chair.

Cheryl: Thank you, Alan. Go ahead, Nick.

Nick: Well, I just wanted to say that Section 13.1 actually relates to how your internal processes work to develop bottom up advice. 13.2 relates to how the board replies to advice received from SO's and AC's. And 13.3, .4, .5, and .6 relates to how At-Large is consulted by the other supporting organizations.

So, the first section is certainly within your remit to find ways that could make it easier, as you say, pick your issues, but also look at how the advice process works and how long it takes to run a bottom-up advice development system.

Clearly, the organization is going to need to come up with some way for representative group perhaps of board members and members from each supporting organization and advisory committee to talk together about how the board deals with the communications it receives from other bodies, and how it lets those bodies know what it has done with the communications that it receives.

Cheryl: Go ahead, Alan.

Alan: I'll make a general comment. The AoC makes some references to feedback. That is, when comments come in, they must be addressed. Prior to the AoC, because of the vehemence, the strength of negative comments in the last year or so about people who put public comments in, and we are among those, which went into a black hole and were not necessarily considered in various processes within ICANN, there is a very strong push to not do that again.

Certainly, the ICANN policy staff working on the GNSO are under strong pressure to make sure that when there are public comments they are analyzed, discussed and we're in a position to say why we agree or why we are discarding it. That is and is becoming an unbelievably large task.

To the extent that we are in fact -- we have our own community in the organization structure stretching out underneath the ALAC, we are going to be in a similar position to have to not only ask for comments, but actually evaluate and justify why we are not --

we're going to have to answer our community, also. So, this is not something to take lightly and it's going to be onerous.

So, I think we need to be careful what we're demanding of others, because they may demand it of us as well. So, we have to be somewhat reasonable about this, and I think that's going to go in all directions between all communities within ICANN. But the load and the requirement to be responsive to public comments is certainly a different world today than it was a year ago.

Cheryl: And even something as simple that we were complaining about during the review process, which was the lack of read receipts, for example. We now find within the last batch of things that we sent through, that we are getting a thank you, it has been received and will be passed on, or passed onto the board. These are all things (inaudible). Go ahead, Alan.

Adam: If the amendment to Sebastien's document goes through, that we see briefing papers that go to the board, then we'll actually see what goes to the board, and therefore we will see what they read, which will be useful (inaudible).

This process generally, I know we do have [technical difficulty] -- from the community to the ALS and individual users, it would really be up to the individual users in the ALS as what they were responding on. Because it would be a downwards and upward flow. It would be that which I think what was intended when the whole RALO structure was set up. So, it wouldn't really be so much for the ALAC to decide what issues we had to address. In an ideal world, users would be telling us what to address. Isn't that what we're kind of bent to be making work?

Of course we would prioritize and we're meant to be expert, etc., etc., but it is meant to be bottom up, and that's the goal of that flow.

Cheryl: Nick then -- oh, sorry, let's go with Alan, then Nick.

Alan: I think we need to have some hard discussions in this group and this extended group over the next year to understand to what extent we are channeling users, to use the expression from another venue, and to what extent we are representing users. I think the concept of us channeling for 1.5 billion users --

Cheryl: And growing.

Alan -- and growing, is pompous and is setting ourselves up to say we're doing a task which we could never do. On the other hand, having a reasonable number of people who can represent the needs of users is something I think we can do. And I think we're going to have to have some hard discussions. And this is leading to whatever the At-Large evolves into the next go around, several years from now. But I think we need to start discussing how is it we're going to do our job to serve ICANN well?

And I understand how we got here and I understand the election process in 2000, which eventually ended up with this structure we have right now. And that's good history, but we have to start thinking, assuming ICANN is going to last a few years, how do we do this job well, not only because of the historical --

Cheryl: Go ahead, Adam.

Adam: Well, all we could do -- what I'm trying to suggest is all we can do is attempt ways to represent the voices we hear from the ALSes. We can't represent people we don't hear from. But the structure we are here sitting as some part of is this Internet -- ICANN

community, ALAC, RALO, ALS, user, and that should be a two-way flow of information. I believe that's how it was set up, and I think our job is to see that flow works. And if does not work, then we have a review of it, which is the purpose of it.

I don't think at any time we're saying I represent the views of X billion users; all we can do is say we, within the ICANN structure, represent the users who have joined. And that is pretty much what we used to do (inaudible) and other things.

Cheryl: I think we have an ideal topic for our Sunday. The agenda is now being set for Sunday in Nairobi. We will be having a 90-minute session on this topic in Kenya. Go ahead, [Rob].

Rob: If I may, and I'm a liaison from CCNS, but my comment is really quite simple. We, ALAC, could not possibly represent users unless they have the same level of access, the same level of knowledge, same level of understanding, same level of involvement as the people in this room, and that isn't going to happen with 1.5 billion people. So, it is a form of democratic -- representative democracy, if you will.

However, I do believe that part of what ALAC should do through whatever method, and I hope I'm going to help with that, is to educate all the way down the line, so that many, many more people do have access to the information and the knowledge and the understanding of the work that will enable them to participate to a greater extent.

Cheryl: Go ahead, Nick.

Nick: With my staff hat on, I would say -- I would like to say two things, one with my staff hat off. With my staff hat on, I would say that until information is provided in a way that an ALS representative could forward unaltered or post unaltered to their members and have a reasonable belief that those members would be able to read it in a reasonably short period of time and have some reaction to it, even if that reaction was simply, "I would like to understand this better," I think it is difficult to expect grass roots members of ALSes to be reacting to some of the quite specialized and technical issues that come before ICANN.

So, I think there is a chicken-and-egg element here, and that ICANN has to do a better job of putting out information that is actually tailored to not just individual Internet users, but many other communities about what goes on here.

With my staff hat off, if I may, I would note that I don't know of any international policy development environment in which those who choose to show up are not effectively representing other people, even though those other people may not know that the environment even exists, and this is by its nature an honor-based business, where one hopes that people are trying their best to actually represent the perceived needs of others as they understand them. And I think you do the best you can and it's not -- I don't think it's necessarily pompous to say you are doing your best to represent the interest of the individual Internet user population, excepting that that doesn't actually mean you are representing a billion people. It means you are trying to reflect that people count, and that the individual Internet user is the point of the Internet. So, I don't see that there has to be a conflict, myself.

Cheryl: Patrick, go ahead, then Evan.

Patrick: And I would add to that, Nick, that even if we were able to ask one to two billion people what they think about an issue, we would get one billion different opinions. So, it's really not possible to say we represent one million people. We try to do our best to represent an aggregate view of what people might think, and I think that's the very best we can do.

Cheryl: And some, of course, play a public interest role rather than a direct representational role, even at the ALS level. Go ahead, Evan.

Evan: And, also, we have been trying to put together some of that tutorial type of information. I mean, you know about that template. Adam mentioned it earlier, for trying to do a policy brief that was in tutorial form that provided factual information as well as a bit of editorializing on what At-Large's and ALAC's analysis had been. If I had my way, we would be allocating more resources to that so that more of those could be available.

So, when we go to our own membership and say, "Oh, we're talking about RIA amendments," and having them not glaze over after five seconds in talking about it. I have a hard time myself not glazing over it after five seconds in talking about, let alone passing the information on.

That kind of tutorial information has always been important, and, like I say, when it comes to the prioritization and things like that, I wish there was something we could do in terms of discretionary budget, or whatever, and say this means something to us.

Tricia: Cheryl, it's Tricia. Could I go in the queue, please?

Alan: We've got 25 or so people in this room. We represent about 120 ALSes. That maybe represents 12,000 people. If all we're representing here is the feelings of those 12,000 people, we are wasting a lot of money.

I believe we are here to represent the needs of the users, the users, the large percentage of whom do not know we exist, as Nick said. They do not know about the processes, they do not know about the arcane acronyms we use, but they are impacted by the decisions that are made within this body. And we are here to speak on their behalf. Not to channel for what they are saying, because they don't know a lot about it, but our job is to somehow assimilate what is needed indirectly through the groups that we do work with, and then use whatever extrasensory perception we have to serve the needs of the users. And if we can do a fraction of that well, we are using ICANN's money well and serving the community well.

And that's different than just representing the bodies who are members of the ALSes, which are by definition a rather unique and very different group from the typical Internet user.

Cheryl: Indeed. Olivier?

Olivier: Thank you, Cheryl. I would like to agree with Alan, Nick and Patrick, and to also add that this kind of question often arises in other Internet governance circles, such as within ISOC and ISOC chapters, as well as the IGF itself, including other groups of public participation and so on.

So, it's a question everyone asks themselves and, yes, we are trying to do as much as we can to represent the users.

Cheryl: Nick?

Nick: And just for what it's worth, someday I won't work here anymore and I won't be reading these documents. No, seriously, this is not my area of policy. I am entirely happy that all of you will show up and the people who come after you who will read these documents and will try to reflect the needs of users. I'm perfectly happy to be represented. I don't have to be a member of an ALS.

There are people who work for the Red Cross, there are doctors who volunteer for (inaudible). I'm glad. I think the world works that way. Everyone doesn't have to have a mandate to represent everybody else to do a decent job making things work better. I think it's not perfect, it's fine.

Cheryl: When you don't work here anymore, there are a few lists I definitely want you to join --

Nick: No.

Cheryl: Because it would be very refreshing to have that sort of discussion. I think we bring this item, now, to a close. And, darn, we started 15 minutes behind schedule and we're now 17 minutes behind. Never mind.

So, we now close off this discussion and start a very important discussion on the process of selecting an At-Large director. Each one of the regional At-Large organizations at the end of our community call and are now highly ensured that each of the monthly meetings that occurred after the community call on this matter were given the opportunity -- in fact, given the mandate to look at the discussions, the questions and the changes to the straw man proposal that was borne out of the NARALO think tank. And to come prepared for this discussion representing your region's views.

So, if there is anyone here that is not quite ready for that, take a deep breath, because you're about to jump in the deep end.

Alan: I demand that any future director that we put on the board ensures that for future meetings we have some juice or soft drinks, or something to keep us alive in these hot rooms.

Cheryl: I must say we are working under some difficulties, that's for certain. Do you want to, just while you're getting your thoughts together, stand up, stretch, go and get yourselves a glass of water. My clock says it's 5:18. We will convene this part of the meeting at exactly -- will two minutes, three minutes do you?

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, 5:23 is almost as good a number as 5:21. Come on, back we come.

Okay. So, what I don't see -- maybe because I can't focus on the screen, is whether or not we have -- no, I don't believe we do have the necessary work space up there. Heidi, can you make the magic happen, or can someone make the magic happen? Thank you, Sebastien.

Where we should probably start our discussion to build on the community call, while we're sitting around the table and having this rare opportunity of being able to discuss and discourse on the matters, let's start with talking about what we expect an At-Large appointed director. Alan, (inaudible), thank you.

Alan: I'll start. Most of our discussions, when we've talked about this kind of thing, and it's true for liaison, also. And, by the way, I don't differentiate an awful lot between liaison and a director. Yes, one is voting, yes, one could do motions. But the bulk of the time -- the bulk of board time is spent discussing and trying to influence others, and try to convince people that your rationale is better than your rationale in the way ICANN should address things.

And the bulk of what the board is going to be addressing are not At-Large things. They're going to be issues regarding new gTLDs, they're going to be issues of how to

resolve a lawsuit that the board -- that ICANN is involved in. They're going to be involved in all sorts of interesting things that peripherally impact At-Large, but they are not At-Large things. And that's as true for a liaison as it is for a board member, because at the board there is no real functional difference other than, yes, you cannot introduce a motion and you cannot vote at it.

So, what I think we're looking for is someone who we believe will be able to be a good director for ICANN, which if you go look into the bylaws it lists what characteristics you want for directors. The NonCom has echoed those and added a few more. And I think that's the number one criteria.

The second one is from our point of view, this is our chance of putting someone on the board who we think understands the issues of users and issues of At-Large, and who will represent those issues in an important way, and in a way which we think will support what it is we're trying to do. With no direct feedback, but you're trying to do something good for the organization. And if we believe we are doing something good for the organization, you pick someone who understands that. And that's about as much as you can do.

It's not a lot different -- we can ask Ron, what is the criteria that the ccNSO uses to select its two directors? You try to pick people who -- now, you're in an awkward position right now, so we won't ask you how you pick one of them. But all you can do is pick people that you have enough faith in to serve you well and to serve ICANN well. Because, really, you're putting our faith in those people. Once they're there, there is not much you can do about it. You can not reappoint them next time, perhaps, but it's like the issue we were discussing on ALAC members. The issue isn't how to discipline; the issue is how to get people to work and who will help the organization. And I think we're talking about it at the same level.

So, I think it's important not to get carried away on will this person support funding of the next ALAC summit, or At-Large summit or something? Yes, it may be an important issue as to when that time comes, but to be quite candid, (inaudible) who (a) believes in the things you are doing and (b) will give you enough private wisdom so you can write a proposal that will be hard to refuse. That's about as much as can be done.

Cheryl: Okay. I think that's a good starting point and something that various of the regions might want to respond to. Certainly, I would think just picking up on your last viewpoints, though, Alan, what's integral to that is that there should be perhaps an expectation that a close and cozy relationship will continue between the appointing body [technical difficulty] ICANN community (inaudible) can be ensured. So, it would be a very interesting thing to see, depending on how our choices go, how we enshrine that in. Sorry, go ahead, Alan.

Alan: I mean, we've had discussions in some of the RALOs, certainly in any RALO, and I know that discussion is being held elsewhere, should we appoint someone within our community or some eminent personality who we think understands users? And I strongly believe it should be someone within our own community for just that kind of reason. Because we do want a regular ongoing relationship with that person, not just one imperial interview a year, but I think the ongoing relationship is important. And it's a lot easier to have that if the person was someone that you work with already.

Cheryl: Go ahead, Adam.

Adam: Yeah, remembering the fact that the At-Large directors who were elected, a number of them used to join meetings at the beginning of each ICANN meeting and simply hold a meeting with the At-Large as it existed them. Which basically it was an open meeting

saying here I am, talk to us. Wolfgang organized them, Carl [Albeck], (inaudible) and a couple of others would turn up regularly. This is a different relationship when there is only one, because it's a bit one-to-one, and that would probably give a little bit more pressure on that person to be our representative, which comes into conflict with some of the independence of an ICANN director.

But that kind of thing would, I think, be helpful to consider, you know, an ongoing relationship of some kind meeting regularly with the At-Large at ICANN meetings, for example.

I do disagree about the distinction between the liaison and voting director, but I don't think we should get into that now. We can do that later. And I think the difference, really, between the ccNSO and the other SOs is that they do tend to select people directly from that community. They are very active members of communities, they are managers of ccTLDs, they are ASO, (inaudible), so on and so forth. You can see a very close connection, and I think that the At-Large, this is supposed to be -- I would to -- well, I think it's very important that the person both understand what the At-Large is meant to be in ICANN and the whole notion of it.

I am tending towards -- I would like -- well, I wouldn't want prejudice against anybody, but I would like us to recruit broadly as the NonCom recruits and not look specifically within our community. I think we have to look for the best possible person for ICANN, with the caveat that they have to have an understanding of users and specifically knowledge of the At-Large, and how it exists and why it came into being. Slightly different emphasis from Alan, is what I am saying.

Cheryl: Microphone, Alan.

Alan: I don't think that's all that different. I think it is indeed the NonCom's responsibility to go find interesting people from around the world who are not involved in ICANN and bring them in as outside people, and the best and the brightest, so-to-speak. I think a director appointed by one of the supporting organizations are now by At-Large is there to act as not a conduit but a soul mate, a representative on the board. And I think our job is not an other ALAC -- is not another NonCom position, but someone who we believe thinks close enough to what we think is important, that that will get reflected in board decisions, most of which will not be related to At-Large, but in board decisions in general.

So, I feel that simply picking an eminent person does not really address that need,

Cheryl: Adam, your --

Adam: I was struggling with the same word, conduit. Do I use the word "conduit." So, I think we are very much in agreement. It is probably a matter of emphasis, particularly as there is only one of them. I do think it's going to have to be somebody of stature, because I think it's someone we want to be listening to and not lost. And there are reasons for doing that. The NonCom struggle is very often because bringing in outsiders it's very impossible to bring outsiders into ICANN by and large because of the complexity and esoteric nature of the issues that are discussed. [Technical difficulty] It's very, very hard to understand.

Cheryl: Certainly, they'll need to come almost with predetermined trust and faith from the rest of the board. Go ahead, Wolfe.

Wolfe: Well, I agree with what Adam just said, and for me it was very helpful the answers I got from Alan around the phone call we had. A person formerly is independent, one, representing a portion of the community and he is more or less responsible to himself on

the first time, according to the bylaws as far as I understood. But I would like to insist on one element which cannot be formalized but can be assured in the process of the selection. I would like this person to be embedded somehow (inaudible). Embedded is more, I think, a cultural element, a way of thinking, a way of commitment to basic ideas and principles of the community, even if he is not representing formally the interests of the community.

But I think when we go around this line that we want this person or personality, we are looking more for a strong personality who is really capable from his background to be a strong vote in the board, but the person should be embedded in our environment, should know about the way we are thinking and what our concerns and what our vision. And this would be more or less enough.

Cheryl: Alan?

Alan: I can't remember the words I used in the document, in the answer I wrote. But it has to do with -- you almost want to be able to -- if you think you know the person well enough that you can predict how they will react, or they will likely react in a way that will satisfy you, if you could ever find out. And it's a level of trust and predictability at a statistical level. They can't necessarily answer every question the way you want. And, indeed, they may be in a position to know things that you don't know at any given time and respond differently than the way you would. But you have to believe that their mindset -- mindset, that was the word -- their mindset is close enough to you that, given what they know at the time, they are making a reasonable decision for your community as well as ICANN.

Cheryl: Go ahead, Carlton.

Carlton: Thank you, Chair. I was just about (inaudible) the last bit that Alan said, because that is what I think is most important. We should at least have a sense that the person has our mindset. And as a mindset, I mean the At-Large mindset.

And the other important bit is that person has to be able to integrate themselves within other members of the board and know their agenda even better than them. Because that's what will give them the opportunity to do something that you, yourself, would not do. But because they have a better feel for what's happening in that room, and you can trust them, because you know the mindset. If you have that information, you probably would have done the same thing they did. That's the sense of the person that you want to endorse. Thank you.

Cheryl: Certainly, they need a very special skill set and I would suspect similar board or board-likely experience. Go ahead, [Azumi].

Azumi: Thank you, Chair. This is sort of my first time saying something in this Seoul meeting. I really appreciate and enjoy listening to all of your arguments from behind the scenes. Anyway, on this thing, I fully agree with most of what the previous speakers said, that to me, what is very important is not only what type of person he or she is or could be, but also how to really establish such relationship with all of us, so that the one single representative will really become a representative of all, or the whole.

I am glad that there is only one candidate to be a director, not two or five. If you may not know, five would be one each from each region. Many years ago we did this election and that resulted in a regional sort of political context or conflict within each region. And then also there is a sense of representing just one part, either linguistic part or cultural part, and stuff like that. And there is a strong sort of emotional element attached behind

the scenes. And to some extent we also have something within the RALO and the RALO versus (inaudible) language and stuff like that.

So, what is to me very important is how to design a process so that we can effectually avoid that kind of an unnecessary or maybe natural sort of type of game and rather we would like to see a real representative of the whole. And it may be influenced by how we really select or have good interaction with the candidates, irrespective of the language or the cultures. And we are close to what I've seen from today's meeting.

But sometimes with external sort of elements people tend to really promote a -- okay, we'd like to have a Japanese representative versus blah, blah. Or, you know, to be fair, like the Caucasians or this and that, and outside of our control.

So, we really would like to see more highly intelligent or highly focused way of maturing this -- bringing the candidate onto the stage. Thank you.

Cheryl: Okay. I'm looking around to see if anyone else wishes to speak to the qualities of the candidate. I haven't heard anything from Latin America, and I would have expected to hear something from NARALO. So, thank you, Carlos, and then be prepared.

Carlos: [Speaking in foreign language]

Cheryl: Okay, thank you. I just wanted to make sure that each of the regions were given the opportunity that they were ready to come. Go ahead, Andre.

Andre: Really brief. Well, it is true what Carlos said about (inaudible) wording recently so well. We endorse that and, of course, just a little help regarding the personal qualities of this candidate. Because I can see the importance personally on many of us not only the main thing is him to know the agenda and to be aware and to be and have the possibility of him or her -- to have the possibility to develop some strategy with the board.

But also to be a person that could somehow be expected and be felt like in a fair position, or let's say someone who has some (inaudible). But this is not easy to develop a criteria. It's not easy at all. But just a simple comment. We are not going to support the criteria so specific about this concept, but we all know this has something -- we have to (inaudible).

Cheryl: Any comments from NARALO?

Evan: Not really. Most of what's been said elsewhere I think covers the territory pretty well. When it comes down to it, of course, this is a democratic vote, so it's going to be people's judgment calls of all this anyway. But, yeah, like I said, there has already been a lot of very good things about that said, and I guess this was one area where we just sit back and deferred to what everyone else has said.

Cheryl: Of course, I do think we need to recognize the not so subtle differences between the very first, the inaugural process that we go through in terms of some of our philosophical views may be less able to be -- we might have to deal carefully now in encouragement and selection so that we do get the champion that we need. Where in future times we've got the benchmark of the performance of the champion we put into place, they will be some already established criteria by the last board member's performance.

And so some of our philosophical issues on how things can be done might need to be looked at. And we might need to hasten slowly, but still go towards that endpoint. And that, I think, is a very nice segue, which is where I'll head after -- no, (inaudible) Adam. I

did note you wanted to reply, though, Evan. No, okay. A nice segue to looking at some of the alternates on the appointment process.

Now here we're talking about even at the pre-selection side. So, there are a couple of things to discuss there. First of all, have any of the regions come with prepared concepts or statements about the proposed pre-selection group, the -- I've lost their name. What's the name of your model?

Evan: It was tentatively Board Selection Working Group.

Cheryl: Thank you.

Evan: Because we didn't want to call it a nominating committee.

Cheryl: No, no. I remember what we didn't want to call it, I couldn't remember what the working title was. So, any of the regions came with any particular comments, criticisms, questions on that, or are we all incredibly warm and fuzzy and happy with that concept. Alan, you're frowning? No, okay.

Alan: I was must musing on the humor. I didn't point this out, someone else did, that ICANN calls its committee a nominating committee and it selects people for the board. And we're looking to nominate people and calling it a selection committee.

Cheryl: Well, I think we need to take our jollies where we can in this particular voluntary business, and I think that will give many of us a great deal of joy to look at in the future. Go ahead, Evan.

Evan: No, just the ICANN nominating committee is what's misnamed. I mean, essentially, our nominating committee is to nominate people who will then have to stand for election anyway. So, I think we're being appropriate with it and ICANN likes to play games and say it's a nominating committee.

Alan: May I suggest we decide what it does and name it later? We can have a context.

Cheryl: However, how is it going to do this job? What's it going to do and how is it going to do it? So, on the table is -- I can't read from this distance, so someone else will have to help me. Thank you, Evan.

Evan: Okay. Well, essentially, this is very similar to what was raised in the public At-Large meeting that we had -- I forget what the exact date was, where this was discussed in a group on October 8. There as a conference call for all of At-Large to participate in this, and so the stages are -- oh, you can read it now.

Cheryl: (Inaudible)

Evan: Okay. Essentially, this has been gone through many, many times before, so I'll just go through it quickly. At-Large selects a Board Selection Working Group well in advance. The Board Selection Working Group then creates a list of candidates with an explicit mandate not to restrict itself to the usual suspects, that is, within At-Large. It is fully able and welcome to go outside of At-Large if it finds the proper people with -- you know, fitting the criteria that we've already started to discuss.

At that point, then, it comes out with a slate of people. If any region believes that there is somebody egregiously left off that really has a huge grass roots behind them that needs to be added, RALOs can, at their option, add another person or two. It shouldn't really be beyond that.

At that point, then, we now have an expanded list that gets -- Alan?

Alan: Just a point of clarification. The RALOs can add someone to the list they are going to vote on or to the global list?

Evan: Hold on, I'm getting there. The idea being is that the working group would come out with a list. The RALOs would then add people to that list. That list of everyone would then go back to the RALOs, which at that point would whittle it down and take off people that they thought shouldn't be there, at which point it goes back for a vote.

And so, essentially, there hasn't been a lot of comments on those steps. The ones on which there was a diversity of opinion was who actually votes. How many votes are cast and what are the constituencies? So, essentially we had

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Evan: Okay. So, there was one option, which was a five-vote election, which was every region casts one vote. There is one where it's the 15-vote option, is every member of ALAC casts a vote. And then there's the 20-vote option in which every member of ALAC casts a vote, plus the chair of each region casts a directed vote as selected by each region. Each region has its own process of selecting its own preferences. The chair of the region is then directed to vote in that exact same way, but you have 20 votes: one for each person of ALAC, and one for the regional chair making a directed vote.

Since then, there were a couple of other options that were added. One was every ALS gets one vote. Another option is everyone who indicates an interest gets a vote. And the other one is every ALS and everyone who is interested gets a vote. Those last three were put forward in the time since October 8. They did not get a lot of support. And the feedback that has come back since essentially the widespread preference that I've been able to figure out, both from other regions and from within NARALO, is for the option 3, which was the 20-vote option.

Everyone on ALAC gets one vote, every region gets one vote directed through the chair as that region states a preference. The chair of the region does a directed vote. So, the 20-vote option is the one that seemed to get the most support.

Cheryl: Thank you very much. Alan?

Alan: There is one step that has never been clear to me, and maybe it's clear to everyone else. The process says the superset of those selected by the BSWG and those added by the regions, and the assumption when we were talking about this is that they would be very few of those. But if a region felt very, very strongly that someone was missed out, then they could add them. That superset list would go to each of the regions for prioritizing and/or elimination of some candidates. So, you end up with that with possibly five different lists with perhaps different numbers of people on it and different people on it and different order, it's not clear to me how you go from those five lists to the list that the X votes on, whatever the voting scheme is that comes up with, that consolidation. Maybe you take the top three, maybe you take, I don't know, merge them together. But I don't think that's ever been discussed.

Cheryl: Thank you, Alan. That certainly needs to be looked at now. Any other questions?
Thank you, Adam.

- Adam: I'm comfortable with prioritization by the region, by the RALOs for the very reason that Azumi was explaining earlier, which tends to lead to all kinds of different things. If we've got a big voting pool, then allow people to vote, I guess, is what I would prefer.
- Cheryl: Andre?
- Andre: Andre, then Carlton.
- Andre: I think what Alan said recently about this 20-vote option and the 5 RALO chairs casting a vote, we were discussing and it wasn't so perfectly clear about what are the conditions for the situation of that vote? If it's just communication about what the RALO decided or if the chair has a brief possibility to express its position in the situation, that the RALO hasn't achieved consensus or voting process with an election, or an election or something? In that position we would like to discuss a little longer and we were doing this in a little break before. Because it wasn't so clear, that part.
- Evan: I can answer the intent.
- Cheryl: Very briefly, go ahead.
- Evan: The intent of what was said is that each region has its own method for making a preference. That preference must be transferred by the chair's vote in this process. So, in other words, we called it the directed vote. So, this is not the preference of the chair; this is the preference of the region and the chair votes that way. I'm saying we could debate that here, but that was the intent.
- Cheryl: Alan?
- Alan: Two points. One of them is that for regions which direct their RALO -appointed ALAC members, that essentially adds a third vote, since presumably it's going to be the same direction in both of those. So, that may or may not be relevant, just noting it.
- The second thing is, on the last call that the North American region had, there was a view expressed that this directed vote could be done in any way the region decided, which maybe ask its ALSes, or maybe a popular vote ala the 2000 election from within their region. But it wasn't clear to me that within our structure we should go out of the ALS structure in selecting that directed vote. And it wasn't clear if that was sort of legitimate within our rules.
- Cheryl: Could you see, too, Evan, if that is direct back to that, and then to you, Patrick? Go ahead, Evan, briefly, then Patrick, then Azumi.
- Evan: The intent is to recognize that every region has its own MOU, it has its own way of working internally. We have one region that recognizes the voting right for individual users and other regions that have handled that separately. The intention was to allow every region to act within their own operating procedures of how it was going to express that.
- Alan: But that wasn't what the person who suggested it said. It was -- they could choose to do something such as have individual people voting even if they didn't have individuals within their RALO.
- Evan: I'm assuming what they would do would have to be in line with their existing rules of procedure.
- Alan: Then I have no problem on that one.

- Patrick: Yeah. Well, one concern I have is with the vote of RALO representatives, because once you start voting on individuals, the vote is secret. So, how can you be sure that the RALO chair will indeed vote for the one selected by the ALSes? So, short of their moral obligation to do that, but you can only trust them.
- Cheryl: Nick, in response to that, then Azumi.
- Nick: One way you could do this is actually to have it automated. For other reasons, we actually asked this question of BigPulse earlier, and they actually -- it is actually possible for you to assign each RALO set of electors to a voting group, and the result of each group's preferences are then automatically weighted in such a way that they are cast essentially as a group and the result is then as if someone manually keyed in the preferences for the region.
- Evan: So, we can remove the necessity for the chair to actually make that vote. BigPulse essentially takes the vote from the region in the way the region has determined it wants to do it. And whatever that weighted preference is gets transferred as if it was an individual voting. Nick, you're saying that's possible?
- Nick: Yeah, effectively, the votes within a region, if there are 26 electors, they have 1/26 of a whole vote. You can think about it in that way.
- Cheryl: Well, that's excellent news. Azumi, then Adam.
- Azumi: Yes, thank you. I may have some shallow understanding in here, so I need some clarification. If, say, we take option 3, the total vote of 20, right? And the candidates are, what, five or seven of 10?
- Unidentified Participant: Whatever.
- Azumi: Then, how do you decide. Do you get a simple majority or the largest one of five, or --
- Cheryl: We use a runoff system. It's what is enshrined in our rules of procedure.
- Azumi: Does it mean, if I may, the, say, originally there was seven or five, whatever, and then you will vote a second round, or you just put all the weights -- one round only.
- Evan: There is a way of doing weighted votes in such a way that even if you have an even number of voters, you still can have it so that if every region only votes for their own person, then you end up saying who put second place, and that ends up having the main effect.
- Cheryl: It's the way we've -- it's in our rules, it's the way it will happen. Did you want to speak to that, though, and then we've got Adam?
- Azumi: Yes, sorry, just to explain it. We don't really exercise this preferential voting in Japan.
- Cheryl: It doesn't matter. It's our rules.
- Azumi: So, it's better to be clearly expressed or explained, please. Thank you.
- Cheryl: We have, in fact, got that linked and if you go to the Wiki site, which all of this information is on, you can drill down to probably the most boring, ad nauseum examples of how it works, including the map. Go ahead, Evan.

- Azumi: I'm thinking of some of the members of ALS in my country.
- Nick: If you want to see a practical example of how it worked, the results of the recent balloting for the ALAC board liaison show how it works. Because that vote was actually incredibly close, and the explanation of how the vote was calculated gives you an example of how the system works in practice. And that might actually be a better explanation than you would get from an explanation which is not connected to a real situation.
- Cheryl: Yes, the example is certainly there. Go ahead, Adam?
- Adam: I want to say that I think we should actually reconsider the voting method we use and not take it as enshrined, because a new process, something we've been asked to do new and specially. And I'm actually quite uncomfortable with this voting process for this particular position partly for the reasons that we saw in that last vote that we did under this procedure, where the person who got the most first votes did not become the elected person. I'd like to consider at least somebody got more first votes than -- anyway, whatever happened, it doesn't matter.
- Cheryl: Let's be clear. They got the majority of the vote insufficient to the correct vote --
- Adam: Exactly. And that's --
- Cheryl: This whole academic world that argue over it.
- Adam: Yeah, exactly. But I think it would be interesting to look at different voting methods. For example, the one that was chosen how the Olympics were recently allocated to Rio rather than where the lowest votes drops out and there is a re-voting, and so on. This is an extremely important process, and I think it may identify the first choice better if we look at a different voting method. But what we use is for later. What I'm saying is I would not like the choice of voting methods taken off the table.
- Cheryl: I need to go to Alan, then Sebastien. And if we are going to have a mechanism used for voting, it needs to be across all of the votes done by all of us, and that is something that I think we'd be very happy to bring expertise in. Because I think that this huge amounts of work that are done to decide which are the advantages on this. And we can argue until the cows come home over some of it.
- Alan: Okay. I feel a little uncomfortable making these comments, because I'm the person you've been talking about, who came in first and didn't win. Came in first in the first ballot. I am not saying I was cheated, I just said it makes me feel a little bit awkward to be making this statement. I tend to agree with Adam, but I can express it in a slightly different way.
- Number one, the fact that we have used one voting mechanism in the past does not mean it's enshrined forever. And for that matter, I don't think necessarily we must use the same mechanism for every vote, if there is a valid reason.
- The reason that I feel uncomfortable with this method is I am not used to it, and I'm not saying a whimsical thing. The concept of prioritizing people and trying to think of what happens if, what then meant I know I voted or I would have voted if it wasn't for me, for the person that was at the top of my list that I wanted to see win.
- If I had my option, I would almost say I don't want to vote for anyone else, because I don't want to help anyone else win. Cheryl, you who live in a place where you do this regularly, your mind is around it and you understand it.

I think the dynamics in any given vote would be different if we do the equivalent of the way the Olympics is and draw out the lower person and re-vote. Yes, people may re-think their vote at that time, but they are focusing on who do I want to win given this set of candidates? And I think the result may be different.

Now, whether it would have helped me in this last election, I don't care that's not the issue. I just know my mindset is not wrapped around the prioritized voting and recognizing that my -- I may be helping my third candidate win, depending on how it runs. And I think for many of us we do not think in the way, we're not accustomed to it. And I think that may present different results.

Cheryl: And, of course, it goes to regardless of what you're used to, there is going to be other parts of our community that aren't going to be used to it. So, we're never going to get something we're all comfortable with.

Alan: But it's the automated part. I think everyone understands the concept of we'll have a second ballot with different sets of candidates on it.

Cheryl: Carlton, go ahead.

Carlton: Thank you, Chair. I would respectfully suggest that we do not take the type of balloting off the agenda for the minute, because I have a slight discomfort myself. I have a slight discomfort with it. You see, the thing is, I want -- and probably -- I'm going to express it and it is probably very personal, but please forgive me. I want the same person to win through every round, whatever happens. If the person that I believe ought to be the best person, whatever happens, however we put it, that's the person that I would --

Cheryl: But the majority of the votes, it seems. No individual has that (inaudible) --

Carlton: Thank you very much. Thank you very much. That's what I want to see. And if we can find or devise a way to make that happen, I believe that I would be happy. And I'm speaking very personally here. I'm not holding brief for anyone else, I'm just speaking very personally. Thanks.

Cheryl: I have a reply specifically to that point from Nick, then I see Adam. Yes, I see you again, Azumi, and I see Alan.

Nick: I just wanted to note in case it's not obvious, that all voting systems are actually designed to return the most popular candidate as the victor. However, they all -- how they treat the rest of those on the ballot is what is different.

And this may be stating the obvious, but what I would suggest to you is that you would be best off having a dialogue with someone who is an expert in voting systems. Because, really, what you want to do is pick a system which reduces the negative impact of how people vote when there are multiple candidates, and reduces the shortcomings. I mean, the first part of the post system is a very familiar and very simple system. It has shortcomings just like other voting systems do.

If you have a discussion with someone who is an expert on voting and simply express -- let him lead you or her, lead you through a set of questions of what it is that you actually want to accomplish, I think you'll find there are more than one system that will meet what it is that you wish to do. And then everyone can have an equal understanding of why that choice is made.

- Cheryl: Okay. So, we were certainly heading towards having a specific briefing on that. Adam, Azumi, Alan?
- Adam: I was going to see or suggest, could we in some way put out, for example, a call for papers on voting systems, which could be expressed to us? Or, could we look for experts who we could discuss with on voting systems? Because perhaps it's important enough to the ICANN community for us to actually explain why we have chosen this particular voting system for this important process. So, an open call, perhaps some academics would respond, for example.
- Cheryl: I think that's perfectly reasonable, but we'll need to do that between now and Nairobi. Azumi, then Alan, briefly.
- Azumi: I also second what Adam suggested, and in addition to, I explained Linux model, we have some different models, like [Pope]. And the essence is, to me, with the whole global diverse constituencies or the groups subdivided into different qualities, the essence is, I think, to the final process, they would like to sort of collect all sort of organize as much support from as many different bodies to the end, so that you feel -- you are participating in the final selection of the winner. Even though you may not have supported in the beginning. And it's slightly different from the preferential [waiting] voting system, where you just cast 5, 3, 1, in the order and then you tally and instantly you have the global result as one shot. Of course, it is complicated if you do twice, two rounds.
- But, also, as I said in the beginning, it may ask you, say, for example, if the candidates from Asia Pacific are not selected in the first round, you have to chose either from North America or Latin America. Then you explicitly support this -- you trust this person. And so the process, of course it's not perfect, because there is a loser. But we need to have some kind of process like the Pope system is a good way.
- So, in that regard I also agree with what Adam said. A simple kind of survey or comparison between different systems and see how they work. And it would be great, too, to sell ALAC to the rest of the ICANN community as well.
- Cheryl: Well, see, ALAC for its own systems have gone through quote a tortuous basis to get to the system we run, so I would not be unwinding the clock without damned good reason, and I don't see that as yet. Alan and then Sebastien.
- Alan: One quick comment. There is a not so subtle difference between explaining to the community why it is our mathematical system resulted -- or processing of the votes resulted in a certain person voting and being able to say that in the round, in the voting that elected this person, the majority of the voting group selected them. Not a mathematical process based on something or other. It's a different issue to say the majority of people supported that person, we endorse them.
- Cheryl: Well, that's the purpose of us agreeing to have a discussion and a review and advice and how the same only different turns out with different names and methods, and we will find who and what we're most comfortable with. Go ahead, Sebastien.
- Sebastien: I'm sorry, it's not because I'm not interested in this discussion, but I would like to go to the Fellowship Program that started just now, to just say hello for five minutes. I am sure that we will find the best way to elect.
- I have no problem with what has happened during the last election. I try to figure out what to vote myself and at the end of the day of course I made a decision. And I don't think that another system will have changed the result at the end of the day. And I try

different figures and it will not have changed a lot. Nothing, I think, at the end, and I have no problem with what system will choose.

But I understand the question, because I go through those questions, too, and I try to find answer by myself and that was okay. And I hope to take what Azumi says that at the end of the day we will not support the people just because they belong to one region or one whatever, because it's like, and it's what you say in your previous speech, and I was very agree with you at that time, is that we need one people who represent us. It's all the user in the world. That's very heavy for anyone who would take this job.

But I want to be sure that anyone chosen, you will have our support, because if you come back to -- if you didn't come back to us, it will be difficult, but if we don't help him, he will -- him or her, it will be difficult, and we need to support whatever is the result of the next chair and next board member (inaudible). Thank you very much.

Cheryl: Thank you. I think we've got to be very cognizant of time here, but I would like to give the floor to Evan. But we also realize that a lot of this -- what we're discussing now is also contingent on which model we choose. But we need to back a little bit as well to the options of selection and pre-selection, how calls are made. So, Evan, and then I'd like to wind you back into the process a little earlier, because I think there are a few things we might need to discuss again as well. Go ahead, Evan.

Evan: My question is of Nick and it's about resource allocation. Is it possible -- is it within the budget or the ability of ICANN to set up a call at which we can have one of these experts on voting systems basically talk to us, ask the leading questions that help us based on the outcomes we want, to say here are the questions. Based on these questions, here's the voting system that will work best for you. Can we not do that either on a conference call or over a series of e-mails? And is ICANN prepared to put the resources in to getting us the appropriate expert?

Nick: Yeah, I don't imagine that would be any problem. I think that you would get the best results from a conversation if you had a fairly good idea of how you wanted the process to run exclusive of the voting method. Because you could then describe to the person, look, we want -- we have five groups of people that are electors, and the candidates are developed in this way. So that they could then come to you and say, "Well, here are the options that would most closely relate to what you are trying to accomplish, and here are the pros and cons of each."

Evan: My reason is, I'm actually kind of scared to death of the RFP process, because we have so little time to work with, and in the compressed time between now and Nairobi, I can't see an RFP process working. But I can see having somebody who can lead us in and at least help us pick something.

Every system we can come up with has strengths and flaws and eventually we're going to have to make an arbitrary decision. I personally don't care which, because a lot of the ones that I've seen have accomplished the results that may have several differences from one to the other, but generally speaking will deliver something close.

I'd just like to try and figure out a process to do this that will allow us to come up with something by the time Nairobi happens. And the idea of having a call specifically for that purpose seems to be a good way to do that.

Vivek: Can I have a comment here, Cheryl? I'm just trying to balance what Nick said and Evan said. If you typically ask a professor of political science, he will tell you a comparator list of different voting systems, some pros, some cons and that.

So, essentially people are opted for certain things based on the system -- the process is done because the underlying thing what he wants. Whether he wants something simple like a simple majority, which is (inaudible) in many of the places, or you want to do a balanced representation depending what he thinks.

So, voting systems what you call essentially have to link upon to some consensus what we have in mind. Otherwise, the problem could be the person whom you are asking may be very good expert in comparator thing but he doesn't know what you all really want.

So, I would say it's a good idea, as Evan said, to also look at an option, but at the same time some material telecom or something where we can come to some quick consensus, keeping the Nairobi meeting as a deadline. And then probably we can talk and get some additional input that (inaudible).

Cheryl: Thank you, Vivek, and I'll look forward to you representing APRALO, because I'll be chairing the meeting on all of those points. And, obviously, James will be there to help you as well. The matters, however, whilst that's an essential item and we will be doing it between now and Nairobi, to make sure we're prepared with Nairobi. We still have to decide on who is electing and how they're selecting.

So, let me roll you back now to the very beginning, where we look at our Board Selection Working Group. As the notes are in front of me and not speaking as the chair but speaking as a part of the potential electorate, the first question that comes to my mind that I'd like immediate feedback from you all on, when and where is a call for expressions of interest put out to ask for candidates to self-dominate and how are those calls going to be made? That's the first one to consider. Because it's quite clear that once calls for nominations are out that you would also want a very busy group both at the RALO level and at the BSWG to be proactively saying and how about you, and how about you?

So, I think that's kind of missing. So, Adam, you put your hand up first. Go for that one.

Adam: I would work backwards from when you want to be seated. And if it's next November, then we probably -- then I will answer your question. So, if it's next November, then in that case I would go for after the Nairobi meeting, because practically I can't think of any other time, and I think it has to be as soon as possible. So, I would say we make a name for statements -- request for statements of interest and recruitment go out after the Nairobi meeting.

Cheryl: Thank you for answering a question I hadn't asked, but that's very important. What I was actually asking is, it doesn't actually say on here that we ever make the call. I assume agreeing that we make a call for request for interest is an important part of this process. Or maybe not. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan: There is a first step you missed -- how do we select the BSWG?

Cheryl: Do you want to go back to that?

Adam: I can tell you what we discussed in the very first meeting that came up with it, or at least I'll tell you what I recall of it.

Cheryl: I just see what it says. At-Large elects members for an ALAC Board Selection Working Group.

Adam: My recollection was set said that each RALO would identify something like two or maybe three, probably two, individuals. Is that where it says? Maybe I have --

- Cheryl: Those questions are well answered, I thought.
- Adam: It's the fever.
- Cheryl: Okay. So, I think getting out BFWG is not so problematic. Making sure that the job description includes putting out a timely call, and our need to advise how and in what way that call goes out. Because we do want it fairly clear that it goes beyond the ICANN community. But the ICANN network will be one of those methods. Go ahead, Alan.
- Alan: With regard to when the person is seated, although Lord knows when the first one will be seated. I would think that in the steady state, the person would be seated six months after the annual general meeting in line with the other SOs. If you pick any other way, the issue of trying to balance the regional representation is almost impossible.
- Current bylaws already have an impossible situation that says the SOs and now the AC and the SOs must honor the maximum of five people per region, but they're all doing it in peril and in secret. So, it's not quite clear how the bylaws enforce that.
- Cheryl: Go ahead Nick.
- Nick: Just as an aside, we actually had a discussion in Marina del Rey about this, which is why at one point I had said that it had been suggested to you all that you hold your election cycle such that it concludes before June, whenever the person takes their seat. Because the NomCom will make its choices in June for the seats that it fills. You'll know who those seats are and you can look at who else -- who is left on the board and what regions they come from and, if necessary, take that into account when making your decision. So, you will actually have the best of all worlds and at the same time be able to tell the NomCom in good time that they can take your -- the region of your choice into account in their appointment.
- Alan: This is one of those areas where I think blending in with the crowd and having the appointment at the same time as the SOs would benefit us in a number of ways, not the least of which is board briefings, and things like that. Now, that may mean our first -- the first person we put in sits for two and a half years or three and a half years, whatever the SIC decides. But in a steady state I would think going along with the crowd would be a better move.
- Nick: And that's a separate issue, as I say. You could say you're going to select the person for six months of the year, and if the consensus decision was that they take their seat at the end of the AGM, you could do that. My only point was that if you make the selection early in the year, it gives you the most flexibility with respect to the regional makeup of the board.
- Cheryl: Evan?
- Evan: I think we may be over-architecting this a bit. I mean, I'm thinking the SIC is going to come back to the board and they'll determine when the person gets seated. I'm going under the understanding that our timeline doesn't have to have specific calendar dates, but says moving backwards from the time when the person is placed. Whenever they are placed, here is our timeline leading up to that. I don't think we're going to have too much control over when the board says the person is going to be placed.
- So, I think the best we can do is rather than saying they're going to be placed on this date an we have to do things on certain dates to make things relative and just move backwards from the day of placement and come up with a reasonable timeline whenever the board chooses to place that person.

Cheryl: Adam?

Adam: I think we should just work to the schedule that works for us, basically, which I would suggest is we try and start in Nairobi and get the person named so that they could take a seat for the AGM, or however it fits that. Because they're effectively going to either be replacing somebody from the current allocation of 15 seats, or it's going to be part of the new overall broadband -- broadband -- board review process. I've been writing about broadband reviews recently-- board review process.

So, at some point we're going to have to -- we have to fit with other people, so let's just do what is best for us, which I think is to make this process work over given periods of time. In Nairobi, give it something like five to six months to run to completion. Where they're seated, it doesn't matter too much.

Cheryl: Alan, you've got a query, then Evan.

Alan: I just didn't understand Adam's comment about replacing someone on the board. At this point it's a brand-new one, unless the board review comes up with something different. And I also think we should ignore the issue of when the person gets seated. Let's come up with a process we need and then see what happens with the SIC.

And, by the way, I wouldn't delay starting any of this process to Nairobi if we can settle on it quicker. I see no point in waiting four months if we can come to closure to it in two.

Cheryl: Well, certainly we'd want to be aiming to have the call going out at or after Nairobi. In fact, if it came beforehand, we might have an opportunity to meet and greet some of these people. Evan? You passed on that? Okay.

The next question that now I've established in my own mind that we will be making a call, I need to come back to we need a place marker -- not to discuss it now -- to look at how those calls go out. What instructions we do use to the BSWG. So, that just needs to be sidelined into the process.. Go ahead, Evan.

Evan: Right. Obviously, this was not to the level of detail that's going to be required to do this.

Cheryl: But this meeting is to get it up another notch, which is what I'm suggesting we do to sideline that.

Evan: We had already requested a Wiki to start working on some of these processes and identify questionnaires. I don't know -- is there? Okay.

Cheryl: Yeah, it's most definitely there. The issues between point 2 and point 3, in terms of the steps, I'm just wondering whether we might want to consider that whilst the BSWG is collecting all of these requests or expressions of interest, perhaps it's not that the RALOs need to add in after that process, but that it's running in some form of parallel process. That there is an opportunity for the RALO to act as, in some way, a pre-selection, a regional pre-selection committee. And that in their own mechanism as a regional pre-selection committee, the RALO can then, knowing when the expression of interest call is going to go out, have their predetermined and accepted candidates, ensure that they are part of that process. Just wondering whether or not we need to go one, two, three, or whether three can sort of slip up and become sort of a 2A and 2B. I see Evan. Did I see - - no? Okay, Alan. Evan, then Alan.

Evan: The purpose behind step 3 was simply that if the RALOs didn't believe that the working group had included people that should have been there. And the intention is that the

working group should go out and do its stuff, and that step 3 would only happen under special circumstances. That if the working group is doing its job, the RALOs are not going to be tacking people onto that. That this is meant to be something that would be hopefully a not so common occurrence because it would indicate a lack of confidence in what the working group is doing.

- Cheryl: If it's written as a step one, two and three, I can assure you that people will start doing it as step one, two and three, which is why, rather than it becoming a measure of course, I was wondering whether we could consider having the RALOs proactively acting as a pre-selection committee and ensuring that their preferred candidates are always on the list. But that's something for us to discuss.
- Evan: And I thought that -- we considered that in general and thought that would sort of be infringing on the independence of the working group.
- Cheryl: That's why we need to discuss it. Alan, then Adam.
- Alan: No, I think it's been said.
- Cheryl: Go ahead.
- Adam: I think as you did, Cheryl, I thought that what this was an opportunity to petition. For example, the ISOC selection process, when they're doing their trustees, there is a nominating committee which selects people for the slate. And then there is an opportunity as a public call to petition, to get onto that slate. That's that one-step nomination process, two-step petitioning. And that's how I read this one, two, three step. So, it may be just clarification, which we've just done or are doing.
- Cheryl: Back to Alan.
- Alan: Having run several ISOC elections, having been elected to the ISOC board as a petition candidate and the one who suggested the nomination process in this thing, what he said.
- Cheryl: Okay.
- Alan: It was really designed as to handle egregious cases and somehow we need to put words around it to make sure it's not every RALO puts in an extra two people at the last moment.
- Cheryl: Because it's certainly not clear from running in it, so we now need to make a note that that needs indenting or something.
- Alan: If this person is ultimately going to get elected, maybe the process has to be at least two RALOs have to put the person up, that one is not enough. Because they're not going to get elected at that point anyway. So, maybe the petition process needs to be the equivalent of signatures.
- Cheryl: Okay. Because I certainly did see perhaps the benefit of having a RALO acting in a pre-selection capacity as a matter of normalcy, not as a matter of exception.
- Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)
- Cheryl: I don't see it outlined in this, so we just need to be aware of that. Our next steps are we ready with those particular points in our agreements and making it clear that we will be annexing out some things like specifics of the electoral process.

Are we willing to take to the Structural Improvements Committee at our Tuesday meeting the modification of this document, we're able to talk with one voice and say this is what we're doing, this is what we're planning, this is what we want to do. And discussing then and there that the options A to F, we have so far established preferences for 1, 2 or 3 of those. I know NARALO has given the option 3, and we also need to hear now, just before we wrap up on this, is there any other region that has a particular preference from the 5A to 5F opportunities? Go ahead, Wolfe.

Wolfe: I remember choosing the same ones in NARALO.

Cheryl: Go ahead, Evan.

Evan: Cheryl, what happened was at the teleconference on October 8, most of the regions had expressed an interest, but that was before the other three options got put on. We had our conference call even afterwards and basically came to the same conclusion, that those other three options were not considered feasible. There were a couple of individuals that wanted it, but by and large the entire region was quite happy with the option 3.

Cheryl: Understood, but it was very specific that the instructions to the regional representatives, and it had to go into their regional meetings, was for them to come back with a firm preference. I know what regions agreed to at the October 8 meeting, but we did need to have a reaffirmation at this meeting. Yes, Wolfe or Adam, sorry. Wolfe, are you wanting more? Okay, turn your light off. Adam?

Adam: Could we -- I agree with, actually, 5C. That was the one I thought 5C is option 3, except I'm uncomfortable with directed vote as for the reasons said before. And also, because if we change the voting methods and it's not applicable. So, if we could square bracket it, or whatever we wish to adopt, that would be perfect.

Just a comment for the future. I think the ideal way would actually be what Patrick proposes, is option 6. That would be for the future all ALSes, and I would like to see that as almost commented on. I think the future is that the ALSes should be doing this, because it is the At-Large, but not at this point.

Cheryl: (Inaudible) to Patrick, Evan. Go ahead Patrick.

Patrick: Well, we haven't discussed that option much today, neither did we previously. My main idea behind having the direct vote by the ALSes is that after all, why are the ALSes there if they can't even vote on the vote indirectly through the process, either through the RALO chair or, as Nick had suggested, through Linux (inaudible). That means that their vote is not counted as one, but only as a partial vote. This doesn't look very democratic.

So, my idea was to get back to more or less what was closest to ICANN version 1 with regard to election, electing board members. And the question still remains why can't we do it now, because we suggesting to do it at a later stage, but I would like to hear why we can't do it now.

Cheryl: Go ahead, Evan.

Evan: I can say that option 6 was discussed at the NARALO meeting and soundly trounced, so this is something that has been brought up at least in one region and was widely disliked. So, this is not an -- so, I can say that it's not like it hasn't been brought up anywhere. It has been brought up and where it has been brought up, it has been disliked.

In terms of the square brackets around the direct vote, the intention behind this was that there was at least one vote per region that was determined by the ALSes and did not indicate a chair's personal preference.

Under the option C, you already have three members of the ALAC who are capable of giving independent votes not necessarily directed by their region. The idea was that there would be at least one vote per region that would require the ALSes having made a determination that would not be at the chair's discretion. That was the intention.

Cheryl: Thank you, Evan. Alan?

Alan: Just a comment on option 6. In at least one region, Latin America, but there may be more, it's not one ALS one vote, because they're weighted based on country. So, that also would have to factor into it. They'd either have to agree to this or the rules would have to be adjusted to factor into that.

Cheryl: Adam?

Adam: The reason, Patrick, I thought was that, for example, when we were trying to get ALSes to attend the summit, even when we were offering them travel, please come along, it was really hard to identify who these ALSes were. I think we have to have a bounded -- a successfully bounded electorate if we're going to use the ALSes, and they have to, also, I think, be seen to real organization. So, I think it's something for the future. I think it is the future and it's the right way to go. It would be a reflection of the process working. So, that's my reasoning. I don't know why the North American RALO rejected it.

On the directed vote, if we use a different type of voting system, then it would have to be a different system. This would only work in the current system, which I can't remember the automatic runoff, or whatever -- instant runoff.

Evan: Well, actually, regardless of the method, the intention. So, go back and give the intention rather than the specifics. The intention is that each of the ALAC members would be able to express their vote. And then the region would collectively express its intent, whether it was in person through a directed vote of the chair or through a mechanized process. But the intention is that there would be one that was not up to personal discretion, but one that would be absolutely reflective of whatever the ROP in that region said.

Cheryl: Thank you, Evan. Go ahead.

Alan: I think whatever method we need, we need to be in a position where we can convince the SIC and the board that we're talking about an informed, understand electorate.

Cheryl: Yes, and I think that's essential. And in closing, because I said we would close at 10 minutes after the 6:30 extension for our much valued and we couldn't do it without them, interpretation team.

Under 5C at the October 8 meeting, please note for the record and change your papers, APRALO also indicates his preference for what was then No. 3 on our list. So, I think that's important that we bring that to the stick as well.

Ladies and gentlemen, the time has well and truly come for us to close off today, but I'm comfortable that we'll be talking in a unified voice on Tuesday.

One other piece of housekeeping, we will send it out. I will be asking to extend to a 30-minute earlier start for our Tuesday meeting. By starting at 8:30 on Tuesday, we will be

discussing some of the education outreach and ccNSO opportunities that both Ron and Rudy will be presenting. So, it's an 8:30 start. You will get confirmation.

Can I ask you all to be upstanding and thank our amazing interpretation team. Thank you so much.