Adigo
nashtonhart _ 2009-7-15 0408 PPT _ 1008969 _ 238320

••

Participants shown in alphabetical order:

Adigo Operator:
Alan Greenberg
Cheryl Langdon-Orr
Fatimata Seye Sylla
Heidi Ullrich
Matthias Langenegger
Nick Ashton - Hart
Sebastien Bachollet
Vanda Scartezini
Wendy Seltzer

••

V: Heidi?

Adigo Operator: Nick -- hi -- this is Tonya. Trying to reach you for the call. I'll give you a call back.

Heidi: Hi, Tonya. This is Heidi.

Adigo Operator: Hi, Heidi. I'm doing fine.

V: Hello?

V: Hello.

Heidi: Hi.

V: Yes.

V: Hi, Vanda.

Vanda: Hi! How are you?

V: Good. Thank you.

Vanda: We are waiting for our chair.

V: What about Alan? Is he on the call?

Vanda: Alan is on the call.

Heidi: He's being dialed out to. Is he in? He's on the Skype chat, now.

V: Skype. Yes.

Adigo Operator: This is Tonya. Not [inaudible]

Cheryl: Cheryl.

Vs: Hi, Cheryl.

Sébastien: Hello, Cheryl.

Cheryl: Good morning.

V: Hello, Cheryl.

Sébastien: Good morning.

V: How are you?

Cheryl: I'm fine. Getting there.

V: Well -- surviving. That's a good idea.

Cheryl: I thought about it and decided, "Why not?" [laughter]

Vanda: Not this time.

Cheryl: How was the opera last night?

Sébastien: It was really great. It was a good opera. We finally… People were missing and then we finally got a very good place for the 2nd, 3rd and 4th acts. It was better than anything else.

Cheryl: Excellent!

Sébastien: For the other, I am still in Sydney. I was at the opera house yesterday night with my wife, and we went to Aida.

V: Oh, Roger and I saw that one, as well. Very good!

Vanda: Very good.

Sébastien: Yes. It is.

[Alan joins]

Cheryl: Hi, Alan.

Alan: Hi.

Vanda: Hi, Alan.

Sébastien: Hi, Alan.

Alan: Hello, all.

Heidi: I think we're missing Nick and Fatimata.

Vanda: Nick said he will not be available?

Heidi: No. We're supposed to dial out to him. He's traveling, but he will be on the call.

Cheryl: Will Fatimata be a dialout as well? She often is.

Alan: Yes. She was listed as a dialout.

Heidi: And Wendy is here, as well.

Cheryl: Hi, Wendy.

Vs: Hello, Wendy.

Cheryl: And for reasons known only to the mysteries of confusion and what they do to you when you're not in front of them, I'm now restarting mine. I suspect some beastly upgrade or thingy happened.

Vs: [laughter]

Cheryl: I hope Vanda -- who still of course is officially acting chair has an agenda in front of her, while I do my best to even open up a screen.

Alan: Gremlins were invented for airplanes, but they've moved over to computers.

Cheryl: It's good to see that at least something is keeping ahead of the technology wave. It happens to be gremlins -- which is a little bit sad…

Alan -- you're traveling, [inaudible]?

Alan: I am in Washington, on a bit of vacation. My wife is here for a conference, and I'm tagging along.

Cheryl: A vacation? I think this should be raised as an agenda item. Who allowed…?

Alan: You should know that I've been in the hotel room all day working.

Cheryl: Oh, that's all right, then. That's okay.

Alan: But I'm not doing it in Montreal, so it's a vacation.

Cheryl: [laughter]

I'm not sure that that's actually permitted to have personal time, is it?

Alan: Well, the drive back-and-forth -- I can't use the computer. So that part is vacation.

Cheryl: Ah -- forced!

Tonya -- are you having any luck getting dialouts done?

Adigo Operator: Nick and Fatimata… I am reaching voicemail on both. I'm still trying.

Vanda: [inaudible]

Alan: She got me -- which proves the concept.

Cheryl: I see! Single example is now proof-of-concept! [laughter]

Alan: This hotel charges by the minute for 800 calls -- for toll-free calls. So I figured calling in they wouldn't be able to charge me.

Cheryl: That's incredible.

Alan: Or maybe they will. We'll see.

Heidi: Oh, I'm sure they'd charge you simply for lifting the phone off its recover.

Cheryl: I must say, I did have an experience where my telephone bill -- because of having to attend a board meeting while I was at another conference -- was actually higher than the whole of my day. Including my room!

I think that puts things into perspective for me -- why we need to make bigger dialouts.

Alan: I was in a number of different hotels when I was in Sri Lanka. One of them, the calls were virtually free. At that point, Internet access was all dialup, and I was on a lot. Then in the other one, my bill was significantly over my room rental fee every day.

Cheryl: [inaudible].

Alan: It depends on where they decide they can get the money.

Cheryl: Yes. That's not as if it's a reflection of the costs from carrier. That's profit-sharing at the hotel level, I'd assume.

Alan: Sure.

Well, both of them were Hiltons, but one of them was a Residence Hotel. Actually, no -- only one of them was a Hilton. One of the Hiltons was essentially a Residence Hotel. Their phone prices were almost nil. They weren't trying to make money out of that. That's what their business model was.

Cheryl: It's sad, anyway.

Okay -- if Heidi or someone could be so kind as to pop the agenda link for Skype. At least Skype is something that opens almost instantly on my computer.

Nick said that he will [electronic issues]

Alan: If that's me, I'll move my phone away.

Vanda: I have the agenda that everybody has.

Cheryl: Okay. From the top, then.

Alan: I have a hard cutoff of about an hour and a half.

Vanda: Yes. I have summary minutes, actions and items from 26th of June.

Cheryl: Yes. Now, regarding that, I thought that -- in fact -- what we had put into action then, after the ICANN meeting, with the somewhat ridiculous number of things that were in for [inadvertent] public comments has gone through its listings fairly well.

There is, however, a nagging thought in the back of my mind that we've missed something. Can anyone help me with what we've missed? Things maybe that we were close to tracking… But what have I missed?

Alan: We said we were going to have comments on three things. One is the interim report on the board review. Where we were going to say something to the effect of, "Don't reduce the size of the board."

Cheryl: Yes.

A: There was one on the expense analysis, where we were going to say, "Good, guys!"

And there was one on the systemization of organizational reviews. I don't know what we were going to say on that one.

I know I put the one in on expense analysis. I don't believe we made comments on the other two. I think they went to the ether.

Vanda: I sent some ideas for the board review some weeks ago. One week ago, I guess.

Alan: Well, Nick had drafted statements on all three.

Cheryl: Yes. [inaudible]

Vanda: And I sent some ideas from the board review.

Sébastien: There was a fourth one I was supposed to work on and I worked on. It's an IIC report. Unfortunately, the 1st of July was my target, and I sent the file to Nick. The file was empty, and I had to resend it.

It's now done. I had the chance to look at some e-mail yesterday morning -- 24 hours ago -- with Nick. I don't know. I just came back to my computer now for this call. I don't know if he sent it to the list or not.

In fact, it's the document with a column I added for ALAC that we already discussed. I added some new ones. It is sent to the special advisory working group member, and I hope it will be done in the next two weeks. Then we'll be able to go for discussion or [larger] discussions -- as soon as I'm back from Australia.

Cheryl: Okay. Fatimata -- thank you for joining us.

Fati: Thank you. Good morning, everybody.

Vs: Hello.

Cheryl: I hope all the trials and tribulations with your family -- and indeed the health of your eyes -- continues to improve. We do thank you for taking all this extra time and all the extra work we put you under.

Fatimata -- we were just looking at the summary minutes and action items from the meeting we had on the Friday -- the last day -- of the Sydney meeting. Just to bring you up-to-speed on that….

We basically sat down with staff and went through all of the for-comment -- for public commenting -- that were looming at us immediately after the ICANN meeting in Sydney.

Knowing that the community usually takes almost a fortnight to recover from this sort of thing, [we tried to] allocate which… just exactly as we do at a normal ALAC meeting… allocate which we were and were not going to intend to put something together, to go out for community review and comment.

We were just up to looking at what we managed and didn't manage to do.

Sébastien -- that would be great. I'm afraid I don't have my time course and my deadlines document open. So I'm going to have to ask either Heidi or Matthias to tell us… Is the plan for what Sébastien just outlined just pushing out the program by two weeks? Or do we need to ask -- or let whomever know -- that this will be a late entry?

Heidi: Yes. Are you looking at that?

Matthias: Yes. There's no date for when [complications] closed.

Cheryl: Great. Okay. So we're not in any risk of problem, there. That's fantastic.

With the other two, the systemization and the board review… What I saw before I went under the knife… What I saw from Nick, I felt, was a true and accurate representation of what we

had all said at the meeting -- and indeed, what we'd heard being said during the workshops and meetings that our members attended during the Sydney meeting.

Alan -- coming back to your point…

The EAG one has gone to the public moment list. Is that correct?

Alan: It has.

Cheryl: [I don't have it] on our list -- the At-Large list. But the other two haven't? Is that the case?

Alan: I have not checked them. I have not seen any indication that they were posted. But I haven't gone to check.

On mine, we need to have a vote started, however, to ratify.

Alan: Right.

Matthias -- while you've got the tracking document open -- are we still okay to put the other two out, based on today's meeting? Give the time starting for our At-Large list input -- and RALO and ALS input…   Then get a vote.

Then we'll need to tell whomever is collecting these things for ICANN that we will be 7 or 14 days delayed. But most importantly, Wendy can take what we needed to say on the board review directly. So can we…

Alan: My belief is that both of those comments were already closed.

Cheryl: That's what I said to Matthias. I thought we were already closed on those. Do we bother to ratify? Do we bother to try to get the ALACs to ratify? Or do we put them on the next agenda and ask the rest of the ALAC if they want to bother ratifying and send a piece of post-Sydney advice, along with what we said we were going to do? At the moment, I'm pleased to hear, for this discussion, that Wendy has asked the board what happens when the comment periods don't run while meetings are on. We thought was going to be the case.

All of this delayed in us hitting our targets on our commentaries -- that's for public comment. Because a heroic amount of things were starting immediately before the Sydney meeting -- and running through the Sydney meeting. We were going to write separately, and suggest that, "Gee -- this wasn't really smart. It certainly doesn't help." At least not from out here at the edges.

We maybe could integrate those comments on the systematization and organization review -- and the board -- into that statement. What do you feel about that?

Heidi: I'm happy to convey that. I thought we had also noted many times that we can give [votes] to the board at any time we like. Including [inaudible] for public commentary.

Cheryl: Yes. Absolutely.

Wendy: I think we can stop the process of ratification, because of the public commentary.

Cheryl: Yes. Thanks, Wendy. But it would really be good if the board could hear why this was an issue for us, this time round. We were getting huge pushbacks from the members of staff, in some cases, that were in charge in inverted [inaudible] -- of collating the public comments, when we were coming in even a few days late.

Wendy: But that was part of the reason why it's perhaps better to give separate advice to the board. The board never sees individual public comments. They do see -- and at least theoretically respond to -- advice to the board.

So if we want to highlight something -- Great, if we can get it into the staff summary of public comments. Even better if we can also send it out as comments direct to [ALAC advice].

Cheryl: Fantastic. I'm more than happy. I was one of those that were very happy to keep playing our special-purpose card.

Alan: With regard to those two statements that did not make it to the public comment period… I have comments to make on at least one of them. I didn't make them to our own private group when Nick posted it.

I was waiting for them to be posted to the ALAC list, to make comments. As far as I know, that never happened. So I am not prepared to say, "Just send out the statements Nick wrote."

Cheryl: Oh, no! I think Wendy's point was to not stop what we had planned, but to take the hiatus as an, "Oh, well -- never mind. We've missed the public comment closing. Continue on in our planning."

Alan: I'm not disagreeing. I'm saying that has to include the step of people actually commenting on it. Not just a private note from Nick.

Cheryl: Oh, yes. But please remember, it wasn't just a private note from Nick. It was the capturing of pretty much what we'd said.

I've got to also make -- I think -- on this call, very clear that… I want to support what Wendy has said, which is… We should also be ensuring that as an advisory committee, the board is hearing the voices that we are trying to transmit from our ALSs and RALOs in the most effective way possible. This probably means not perhaps only fitting into the public comment space, but using our direct reporting or advice to the board.

In this case, why not -- I'd like to propose -- attach the specifics of these comments. Including those that have already gone into public commentary -- in a synopsis. I think they're all fairly short this time, anyway.

To a specific piece of advice to the board on what we've done before, during and after Sydney -- in terms of comments and discussions. That allows us to refresh conversation on the IRT -- which is terribly relevant at the moment.

I don't know. I didn't manage to look at anything from New York. But I did spend a bit of time looking at London last night, because I was already on another working group call.

There's another important set of conversations that we probably need to try and encourage the ALAC to make firm statements on. So we need to perhaps have that as a discussion under "for decision," at the July meeting for the ALAC. To hopefully agree as a whole on us bundling a whole bunch of advice together -- and sending it in our normal way directly to the board. To ensure that the board gets to hear it as our voice -- rather than as one line -- if we're lucky -- in a synopsis.

Has that captured what you were saying, Wendy?

Wendy: Yes. We might even draw an example from the GAC communications. Where there's a routine of gathering the various things that the GAC has to say. Submitting them to the board, and having the board come to us. That's when that would be received and responded to.

Cheryl: Building on that, let's make sure then that this particular conversation we're having now is captured, and becomes part of the discussion and agenda for decisions at the ALAC meeting.

Alan: Then we need to get each of the draft statements we're making sent out to the ALAC list quickly.

Cheryl: Correct. Yes.

So can we all agree on doing it as a result of this meeting today?

Vs: Yes.

Cheryl: Okay.

Because you've got people on holiday and people traveling… And Vanda probably actually has a life, as well as her additional role of being me at the moment. Can we ask Matthias… Can you or Heidi or someone do that? Who's carrying the controller while Nick is away?

Alan: The two items were assigned to people. I don't remember whom they were assigned to.

Cheryl: Okay. Neither do I. But I've got a good excuse. So whomever they were assigned to…

Vanda: I can't do it.

Cheryl: Sébastien -- is it possible for… Did it go just to Nick? Or did it go to staff? You could perhaps just send it straight to the list.

Sébastien: My problem is that I have difficulty with my mail. When I use the mail, I don't want to… But I will resent the same I sent to Nick yesterday to staff. So staff can act on that. Okay.

Cheryl: Okay. And Matthias -- obviously -- make it really clear that this is Sébastien asking you to pass it on, et cetera, et cetera. That'd be great. Good!

All right -- what's next?

Well, in our action items, the other hugely important piece is one that we need to take out to the RALOs. But before we take it to the RALOs, I believe we need to have the agreement of the ALAC on the way forward, as we saw it -- with the involvement of the finance committee and all of us working together with the regional leaders. To look at travel -- using the Seoul travel and funding models. I know that I did see them. I haven't really analyzed them but hoping that Alan has. We now have information from ICANN on costs and predictive values to use as costs.

To see whether or not we can come up with some hard proposals as to how the community at the regional level can best be involved in ensuring funding for regional meetings. Hence -- within the fiduciary controls that the CFO wants us to work with…

Alan: Forgive me for interrupting, Cheryl… is this item on our agenda?

Cheryl: It's the second part of action items from the 26th of June. Those were the only two things we did.

Alan: Okay.

Vanda: This is not [totally] expressed, but it's something that we decided to do after the last meeting on Friday.

Cheryl: Yes. I gather then… I only saw the values coming in. We don't need to go deeply into the analysis. We need to decide with this new data that [Steven] has given us… Are we now in a position to take it to the ALAC Budget & Finance Subcommittee and the ALAC, and then get the ALAC representatives in the regions to work with the regional leaders? Or do we need more or what?

Alan: Sorry -- I'm confused. I don't have my documents. They're at home. I didn't see any reference to this online.

Are we talking about what we're going to do with the money that was nominally allocated to the 10 RALO people at each ICANN meeting? And what other uses there are of it? Or is this something different?

Cheryl: Yes. It's that and how we can get regional general assemblies.

Vanda: In the same budget.

Cheryl: In a budget pre-perspective.

Alan: But we're talking about the money that was allocated with the name of RALO -- for RALO people at ICANN meetings. But we could choose to use it for something else. Okay.

Cheryl: If the regions disagree. Yes.

Vanda: They use it for regional meetings. That's the idea.

Cheryl: Yes.

Alan: If we don't want 10 RALO people at the ICANNs. If we want them there, then we can't spend the money [inaudible].

Vanda: Yes. It's the same money. It's important to know that it's the same money.

Cheryl: But Vanda and Alan -- what's really important is that [inaudible] having to… And Alan, I know you said [inaudible] even over coffee later… We have to keep remembering that it is the regions that need to make the decisions about the regional meetings.

Alan: I'm not debating how the decision is made. I just wanted to make sure that I know what money we're talking about.

Cheryl: Sure.

Alan: Thank you.

Cheryl: Just for this record here, it's really important. And [inaudible] -- we have a fixed budget. Kevin does understand that there is a huge and very important function that the general assembles -- that the regions -- can conduct in getting the policy work coming in from the ALSs and regions.

We have a bucket of money. We have to now help the regions in some way -- the regional leaders in some way -- across all the regions. Agree to how that bucket can or cannot be best [used] to meet the ALS needs.

Alan: Okay. Before we can do that, there's one additional bit of information, which you may or may not have. Or you may or may not remember.

Cheryl: That's what we [inaudible]

Alan: I met with Kevin on Saturday morning. You may remember -- before we went out.

Cheryl: Yes.

Alan: He got a bunch of information that was new to him at that point. At least I believe it was.

He was going to go back and check with a number of people. So I need to touch base with him first, to ask him and confirm… Is the money that they said we're getting the right money? Or did he realize mistakes were made and adjustments were to be made?

Heidi: This is Heidi.

Cheryl: Thanks, Heidi. Yes.

Heidi: I sent an e-mail yesterday with the estimates -- in consultation with Kevin, yesterday -- using the most current information that he had. This is the information he came up with. He included the two possible scenarios that I included in the e-mail I sent out to you yesterday.

Alan: I have not looked at that, yet.

Cheryl: Heidi, could you run us through that?

Heidi: Yes. I'll put this information into the Skype chat. Wendy -- we are trying to add you to the Skype chat, but we're seeing that you're not online.

Wendy: I am online. Wendy Seltzer.

Heidi: Could you take a look at that place, while I do this?

Cheryl: Yes.

You see, Wendy -- the major response from the regions, and obviously the ALSs… not particularly the voices of the regions… was that funding for general assemblies for the regions is a hugely important factor.

Of course, it's a factor that hasn't come into play in the current budgetary calculations. Alan -- hopefully by the sound of it -- has finally made the point a little bit clearer in Kevin's mind, from Sydney. That in fact…

Wendy: I'm sorry to interrupt. Is the general assembly different from all of the members -- RALOs -- from a region joining the meeting when it is in their region?

Alan: That's one flavor of a general assembly. But it can also be held at an [APRICOT] meeting in Asia-Pacific or something like that.

Wendy: So this is reflecting a change from the budgeting that brought one member of every RALO to the meeting in their region before now the call for budgeting to be added back for [inaudible]?

Alan: Well, from Kevin's point of view, he was not aware that there had ever been a policy of bringing all the ALSs from a given region to a meeting that was held in their region. That was news to him.

Cheryl: That thing dropped off the budget [inaudible].

Alan: From his point of view, it wasn't that they dropped funding for people within a region to get together once a year. Whether at an ICANN meeting or not. It was that it had never been there.

Nick: I would note that…

Cheryl: Oh, hello, Nick!

Nick: He had been acquainted with that many terms.

I'm sorry that I'm late.

Alan: I was giving you his state of mind at 8.00 in the morning on a Saturday after ICANN. Whether he had been exposed to the information prior to that or not, I am not commenting.

Nick: No, no. I'm not sure that any of us would know our own names at that particular time and date.

Sorry I'm late, but it was my best friend's 60th birthday, and they started the cake-cutting process at 5 minutes to 10.   The cake actually got cut at 20 minutes past 10.

Cheryl: Whoa!

Nick: Yes. So they're still down there, and I'm up here with you all.

Cheryl: Oh, thank you, Nick. We do know that's above and beyond the call of duty, but I'm sure they'll save you a slice of cake.

Nick: Yes. It's enormous. I'm sure there'll be plenty.

Cheryl: [laughter].

Yes -- so, Wendy, you see what we've been arguing? As you can hear almost tirelessly, in fact, we've lost out significantly. This is unfair, if you're trying to build ALS and regional involvement.

Alan: I made the case. He claimed he hadn't been quite aware of it in those terms. I gather from Heidi's note, just very briefly looking at it… We are not seeing any change in this budget year. To be honest, I don't expect to see any budget change.

But I will be checking with him to see whether he's confirmed that such regional meetings did exist before, and it wasn't just a figment of my imagination.

ALAC has made many statements about [inaudible] through the general assembly, to the board.

Alan: But Kevin hasn't read those statements, necessarily.

Cheryl: Yes.

Alan: They were talking about the segmentation of duties.

Cheryl: Yes. This is another one of those examples where we don't want to be seen as just bleating about travel. We're trying to link it to productivity and overcome. For the purposes of this current budget exercise, what we were able to do with Kevin and Steve

Antonov at the [inaudible] meeting on Friday… We [trimmed] all of that at 7.30 or 7.45, if memory serves.

If we can get meaningful figures -- figures that ICANN is using -- in terms of what it costs to travel, then we could do some financial extrapolation and hopefully assist the regions and the regional leaders to look at "Money Bucket equals X. How would you regions like to use this?"

Continuing to send 8 as opposed to 10 -- which is an interesting concept, in itself -- regional leaders. Or do they get saved up once or twice and then it rotates through? How do the regions want to approach it?

Have I made that clear, Alan? Or have I totally confused the issue?

Alan: I understand, at this point, that we need to take whatever number it is that we can realistically expect to spend this year on non-ALAC travel, and put it up to the ALAC and the RALOs and whomever they choose to consult with. To try to make a decision on how we spend that money.

In parallel with that, we need to reinforce -- again -- that we have lost money, and we would like a rationale for why we lost it, and what we need to do to get it back. Is that a reasonable summary?

Cheryl: Yes. But I'm fearful that we'd get a bit forest-and-trees, here. Wendy -- you're a bit fresher to this current debate. Are we making sense?

Wendy: What I'm hearing is a request that not just ALAC, but specifically, the regions, be given allocation control over a portion of the money that's budgeted for At-Large activities. So that they can host regional general assemblies.

Nick: That ability already exists.

Cheryl: In theory.

Nick: Yes. There's no problem with changing the way it's allocated. The problem is how much is required, in order to have a general assembly for each region every year.

Cheryl: Yes.

Wendy: So it's news to me at least that the regions have control over allocations. Or that the ALAC even has enough control over allocation to permit the regions to [inaudible].

Alan: I don't think that's really very new. Certainly, if you look at how gNSO meeting has been spent for the last meeting, there's been some flexibility whether it's counselors who go -- or other members of the gNSO community. Currently at this last set of meetings, Kevin has made it clear that if we choose to…

If North American region -- as an example -- because I remember both names -- chooses to say that Evan and Darlene are not going to ICANN meetings, but we want to take the money that would've funded their travel and put it to fund a small general assembly in Wichita… I

think we would be allowed to do that. To put specific names and terms on what we're talking about.

Fatimata: Are we allowed to do that, Alan?

Alan: I believe that what Kevin is saying is, we have the flexibility of using that money. Similarly, if we said only 10 ALAC members need to come to every ICANN meeting, we could take the other 5's money and put it into something. I don't think that's a rational way of doing it, but I think we would have the privilege to do that.

Cheryl: Fatimata, this is where we were in our conversation with Kevin and Steve in Sydney. We got this far, to say that if there is a case, can we have a say? And can we help the regions to have a say in how that cake will be distributed?

They seem to indicate that that was palatable to them. But then of course the big question came up of how much money you use when you calculate. It's that figure of USD1,500. Is that correct, Heidi? We now have the scenarios.

So -- General Assemblies and Regional Meetings… According to an analysis of costing, it works out to about 1.5K per meeting. Kevin provided via Heidi two possible scenarios, where we now can look at options.

Heidi: Exactly.

Cheryl: Now, Kevin has made himself available to talk to us on this call. I'm not terribly certain with the hard stops that so many of us have whether that's going to be a best use of all of our time. But I do see this as an opportunity for us to perhaps look at getting him on a call with not just us, but a single-topic call. But with less of a presentation and more of an ALAC-funding/At-Large funding-specific discussion on an ALAC and regional-wide call. Or is it too early to have [inaudible]

Alan: I would say to leave it in my hands for another week until I get back home. I can read the documents. I can talk to Kevin.

V: Hello?

Nick: Ellie -- I'm on the phone. Sorry.

Cheryl: Yes. So, okay -- but can we at least have this [inaudible] opposed to this exercise [inaudible] populate the agenda for the ALAC meeting? This topic now does need to be on the agenda for the ALAC meeting.

We'll try to have enough [inaudible] [crossing]

V: Hold on -- Cheryl -- we can't hear you.

Vanda: There's a lot of noise.

Cheryl: Sure is!

Okay! Hopefully the magic of the Adigo Operator's mute button has worked.

What I was suggesting, Alan -- okay… We leave it with you for another week or so.

Alan: When is the ALAC meeting?

Vs: 28th.

Alan: Okay. What I will do… Assuming Kevin is not on vacation… I will check with him to verify. I'm sure of what the answer is. That the funding we have for FY10 ain't gonna change.

Cheryl: Yes. That's right.

Alan: Verify with him whether he thinks they may have missed something, and therefore they need to make a correction for FY11. It's not clear what the answer is.

Take the data that Heidi has sent out. Reformat it in light of the two answers above. Then send it to the ALAC for discussion -- prior to or at the ALAC meeting on the 28th. Is that reasonable?

Cheryl: Yes.

Alan: Do any staff people know if Kevin is in next week?

Wendy: I'm pretty sure. I can go ahead and contact him now and find out.

Alan: Whatever will be will be. So it might not matter.

Cheryl: Then probably also we need to look at at least the finance and budget subcommittee, and get some doodling options done. Wendy -- I'd really like to see that you keep a close eye on this, as well. Because we're going to need a direct input into the board on someone being able to tell the board what we're struggling with, and why we're struggling with it -- and see if we can get some possible dates to then discuss at the ALAC meeting. So they can go out and we can get as much regional input in as short a time as possible.

Or is that [too soon, Alan]?

Alan: The regional input is for FY10. Is that not correct?

Cheryl: Correct.

Alan: I'd put money on the fact that the amount of money in the process is what we know about. With Heidi's numbers, I don't think presenting the issue to the regions is going to be problematic.

Cheryl: Okay. Well, do we not just run with that, then?

Alan: I want to hear directly from Kevin that indeed, that what it is is what it is. Other than that, I don't think it's a problem.

Heidi: I just heard from Kevin. This is Heidi. He is going to be in at work for the next two weeks. He again said any time he'd talk with you.

Alan: Once I talk with him briefly, some subset of this group needs to confirm that we go ahead with what we just discussed.

Cheryl: Okay. All right.

Now the other thing under this travel topic for the ALAC meeting is a review on what we discussed in looking forward to Seoul. That's working specifically with Steve Antonov. We've got a whole listing here of things we raised -- and some action items that may indeed need to come out of those.

I haven't done a damned thing on any of that, obviously. But we do need to start working with Steve on this Seoul travel as soon as possible. I've noted that a number of other parts of the ICANN community are already [well and surely] booked in travel. So we need to just crosscheck where we need to be, based on the 15-plus-10-plus-NonCom.

Now, Heidi -- did our current database go across to Steve, or not?

Heidi: No. Not yet. We need to have information besides the ALAC of who is going to be attending. I will, of course, prepare the ALAC information. I can go ahead and do that.

Cheryl: Well accepting you've got the regional leaders who are currently incumbent won't be changing…

Alan: If we decide to put the money into…

Cheryl: [inaudible] they would change at the end of Seoul, in some cases.

Alan: Assuming we are continuing to use the money that we've been talking about for the last half hour.

Heidi: Yes.

Alan: To send regional people to ICANN meetings.

Cheryl: Yes. Chicken-and-egg. I agree. Okay.

Heidi: The logic that's in that.

Cheryl: Yes. That's another reason we need to review with the ALAC what we discussed with Steve -- so that we can get that information. [inaudible]

Vanda: Cheryl?

Cheryl: Yes, Vanda.

Vanda: Excuse me, but I just need a bit about… What do we expect from the regional leaders?

Cheryl: Thanks, Fatimata.

With the question on whether or not the regions would like to reorganize the bucket of money. It currently takes regional leaders to the ALAC meetings. To in some way allow them to run a regional general assembly or not needs to be…

Fatimata: A regional [inaudible] meeting.

Cheryl: Yes. It needs to be discussed before we can then give Steve Antonov our list for travelers for Seoul, that goes beyond ALAC. We know the ALAC will be going. At the moment, we would be saying the ALAC-plus-10 regional leaders and NonComs. By "NonCom," we mean the appointment to the ALAC from the NonCom process going on now.

So, whoever -- for example -- replaces you as a NonCom appointee from the African region. We argued with Steve and Kevin that for transitions -- at the Seoul meeting -- not only do you need to be funded to go, but also whoever is taking your place needs to be funded to go.

Sébastien: Do we include if they are so, the elected ones who will replace at the end of the Seoul meeting?

Alan: They have always been funded out of some budget or another. My understanding is that there is an allocation in the NonCom budget. If nothing else, for that. Nick can confirm.

Cheryl: Nick's probably on mute, because he's at a party there.

Alan: My understanding is the ICANN process allows for those people -- assuming they can get visas and such -- to come. If they don't, it would be totally ridiculous.

Now, whether it comes -- in fact -- out of our own budget, I don't know that.

Cheryl: The answer is yes [inaudible]

Vanda: I'm [not] sure that they have a NonCom budget for that.

Alan: Well, I don't know. It would be nice. We need to ask the question. I will put it on my list.

Cheryl: How about while we're having this conversation… Heidi -- you're still in contact with Kevin. Can he just drop in for five minutes and answer this question? We promise not to drag him back to the murky waters of the Sydney world, and the torturous conversations.

Alan: Kevin already answered the question. We asked it at our Friday meeting. He said there is enough of a fudge factor in the various travel budgets that bringing the new NonCom people to a meeting is one of the things they use the excess for.

Cheryl: Okay. Well, in that case…

Alan: He explicitly answered that question.

Cheryl: In that case, [he did].

Sébastien: Just to tell you my deep thoughts about this travel issue -- I will support what is said by us collectively.

But I still think that both general assembly and the other regional leaders from the RALO must come to each and every ICANN meeting.

Alan: Sébastien -- that's what we said in our last statement. But now we're talking about, "What do we do this year when we don't have that?"

Sébastien: Yes. It's just be sure that the… Okay… If we say it like that, I agree on that.

Alan: We have said it in every statement we've made, recently. And we've said it pretty clearly.

Cheryl: Yes.

While Wendy's here in this conversation and she's -- I think -- hearing from a different perspective what we keep bleating about… Why we keep bleating about it is because the CFO and the budgetary process that he's working on have dropped off some of our previous amounts of their spectrum of data. It's pretty important -- as far as I'm concerned -- that the board knows why we're carrying on about this stuff.

Heidi's just reminding me that Kevin is available if we want him. Final question is, "Do we want him?" Yes or no -- now.

Alan: I think we have some other things to talk about before this meeting ends that we need to get to.

Cheryl: Excellent. Okay. Does everyone else agree?

V: Yes.

Cheryl: Okay. Thank you very much, Heidi. Tell him we'll get back to him.

Heidi: He says, "Thanks for everything."

Cheryl: Tell him not to be too hasty to thank us.

Nick: Yes. Be careful what you say.

Heidi: Thank you.

Cheryl: But tell him I was laughing at the time. I wasn't snarling, for once. [laughter]

Okay. All right -- so we need to make sure that we have a reasonable amount of time to have this conversation about travel and travel funding, in two parts, in the next ALAC meeting.

The higher-level travel-funding regional input -- to discuss and decide how funds may or may not be allocated across regions -- et cetera, et cetera. That's going to take a bit of time, but then will need to be cut out to a single-purpose call. I'm pretty keen that we'd prep up for some -- at least those who've already been tasked by the ALAC -- to look into greater detail with this. That would be the Budget & Finance Committee and the regional leaders. Then see what happens.

Alan: There's one more item we haven't discussed that needs to be raised. When we appointed our current liaisons -- specifically the IDN and ccNSO liaisons -- the candidates specifically said they do not need travel funding for this year.

They took the position under those conditions.

Cheryl: True.

Alan: Are we maintaining that for the Seoul meeting? It might change with new liaisons. We may have to rethink that. But can we assume -- for the Seoul meeting, in any case -- we are not attempting or planning to fund those positions?

Or do we want to allocate money toward that?

Sébastien: It will depend. It's difficult to point to one of those. It's a global picture we need.

For example -- Europe is just one of the two. Cheryl and I forget whom.

Alan: No -- I'm talking only about the liaisons.

Sébastien: Let me finish my sentence, Alan. If there is just one, we think it's not bad to have our ccNSO liaison, if there needs to be supported travel from Europe. It's good also for Europe. It's not just good for the liaison at ccNSO.

Alan: And that's a decision that your RALO can make. The question is, "Is ALAC exclusively funding them?" I'm suggesting that for this coming meeting, we maintain the policy that was in place when they accepted the appointments.

That doesn't mean the money doesn't come from somewhere else.

Sébastien: I think it would be important, anyway. I don't know where the money will come from. But it's important to have our idea and liaison in Seoul.

Alan: I believe both the IDN liaison -- someone correct me if I'm wrong -- and the ccNSO liaison -- accepted the position knowing that it's not funded.

Cheryl: That is definitely…

Alan: It certainly was true for the ccNSO.

Sébastien: Yes. But knowing that it was not funded, they did not say that they would agree to fund themselves [inaudible].

Alan: No -- I think it did.

Remember -- at that point, we were debating whether the liaison should be an ALAC member or not.

Sébastien: Yes. But…

Alan: Rude, in specific, said he did not need any external funding.;

Cheryl: Yes.

Alan: I don't know about the IDN liaison.

Sébastien: I think we need to have them, anyway. I don't care how it's funded. But if they can't fund themselves, we need to have it included in our list.

Cheryl: That's what Alan is basically saying. He is saying that up until the discussion right now, at least I've been telling the IDN liaison that he is not an assured traveler. And that the ccNSO liaison did state that he would not require funding out of the At-Large and ALAC budgets.

But for this year, do we need to make that up for review again, knowing that things have changed, worldwide? Is that not the question you were asking?

Or were you proposing, Alan, that we do not change that?

Alan: I'm suggesting that for the Seoul meeting. That's the last meeting of the current appointments. That we manage our budgets according to what they committed to when they took the jobs.

Before we appoint new liaisons, we need to review whether we have funding available for them.

Wendy: We have to have support for them. Yes.

Alan: Or make it available to a non-ALAC member only if they have self-funding.

Vanda: Yes.

Alan: Which is what we did at our last several meetings.

Cheryl: So Sébastien -- do you see what Alan's getting at?

Sébastien: Yes. I understand. The discussion is always complicated. But at the end of the day, my feeling is that we need to have those two liaisons participating.

We may not change our [permissions], but at the same time, if they are not able to fund themselves, then we need to fund them.

Alan: But Sébastien, we're all agreeing on that. The assumption is that when someone's appointed, they will be at the three ICANN meetings. If they now say their own position has changed -- they changed jobs and their employer that they had planned on funding it will not do it any more… then we'll have to react.

Cheryl: That may mean a [revised] future model. If we go with… Depending on what happens with the future budgets… We need to have the answer to, "Are the liaisons included or not?" If they're not in the future model, an inability to get there may mean that your ability to continue in the role needs to be assessed.

No performance inability other than being at an ICANN meeting is hugely important for your activity as a liaison.

Alan: We've always said that. That's not changed from before. The only reason this go-round that we have non-ALAC members in these positions is because they said they'd accept the limitations.

Cheryl: [They could self-fund]. That's right.

Alan: Yes.

Okay -- you'll all see the draft of what I send out a day or so before I plan to send it out to the committee. So if I say anything stupid, they'll tell me.

Cheryl: [laughter] Absolutely!

Now, guys -- I'm thinking we're going to need to have at least 20 minutes on each of these items. Or am I looking at 15 for the agenda? What do you think?

Alan: Are you talking about the ALAC agenda, now?

Cheryl: Yes.

Alan: Sorry. I thought you might be talking about today's agenda.

Cheryl: Oh, no.

Vanda: [inaudible]

Cheryl: 15 or 20? What do you think, guys?

Alan: For each of which items? Sorry -- I'm not trying to be obtuse.

Cheryl: One is the comments. Let's look from the top.

On the comments system -- which is what we discussed -- I think allowing 10 minutes for that is fine. On the travel guidelines, there is a huge amount to bring the committee up-to-speed on. I think we need at least 15 or 20 minutes on the travel guidelines.

Alan: 20 minutes.

Vanda: At least 20. Yes.

Alan: Okay.

Cheryl: Yes. And then a second 15 or 20 for the specifics about the Seoul travel. Or am I being too generous there?

Alan: I think you're being too generous.

Wendy: Yes. I think policy is far more important for the discussions.

Cheryl: Well we'd all like to think that, Wendy. But we're still struggling to get the rest of the ALAC [past it].

Alan: Why don't you allocate 30 minutes for the whole thing, and then we'll shrink if necessary, based on the total of the agenda.

Cheryl: All right. 30 for the whole thing. Okey dokey.

Let's try to keep on track. I live in hope and will probably die in despair.

We've kind of been doing the policy-advice-development calendar as we go. We've made a couple of changes to that through today's meeting.

Are we needing to shift any of these others or not?

Alan: There's a whole new bunch of things out for comment that we haven't looked at.

Nick: Those, by the way… The new things that have come out… I don't know if Matthias sent them today or not. I asked him to, as you directed, tell the relevant working groups about the consultations. And of the need to provide proper responses.

Alan: We're one hour into this meeting, and I have to leave in a half-hour.

Cheryl: Yes. [inaudible] along.

Alan: Sorry. I just don't want… I've been the brunt of some rather strong mail. Some of which none of you have seen in the last week. On ExCom -- driven by the position-description document. I demand that we talk about it before I leave today.

Nick: I would note that the elections process… You will shortly be unable to use any process other than the current one.

Cheryl: Well, that has to happen.

Now can we just say that for the agenda on the policy-advice-development calendar, we will simply be just like we look at the ALS progression document… We will just be looking at the advice-development-calendar document. Let's give it 10 minutes or 7 minutes, this time. But

in the future, the aim is to have this meeting as an extremely useful tracking document -- doing what we're reading into our public comment or not.

We will discuss the facts that -- as Wendy is advising us -- we also need to bring things directly to the board in our normal fashion. Because that is a [inaudible] imparting to the board that the fact that some of these points are very much specific "At-Large" points of view that we are bringing to them. Not directly into the [queue of] public comment period.

That will have already had a healthy discussion at our next agenda or meeting. So we shouldn't need to put too much more time other than to maybe ask what sort of yea or neigh mechanism to get something into our policy-advice-development calendar we can use that is list-based -- rather than engine-spaced. Is that not reasonable?

Alan: You want it list-based rather than…?

Cheryl: I just meant we decide at an ALAC meeting -- once a month. We decide what we're going to comment on. That's often too little, too late. Or with too short a time to follow-up.

One of the advantages now -- at least since the Sydney meeting… the community's been able to see the policy-advice-development calendar working. That tool in itself tracks on a set of dates as key milestone dates.

Once we decide we're going to make a statement on something, I wouldn't mind at the next ALAC meeting having a short conversation about how we get something on that process. How it gets to be a "yes," or a "no," for us to comment on. [inaudible] is not working.

Nick: I thought you had wanted that when a public-comment period opened, the relevant group would be notified, and asked to produce a statement and advice of the timelines.

Alan: If there is a relevant [group].

Cheryl: That is what we want. But the ALAC hasn't ratified that.

Nick: That's why I guess that's what I'm saying… That is another question to be put, basically.

Cheryl: Yes. How we do that.

This is also going to be something, Alan, that means whomever the ALAC lead is in any working group is going to have to own that piece of work. They're going to have to come back to us -- come back to our internal list or whatever. To our working list. To say, "The working group does not believe we need to make a statement," or, "The working group does believe we need to make a statement. What does the rest of the ALAC think?"

Alan: I have no problem with that.

Cheryl: Okay. So -- 5 to 10 minutes on that. Fantastic.

Getting to the important stuff -- which is where we need to be…

The ALAC member position description and the electoral process for liaisons. Alan -- do you want to bring in the general vilification issues of why, in fact, we are all incredibly foolish individuals and why we're all wondering why we're here at all? I suspect you, in particular, by the sounds of things. Before we get to Items 3 and 4. Or do you want to leave it with them?

Alan: I don't want to discuss the issue of, "Should we have an ExCom, and what we're going to do with these evil bastards."

Exclude my language.

Cheryl: Well, no -- I'm planning on just wearing the rest of the evil bastards down by surviving. But that's just my view. [laughter]

Nick: I can tell you my conversations with Evan and Darlene on the subject. Their basic positions as -- I think Evan and Darlene are both sort of [inaudible]… They both acknowledged that the idea wasn't really… It sounded like it, but it wasn't their objective to shoot the members of the ExCom for doing lots of work.

They wanted to see ALAC -- as a whole -- become more engaged. So that it wasn't necessary to have such meetings in order for things to get done. That's why you see them push and say to others… "Look -- we do need to have position descriptions, and we do need to have some process of deciding whether or not people are pulling their weight or not." That turned into -- it seemed like -- a reasonably productive discussion, after [inaudible].

Alan: That's why we can expand the ExCom or do whatever we want. If the issue is to get work done, we've got to get people working. That's why -- although I've slipped up on the whole performance-indicator stuff -- I think we need to get this done, and we need to get it done very quickly. That's why I said I don't want to have a discussion right now on the ExCom.

Cheryl: No. Okay.

So let's leap into [inaudible] position description.

Alan: Nick drafted a good document. I made a bunch of comments on it today. I don't know if anyone has seen them, yet.

Cheryl: I haven't.

Alan: I can summarize them. I can go through my document -- they're in red -- and I will tell you what they said.

The first point was on the issue of language. Nick used words which may have been from a previous document, saying… "We hold meetings in three languages. But people need English, because the rest of ICANN works in English."

Nick: By the way -- I heavily plagiarized this from NonCom documents.

Alan: That's fine.

Nick: So I can't [inaudible]

Alan: I would suggest we replace that completely. The ALAC Working Group Report -- the ALAC Review Report -- says… And I quote, verbatim… The working group also recognizes that at the present time, it is essential that members of ALAC have proficiency in written and spoken English -- to allow the committee to function effectively.

I think the position description must reflect that.

Cheryl: [I'd say the same].

Alan: I believe it does not make any reference to us operating in three languages in our meetings. If we choose to in the interim basis, we can. But we certainly shouldn't set expectations that we are. Because operating in three languages is exactly what's gotten us to the point -- or one of the things that got us to the point -- of not being functional.

Cheryl: Yes.

Vanda: Yes.

Nick: I can admit to coming up with that sentence.

Alan: I understand.

Cheryl: Ah -- well -- that [inaudible] Nick -- you get shot along with the rest of us then, my dear. Sorry about that.

Alan: Now the fact that the rest of ICANN also operates in English, we can also add. But I'd like the position description to reflect what the ALAC Review says -- and what the board has now approved.

Nick: [Right].

Alan: So this is now a formal board position, and all we're doing is reflecting it. We are not making policy. We are simply echoing it.

Cheryl: Yes. Hugely important. And of course, we always need to go out and try to encourage at least ICANN, if it's going to be using something giving lip service to being a globally representative model to work in five UN languages, wherever possible.

Alan: We need all sorts of translation and interpretation facilities. But that's a different issue.

Nick: Which the At-Large Review did also emphasize.

Cheryl: Yes.

Alan: Say that again?

Nick: Which the At-large Review working group report did emphasize.

Alan: And we supported innumerable times.

Cheryl: But we just don't need to have babies tossed out with bathwater on this.

Alan: Then the next point I made was on the time commitment. I believe we need a section that says, as other groups have said in their documents, that the time commitment we're talking about is over and above the ICANN meetings.

Cheryl: Oh, yes.

Vanda: Yes.

Cheryl: Significantly over.

Alan: I moved something up that Nick had later. And I also changed the wording. You can look at it when you look at the document.

For the RALO appointed people -- they are expected to participated in the RALO activities.

Cheryl: Yes.

Alan: I think that's a given.

I made it optional for the NonCom-appointed people.

Cheryl: I'd like to strongly encourage them all. To encourage whatever.

Alan: I would support that.

Cheryl: Yes. One would see better functionality out of the regions where NonCom- and RALO-appointed people are actively involved in the regional activities.

Alan: I completely support it. I just don't want to be in a position to say it's mandatory.

Cheryl: Sure. Understood. But we should also make sure that we're telling people -- particularly those coming in from NonCom -- that it's a high expectation.

Alan: We need to tell the NonComs that, so they put it in their expectations.

Cheryl: Yes.

Alan: If someone is appointed on behalf of Asia-Pacific, that person knows they are supposed to be working with the existing Asia-Pacific group -- which is not said at all, right now.

Cheryl: That's right.

Alan: The next thing I added is the statement that teleconferences include participants from all regions. It is inevitable that some people would have these calls during working hours. Some of them will have calls early-morning or in the evenings.

Vanda: Yes.

Alan: Although we will do our best to maintain flexibility, this is an expectation. People have to be able to have calls at specific hours. Given reasonable advance notice, and the understanding that not everyone can always attend.

My next comment was on the statements of what we expect people to do. That is to actively attend all teleconferences, for instance. Or the one on voting.

I would suggest we do not put in this document what the amount is that we allow to be forgiven.

Cheryl: Right.

Alan: Number 1 -- it sets the expectation that it's okay to skip a third of them.

Cheryl: Well that's a good point, Alan.

Alan: That doesn't mean we can't have something in red or pink or whatever in our reports. All we're saying is that we expect people to participate.

Of course, we all have lives and businesses. We all have reasons that we can't attend on occasion. That's understandable.

Cheryl: Sorry -- a little bit of background noise from me at the moment. I will try to keep it as quiet as possible, but I'm using a headset that doesn't have a mute button on it.

Fatimata -- AFRALO has gone through a very productive and important set of discussions at the moment. Would you care to bring the rest of the team up-to-speed on how you've all been progressing with the pinks, reds and warnings on meeting expectations?

Or if Fatimata's on mute -- perhaps Heidi?

Heidi: Let me just confirm with Adigo if Fatimata is still there.

Cheryl: Okay.

It's just that when you were talking about the color-coding, Alan… I thought it was important that we note that the regions… Some of the regions themselves are going through performance criteria development processes. In the case of AFRALO, rather than the ongoing color-coding on our statistics for ALAC members, AFRALO would have been discussing a set of almost colored cards. It's a little bit like being on a football field.

So it seem to me that what you're saying would be strongly supported. To not set minimums in the document, but to have a system where you're "falling below" agreed expectations.

Alan: Yes.

Remember -- for the RALO-appointed people, the real issue is for the RALOs to take action if their people are not performing.

Cheryl: And therefore the RALOs need to be able to find that out easily.

Alan: Yes. That's going to come partly from quantitative things and partly from word-of-mouth and a whole bunch of other measures.

Cheryl: There's a whole lot more to attending an ALAC meeting than simply having your name marked off the roll, as we all know.

Alan: You bet! Especially since at one point, we said all you have to do is be there at the beginning and it's okay to drop off.

Cheryl: Yes. Which is not.

Alan: My next substantive point is… We have a statement saying that everyone must lead or help to lead a working group.

Cheryl: Yes.

Alan: I don't think we necessarily have enough working groups to do that. It doesn't factor in other ICANN activities outside of the ALAC.

Cheryl: [inaudible]

Alan: I would like to say something far more generic. People have to participate in ALAC and other ICANN working groups, and take a lead position -- that's very non-specific -- in at least one.

Cheryl: Okay… Alan…

Alan: Again, it's harder to measure, but more reflecting what we want.

Cheryl: I hear where you're coming from. To some extent, our policy-development document -- where it lists the non-internal-to-ALAC working group that members are a part of -- is starting to introduce that concept.

I am concerned, however, that we make some effort to ensure in our job description that it is not just a matter of being in every gNSO or ccNSO or who knows what SO working group that you can poke a stick at. You are here as an ALAC member, and you need to be involved in an ALAC workgroup, as well. Otherwise, we're just going to encourage self-promotional activities for people that want to become NonCom appointees to the board of a gNSO council.

Alan: It's certainly true that simply membership in a working group is worth zero. All you have to do is put yourself on 100 mailing lists and say you participate in 100 mailing list working groups.

We need to refine the words.

Cheryl: Yes. I'd like to measure this. This clearly quantifies. I'd still like the expectation that we should never have an ALAC work group that doesn't have at least one -- and there could be more than one -- active lead from the ALAC who's acting as a conduit between the ALSs and the regional activities that are going into that process, and our committee.

Alan: Just for the record… I didn't rewrite that section. I have a comment in square brackets afterwards -- saying that, "I think this is what needs to be factored into it when it does get rewritten." So I don't disagree with what you're saying, at all.

Again, in the voting… I would remove, "You must participate in ¾." For the same reason that I did the meetings participation.

There's another thing that says you have to read and comment on At-Large's mailing lists -- ALAC and At-Large.

Vanda: [inaudible]

Alan: Nick had a relatively large section on participation in monthly teleconferences. I already put it up at the top under, "Time Commitment." I don't think we can omit it. But I think this one could probably be toned down or reduced a little bit, just so we don't have the same words twice.

Again, I didn't try to reword.

There's a section I never heard of, before. Maybe I was asleep that week…

We are recommending that we have recommended to the nominating committee that previous and current ALAC members and members of the interim ALAC should not apply. And that people who are doing other things in ALAC are not good candidates for the ALAC.

That says Adam, Vanda and I shouldn't been here -- to begin with.

Vanda: Yes.

Alan: And we don't want anyone else who understands the ICANN culture and knows how it works.

Vanda: Yes.

Cheryl: [laughter]

Alan: I'll be glad to leave. If that's what we really want, I'll be glad to step down. So you don't have to worry about that one.

Cheryl: That's certainly not what I particularly want. [inaudible]

Alan: I don't think we've ever made that decision. If we did, then I missed it.

Cheryl: We did make that decision. But in the various rules, there are a couple of… And if you had a particular position, then you shouldn't be coming in as a NonCom person or something.

Alan: You can't hold positions concurrently, perhaps. And we might want to suggest time limits -- which we haven't, in the past. And there aren't any, at the moment.

Currently you cannot be a gNSO counselor and an ALAC member at the same time. Things like that. But saying you can't apply for it if you're not going to be leaving the other position -- or you can't apply for it even if you're leaving the other position -- is not something I would support. The committee may vote for it, but I wouldn't support it.

Again -- I've written all of this. You can read it at your leisure. That was the last comment.

Cheryl: Okay. Discussion on that last comment?

Okay. I'm clearly biased.

Alan: It says the ALAC has asked the NonCom to give preference to new people -- not old farts.

Cheryl: Well, excepting that I don't think we've ever done that.

Alan: Well, I don't think either! That's why I was asking!

Cheryl: In some cases, we've done the exact opposite.

Vanda: I believe we should look for new people, but not allow people that have no knowledge about it. I don't know. It's completely against the idea of having ALAC [stronger].

Alan: All of the other positions I gave -- except the language ones -- are my personal opinions. I'm happy to make them again if this is posted in a public sense. I believe the one on language, and I believe this one on good NonCom appointees needs to be fixed before we release this for public [comments].

Cheryl: Yes. I agree with that.

Sébastien? What are your thoughts?

Sébastien: I think that the comments made my Alan are good. Just to make a short answer to the last comment… I would still put my name into the nominating committee. Even if ALAC says that incumbent ALAC members will not be able to be nominated by the nominating committee.

I think we need to leave the nominating committee some way to choose. The way to choose is to have names. If they don't have names, they will not be able to choose.

At the end of the day, we can say something. Unfortunately, sometimes new people are not good -- and sometimes very good. But we need to have a way of finding the good people.

For example, I think the way we elected Veronica was just a very painful discussion within EURALO. But at the end of the day, she was a very good candidate. We were very fortunate to have her for one year. Not enough, but…

At the same time, some nominating committee people are not useful at all. Yes -- we need to leave the nominating committee some…

Alan: I agree completely. I think our job is to write a good job description, and let the nominating committee do their jobs.

Cheryl: [inaudible]

Nick: I have heard it said that the nominating committee should be encouraged to appoint people that are new, rather than incumbents, on the basis that someone who is an incumbent can get elected by their region. Whereas, it is less easy for people who are new to find a root.

Alan: That's a good guideline for the nominating committee.

Cheryl: Yes.

Alan: I don't think we even asked for it.

Sébastien: Sorry -- but that's not the truth. It could be. But it was not the truth. Once again -- Veronica was coming from nowhere, and she'd catch a bus to go to the ALAC. I'm not sure that she will be able to do that through the nominating committee.

So I disagree with this [inaudible]. It's not the truth.

Alan: I'm not sure that Vanda would have gotten appointed by the LACRALO.

Cheryl: Exactly! Yet the nominating committee -- I think -- needs… Nick… I here you say, "You've heard it said." But I'm not sure you've heard it said by the ALAC. If you have, certainly not as an official ALAC.

Nick: No, no. It's certainly not been said as an official ALAC statement. I've heard it said by a number of ALAC members.

Cheryl: Then those little mousse hiding in their specific little corners need to grow some balls and say it to the rest of us.

Alan: If nothing else, I do not believe -- as this statement says -- that the ALAC has asked the NonComs to give a clear preference. That at the very least, I believe, has to be [inaudible]

Nick: I'm not arguing in favor or not in favor. I'm just saying that that [inaudible].

Cheryl: I'll look forward to having a lineup of ALAC members that feel this way come forward and share it with at least these 5 people.

Alan: My preference is, this is a document on position description. "Eligibility for appointment by the nominating committee" -- I do not believe fits there. It could well fit in our advice to the NonCom, which they ask for every year and we don't normally give them in any formal way. But I don't believe it fits in the job description.

Vanda: Yes.

Cheryl: Yes. In fact, we have each year been asked by the NonCom if there's a particular thing that we're looking for. In some cases, it might be that we're in desperate need of an IP lawyer. I can't think of why, but that just came off the top of my head.

We can't always get [inaudible]

Nick: There are lots of them floating about.

Alan: And we can never have too many lawyers.

Cheryl: Apparently not. [laughter]

Alan: Nothing personal, Wendy.

Cheryl: Okay -- so we're just cutting that. I don't believe that it belongs as a position piece. If someone else disagrees, then at the ALAC and At-Large comments space of this, I look forward to then putting their name to a statement telling us different.

Alan: Given that this comes under the jurisdiction of performance-type stuff -- which I'm supposed to be doing… do we agree that I take Nick's statement and replace the language one?

Cheryl: Have a little [ply] and get back to us [inaudible]

Alan: Delete the other one -- the last section -- send it to this group quickly -- and then send it out for comments to the general people?

Cheryl: Sold.

Nick: Alan, as soon as we have a text, we can get it translated for you.

Alan: I will do my best to get it to you. I'm traveling over the next day or two, but I will do my best to get it to you by the very beginning of next week -- at the very latest.

Nick: Then we can send it off for translation.

Alan: I will do a Google translation if I have the energy. Just so people have a bad translation.

Vanda: I can do some translation of that [inaudible]

Cheryl: Good.

Alan: I'm down to four minutes.

Cheryl: I guess I'd really like to move to our last agenda.

Alan: In the chance I can find it on my computer.

Cheryl: Now, as a result of this meeting, I would like to start a call for nomination process. It's my intention that in these next few hours -- whether or not we finish our discussion in this formal call, or we agree to continue online -- I'd like to finish the discussion in this formal call, however… That we put a call for nominations out -- and that a proposal on the rationale for selecting theirs this time round… strongly reflects outcomes of what we assume are going to be the requirements for us to have At-Large-elected voting board members in the future.

With that preamble, we've got a document in front of us. Let's talk about it.

Wendy: As the incumbent liaison, this document makes zero sense to me.

Cheryl: Okay.

Wendy: I wanted to add that comment early.

Cheryl: Sure.

Wendy: Why are we imposing immensely bureaucratic procedures on appointing a liaison whose function is not that of a sitting board member?

Cheryl: Wendy, I can answer that question very easily. That was because of specific discussions between the Structural Improvements Committee members, the ALAC, and also a couple of those members that are also members of the ALAC Review Committee. [They asked] whether or not we could come up with a dry-run model to field-test this time on a mechanism that may -- in fact -- be considered in the future for the position, being a voting board member.

So that's the rationale. It's what we were asked to consider doing.

Wendy: The Structural Improvements Committee has not shared that discussion with the rest of the board.

Cheryl: Quite possibly. It was, "Do you think, ALAC, that you could come up with some concepts or not?" We said we'd try, and we have.

Wendy: Okay. Then I think that these are way over-complicated -- even for the election of a voting board member.

Cheryl: Okay.

Wendy: I think we are contributing to the sense that you need to enmesh yourself in layers of bureaucracy before you can be a useful contributor to ICANN -- rather than working to simplify things.

Cheryl: Understood.

Alan: Could I make a few comments before I drop out?

Cheryl: Obviously you've read this and you have some specific proposals that I was actually going to call for. Yes. Please go ahead, Alan.

Alan: Okay. I don't have specific proposals. I to some degree support what Wendy's saying. I think it is very complex.

Cheryl: Yes.

Alan: I also feel that by saying each RALO can only come up with one person -- and not specifying any particular process… Which I wouldn't want to see specified in other levels of complexity… But I think we may end up with popularity contests, which will essentially ignore all of the other qualifications we're putting there.

Cheryl: Yes.

Alan: Sorry -- I had to deal with something, here. I think it makes it a popularity contest. I think we'll end up getting the person that has the most clout -- or is the most-liked -- or whatever, selected.

Cheryl: Yes.

Alan: Look at the people that have been selected by the RALOs to the ALAC.

Cheryl: There are quality people.

Alan: There are similar cases.

Cheryl: [laughter]

Alan: We may end up with the right candidate not winning the popularity contest in their RALO, and therefore excluded from the process.

Cheryl: Yes.

Alan: I have a real worry about that.

Cheryl: I have a worry about the term, "Single Candidate." Yes.

Alan: In line with what Wendy said -- I understand this may be a dry run, but… Since it is a liaison position, we do need some words somewhere saying, "This person is expected to communicate and represent positions of At-Large and ALAC. If necessary, to the exclusion of their personal positions."

Cheryl: Yes.

Alan: This is a liaison position, and we can't forget that. This is not an independent board member.

Cheryl: Very true. Yes.

Alan: It's completely unclear from the wording I saw how the voting system prescribed interacts with the weighted voting system used by some of the regions -- or at least one other region. Maybe some.

That makes a major change.

Nick: Because each region is free to vote using its own rules and procedure.

Cheryl: Yes. Any way they want. It doesn't need to come to [inaudible].

Alan: But remember -- we have the first… So you're saying every time you do a tally, you do it according to the rules?

Maybe the description just needs to make it clear how that kicks in. I read it through and it didn't seem to make any sense, in light of the weighted voting. But maybe it does.

Overall, I don't think this is going to result in getting the best liaison. And almost certainly not necessarily a good board member. I think it will end up getting the least-objectionable of the candidates.

Cheryl: Yes.

Alan: But not necessarily the best.

Cheryl: Yes. I think it makes it a sorting of candidates. Obviously, it's one I'm familiar with. Because we have tablecloth-sized processes here every election that go through this. It certainly does manage to get a person who is clearly tied to those that appoint them.

I think we're very aware of how they've managed to get there, going through this process. But I think the critical thing is how you get the puddle of nominees in the first place. That's where -- at the regional level -- I have a problem of just a single candidate.

We may get to the point, regardless of what mechanism we apply on the top, at which choosing between shit and crap. I'd rather not have to necessarily limit that.

Well, this week, I can easily take my own position. I if decide I want to run for some position under this arcane set of rules, my own region may tell me I'm God walking on water, because I do so much. Or they may say something radically different -- as I think they would, this week.

Cheryl: Because you're [inaudible]

Alan: Because I've come out with some things that they disagree with violently.

Cheryl: Exactly.

Vanda: You work too much.

Alan: I don't think that changes whether I would be an absolutely rotten board member or an absolutely great one.

Cheryl: Yes.

Alan: But the popularity contest will come out differently this week than it would've last week.

Cheryl: Exactly. But you still have to have some method whereby the At-Large structures and the regions can bring not necessarily anybody who is --like you, me or Wendy -- obvious to the community, but people who may not be obvious to us at the ALAC.

I don't know what kind of skills are out in Africa. Africa should know what kind of skills are out in Africa.

There needs to be a way that as broader regional search goes on to target candidates. That's the critical part, from my perspective.

Alan: I know people are going to disagree. I know some people are going to disagree. But whether this is an ALAC liaison or whether we're talking about an At-Large board member, I don't think we want brand new people coming into this that aren't familiar with our overall processes and structure.

The NonCom has a responsibility of putting new people on the board. We're putting someone on that we know we can wake up… To use an expression that's used in English, anyway… To wake them up in the middle of the night, and have some idea of what their reaction would be. What their values are.

I think the important thing is selecting people whose values we understand. Not a new person that we've never heard of, before.

Cheryl: But Alan, where I was coming from is… There's a difference between those of us who are currently in a particular profile and those of us who have specific… Remember -- this is going to continue on. It's not just in this last couple of years. It's in the next few years that we need to think about it.

It may be that we could say, "We understand John Levine well enough. We understand [Pia Deniov] well enough. We understand a whole lot of people who are active within the ICANN, and not necessarily ALAC and At-Large current worlds." I wouldn't want to not have those sorts of names.

Alan: We're agreeing with each other on this.

Cheryl: [inaudible] and Carl again. Who knows? However these names come, I think that a good knowledge of not just ICANN, but of At-Large and ALAC is important -- if not essential.

Alan: Again, I don't think we can put this in the official document… But if you wanted me to make a list of good potential candidates -- for board liaison or board member -- I would take the sum total of all current and past ALAC members, and all current and past RALO leadership.

Then you could add in something else to capture Carl's position -- or something like that. And there are a few others. But I think that's the group of people we're looking at to pick from.

People who really understand what's going on. They understand the issues. They're familiar enough with ICANN.

Cheryl: You know, Alan, I couldn't agree with you more. But I want to see some of those names coming from Asia. I want to see some of those names coming from…

Fatimata: Yes. We know -- with ALAC. Specifically, regarding Africa. People have just started understanding what's going on in ICANN, ALAC and the like. If you put this in the policy that we don't want new people, it's going to be a problem.

Alan: But Africa has had ALAC members since the beginning.

Fatimata: Excuse me?

Alan: Africa has had ALAC representatives since this process began.

Fatimata: I agree. Maybe I don't understand, then, what you're explaining. If I understood, you were saying that in the [inaudible], you had some suggestions. That we would not appoint old members. Old ALAC members. Am I correct?

Alan: No, no -- that was talking about the position description. I was suggesting we remove that section altogether.

Fatimata: All right.

Alan: That got put in when it was drafted, but that, I do not support.

Fatimata: Okay.

Alan: Now we're talking about how one finds a good ALAC or At-Large board member or board liaison. Those, I'm saying… A new person is not what we want, in this case.

Fatimata: Okay.

Alan: I think it's someone we want to have [inaudible] and knowledge.

Fatimata: Okay. [inaudible]

Wendy: I want to add two things to the discussion, but I'll try to be brief. One is, I don't see it as being helpful to fractionalize the group along regional lines. It might well be that regions get together and agree that they would be best served by somebody outside their region.

Yet starting the process from silos doesn't facilitate that kind of discussion. And I don't think that with this -- for the selection of one or two people -- centering it all around votes is as helpful as fostering consensus.

So of course, not everybody is going to agree. And of course, at some point, often votes need to be called in. But a process that emphasizes as its first line the voting process, downplays the importance of getting the relevant people -- the regional representatives and ALAC members. To spend some time -- polling among themselves -- whom do we agree would be good representatives in this process? Can we get together caucus-like -- to use an American term -- to pick a few people to suggest that other support -- 1 or 2 strong candidates? And then bring it down to a vote when we'd made that kind of selection?

Alan: I support everything Wendy has said.

Nick: I would note that that is not how things work now.

Cheryl: Yes.

Nick: How it works now is, the regions each discuss whom they think is appropriate. In some cases, they instruct their ALAC members in how to vote.

Cheryl: How to vote.

Nick: So the RALOs are already amongst [themselves separately] looking at who they think should serve.

Alan: But if it comes down to a vote, need the RALO has the right to instruct their two members to vote that way -- that is within their rights, if they choose to do that[?] Just as some gNSO constituencies instruct their members and some do not.

Nick: But even the RALOs that don't absolutely tie the hands of their ALAC members discuss -- and strongly recommend -- whom they would like to see [them vote for].

Alan: That's fine. That's good.

Nick: [It's not like] this process is somehow -- in that way -- doesn't actually reflect anything other than what is happening now. On the contrary -- it actually makes more transparent the selection process. It gives each ALS the ability to directly influence the outcome -- which they don't have now. So it's actually more democratic.

Alan: I'm less worried about democracy than getting a good person.

Nick: The way in which the STV -- the single transferable vote -- system works… This actually ensures that the person chosen is the person most supported across the regions.

Cheryl: Everywhere. Yes.

That applies to a set of candidates.

Fatimata: If my phone stops, please understand that my battery is [inaudible]…

Cheryl: No problem.

I still would like to see a system whereby a broader net of suitably-qualified, experienced and supported by the At-Large structures and regions… A set of candidates come in. Where we're not looking at regions that are to instruct their ALAC people or not to vote [and] have not had an opportunity to put candidates forward.

I want the candidature to come from as far out in the regions as possible. Tell me what's wrong with that.

Alan: It's only wrong if it ends up with candidates that don't meet the qualifications.

Cheryl: But then, the voting will… If I have someone here and we do -- at [inaudible] regularly… whom I wouldn't piss on if they were on fire. I don't vote for them.

Now if it is a clearly poor and unsuitable candidate that ends up in this voting system, they lose.

Sébastien: We will not discuss democracy, because I'm not sure we are ready to write the French president [inaudible]

Vs: [laughter]

Alan: Touché!

Sébastien: Nevertheless, we are trying to do two things at the same time. We are trying to find a way to allow more input from the community. And, at the same time, at the end, to add the right candidates selected.

We need to fine-tune this. You already know that democracy is the best way to do this.

Cheryl: You'll get no argument from me on that, Sébastien. You know I'm not [inaudible]

Sébastien: Yes. I know, I know.

Alan: Excuse me. I've made my points clear. There are a few other people that can represent them. I have to drop off, now. Good luck.

Cheryl: [laughter] Alan, thank you.

Nick: I fairly desperately need to go back to my friend's birthday

Wendy: I fairly desperately need to go back.

Cheryl: Can I just say what we still have to do is start the call for nominations? That's going to have to happen. And it's going to have to happen right now.

I don't think we should limit nominations to only one from any particular region -- or any small number. I think the community -- the ALSs and the regions -- need to know that what we're trying to do is an "experiment," for want of a better word, on how the edges can put forward candidates for the ALAC to vote on. That is, looking at how ALSs and regions can put forward candidates to then model for a later board position. Assuming we get a [paid] board position.

Alan: As long as you add in the liaison part, I can support that.

Cheryl: Okay.

Wendy: My question is…

Alan: I still think -- as Wendy said -- it's far too complex. But I'll leave that to y. [inaudible]

Cheryl: So we don't need to deal with that part, right now. What we do need to deal with right now is getting a call for nominations.

Alan: Go for it.

Nick: You could start and say, "Look -- could each RALO nominate one more?" Or at least one.

Alan: Yes. Okay.

Cheryl: Yes. And also, [inaudible] nominations.

Alan: Bye, all.

Cheryl: Okay. Thanks, Alan.

My balking point was just single candidature, I must say. We also then are going to have to ask each and every one of you… I know that Alan will be working with NARALO. But I'm also confident that NARALO will have an awful lot of say about it. They've consistently put forward candidates, anyway. So I'm less concerned about their region getting candidates up than I am the rest of the regions getting candidates up.

Each and every one of us needs to go back to our regions right now, and start getting our ALSs in our regions to put forward things to caucus to come up with. Name or names -- preferably, names -- that they believe would be ideal candidates.

It might be that Asia-Pacific wants to nominate someone who happens to domicile in Latin America. That's okay, too.

Vanda: I do believe that the exercise is a good one. I don't believe that we don't have -- at the end of the process -- really the best guys, certainly. But I do believe that the exercise is a good idea.

To make sure that when we have both members, we have a clear process. They learn how to do, and we have all settled when the time comes. That's my point.

I do believe that we need to have a board to not be captured for some reason -- for someone we don't want, in the middle of this process. For sure, we need to have qualifications of the people as part of this process.

Cheryl: Yes.

Vanda: Probably the documents that we have read and discussed and put forward could be the base on how to choose people for this exercise that we're going to have, [and be for] liaisons.

Cheryl: Then Vanda -- Fatimata -- do you have any points that you believe Africa is going to be concerned about, if we put out a format? Do you believe AFRALO will be in a position to come up with some names?

Fatimata: No, I'm okay.

Cheryl: Sébastien -- again -- I'm confident that Europe will come up with names. Traditionally, they've always done so. So in many ways, I'm less concerned our more democratically-practiced regions than certainly my own region. The concept of democracy in many of our members' areas is just something we have a huge amount of time even trying to get the concept across.

So I'm less concerned about some regions than I am about others.

I want to ask staff now -- if we get the call for nominations coming out to the list in the next 24 or 36 hours, we're on track -- is that correct?

Nick: I cannot look at the text of the ALAC rules and procedure. I believe you must make the call within 3 weeks of the closure of the ICANN meeting.

Cheryl: Which means it's in this week. Yes.

Nick: I believe. But I'm not absolutely certain.

Cheryl: Yes. That does mesh with my memory of it.

It also falls to the chair to do so.

Nick: Yes.

Cheryl: In a purely non-democratic way, the chair is going to do just that.

The chair is going to take the conversations and discussions that the elected vice-chairs,

[rector] and additional regional balance has under the working name of "Executive Committee," here, today.

I'm going to also include the points made by our board liaison -- and indeed, most importantly because of the points made by our board liaison -- I'm going to work with staff, to put some words together. I don't know who's going to wing me on this one. [inaudible] toss a coin -- it doesn't matter.

We're going to have to put some words -- based on what we've got transcribed and recorded here today -- on the rationale; on the exercise. So it's clear to our community that we're doing a bit of test-run, and why.

We'll call for nominations -- plural -- from each region. Multiple. We'll include self, individual nominations, as well.

I think it would be foolish for us to become proscriptive and restrictive. So if Carl wishes to run as the ALAC liaison, he should certainly be able to do so. Then to try to prove to those who will be on the electoral council -- those who will be voting… i.e… the ALAC -- that he versus anyone else deserves their ultimate vote.

The matter of "how" we vote, then, can go to a conversation of the At-Large Advisory Committee.

Wendy: I just noticed I've been trying to note for a little while.

Cheryl: I am sorry. I'm not at my computer. I do apologize. Go ahead, Wendy.

Wendy: I hear a slippage between whether the votes come from the ALAC or from the At-Large. It's not settled among the discussions at the board level, where that vote or choice of elected board members would come from.

So it's worth considering whether the vote would be a vote of council of RALOs.

Cheryl: Wendy -- it's perfectly clear from this exercise -- for the board liaison and other liaisons -- that it is the ALAC that votes. The experiment is how we get the candidates [to sift in from the edges].

Sébastien: And it doesn't preclude anything for how a board member -- if so -- is elected, chosen or whatever, in the future.

Cheryl: That's right. It's not. It's an experiment in candidature collection. Not an electoral process. Right now, we're running [inaudible] [crossing] liaisons.

The ALAC will vote for all of its liaisons. The board liaison happens to be first [cab off the rank]. So I'll make that very clear with our call for nominations, as well.

I'll ensure that the words of Alan and that's got -- I believe -- wholesale support from everyone else… The criteria for such a job must include experience within At-Large, and preferably the regions or ALAC. Is what I've said what you'd expect? Am I missing anything?

Nick: Do you want to acquaint people with the time commitment, at least, from the job description? So that people -- when they're putting themselves forward -- know what time commitments they are being asked to fulfill?

Cheryl: Yes. I think that's very important.

The fact that they will be not only committing themselves to the work of the board, but also committing themselves to the work of all of the meetings that the ALAC would expect them to turn up to, as well. It's a huge commitment.

Vanda: Okay.

Cheryl: We'll also make the point that we believe it is the role of the NonCom to put fresh, safe opinion on the board. Not the role of the At-Large Advisory Committee.

Nick: I believe there is a paragraph that makes clear that nominees should be participants in the At-Large community -- acquainted with its views and the like.

Cheryl: Yes.

Nick: I'm not reading it, but I seem to remember I wrote something like that.

Cheryl: Yes. But Nick, we just have to make it painfully clear, and make it an integral part of the call for nominations.

Nick: Well, I'm going to go now. [inaudible].

Cheryl: We thank you very much. We appreciate the fact that you're missing out on cake.

Sébastien: Just before Nick leaves… Nick -- you received my last e-mail about the IIC? I just resent it to the staff list. You weren't there at the beginning of the call when we discussed that.

I agree with your document. Do you do something or may I follow with Matthias on that?

Nick: No - if you like that, then we can get it posted on a wiki page for public comment and [announce it].

Sébastien: Yes. I like that. The only thing I would like you to add is that when it's green, it's because it's current or was already in a statement of At-Large [or] ALAC. If it's red, it's because I suggested new comments from [Thomas].

Nick: I don't think we can show that on our wiki page. In fact, [inaudible]

Cheryl: Yes. It might be [inaudible] italic or non-italic rather than colored, I think.

Nick: Yes.

Sébastien: [But we'll find a way to show that]. Thank you.

Cheryl: Okay -- Vanda -- any points from you?

Vanda: No. For me, I guess the idea is that it's okay for me. No other points. The only thing is, I guess we have read the board review. The IDN issue, I believe, is something to finish and to send. I believe you're going to put some ideas forward about the discussion about the ExCom?

Cheryl: Yes.

Matthias: Did you all schedule those three statements for voting, by the way? Did I miss that?

Cheryl: Two of them… Sorry -- which three statements? The EAG one needs to go up for vote.

Matthias: Yes.

Vanda: Yes.

Cheryl: The other two didn't make it to the list. They need to. They need to go through the vote as soon as possible after that.

I think Heidi or Matthias -- you'll have to help me. Because I'm not sitting in front of my computer.

Nick: The second report of the board working group is one.

Cheryl: Yes.

Nick: The other is organizational review.

Cheryl: Okay. I think Vanda -- if you wouldn't mind sending something to the list, saying, "This is the type of statement we believe captures the feelings and the discussions at the Sydney meeting and before. Please comment on it, now."

Nick: [inaudible] Just so you know… the comment periods are closed for those statements.

Cheryl: Yes. We know.

Nick: I assume that…

Vanda: Yes.

Cheryl: Yes. Nick, we know that. At the beginning of the call, we went through and we decided. But we will continue with this and put the outcomes into a statement to the board. Because we need to reiterate a few things. We also need to raise the board's awareness on a couple of other matters. Because what Wendy was making clear is that the board doesn't hear an ALAC voice in a public comment synopsis. So we need to do [both].

Vanda: Yes. It's my point, too. I believe we can -- even if it's closed… It's not important. We can get some feedback from the community, and to add for the specific points, to send to the board.

Nick: I think you can certainly put it in an advisory committee statement at any point. It's just that it then becomes a hostage to timelines.

For example, the organizational review statement -- there is already a proposal for bylaw changes related to the organizational reviews that's out for public comment.

The statement becomes redundant. That's the only problem. Not always, but in some cases, it can.

Cheryl: Yes, indeed.

Nick: The comments are synthesized and then new papers are drawn up.

Cheryl: Yes. We understand. We've flipped on two of the three. We realize we've flipped on them. However, they're going to go out today. Vanda's going to put up the board review one, and somebody -- I think… I have no idea whom -- it doesn't matter… perhaps Fatimata or Heidi could help do it, and work with Fatimata offline. Because her phone is about to die on battery.

But on the synchronization of organizational review. So that we can have our community input and put those to the vote.

We'll still track on all of the other policy-development work. That's not going to change.

Nick: Okay.

Cheryl: But the one that does need to go to the vote is the EAG one. That did go to the list.

Nick: Okay. I must go. Literally, the entire party as now broken up.

Cheryl: Go, Nick!

Nick: [Soon I may well have gone to sleep].

Cheryl: I'm not going to. This is recording. What I was about to say, you can use your imagination. Off you go!

[laughter]

Thanks Nick.

Fatimata -- if your phone hasn't died on you, is there anything you need to say before we wind up?

Vanda: Fatimata -- still in the call?

Cheryl: She may be on mute.

Vanda: Yes. So -- are you feeling better, Cheryl?

Cheryl: My foot is not too good, right now. I've just typed up to Heidi. I've now come back to my computer. She said, "Can we have a beginning of our meeting as we hang up here?" I said, "Yes. But I won't be sitting at my computer. I really do need to go take some painkillers and go put my foot up."

But yes, I shall survive. And more importantly, I will keep my foot. I can now share with you that amputation was actually an option.

Vanda: Oh, my God.

Cheryl: I was waiting on the results, looking at losing my left foot. I wasn't joking when I said I'm now going to be getting back on my feet.

Yes. If I was distracted, that's why. I now will get back on my feet.

Vanda: That's good.

Cheryl: I have a plan of attack. I will grow more tumors, but whilst they're rapidly growing, they are at this stage benign. We'll just make sure we watch, and don't do anything drastic until we have to.

So thank you for your care. Vanda -- if you don't mind just holding the chair for a little bit longer while I'm only partially…

Vanda: You'll be here. I'm just working all the time. [inaudible]

Cheryl: Thank you so much. Wendy -- are you still on the call?

Wendy: Yes. I'm also very pleased to hear that you're in good shape for recovery.

Cheryl: I'm in some sort of shape. One never knows, with me.

But I did put off the surgery 'til after the Sydney ICANN meeting, which I must say just had me slightly nervous. [laughter] So if I wasn't at my best, you might know why, now.

However, you pay medical expenses and get the best care you can for good reasons. This is an example of why.

Vanda: Yes.

Cheryl: Wendy -- I'm really keen to make sure that your points on the fact that this is only a test-run in terms of how we get a set of candidates in is made clear. When I make the call for nominations. Is there anything else from your perspective that I need to put in the preamble on this?

Wendy: I guess it seems overly formal to start a call for nominations. Although I recognize that's part of the procedure. But maybe at the same time, you could call for discussion of potential candidates. The qualifications and qualities that each region sees as important.

Cheryl: In this chat I'm about to have with Matthias and Heidi, we might explore some tools and options to make that as easy as possible.

Wendy: Well, because I see the importance of regions. I also see the importance of encouraging the regions to think of the world as their candidate. So that we don't end up with each region putting forward their regional candidate, and for the five regions being disappointed with their regional candidates.

Cheryl: Exactly. That's something I do think we need to have a [fuller frank and feel of] discussion on. In fact, I might make the point that there is no reason why a candidate or candidates put forward by a region need to domicile within that region.

If they're looking at just global names, they can -- with the appropriate criteria.

Well, thank you all very much.

Vanda: Okay.

Cheryl: I think it was a very productive and important meeting. Wendy, you've got a [inaudible] [crossing]

Vanda: It's over?

Cheryl: On the possibilities of bringing things up. Things like travel budgets and regional meetings may come up at the board level. It's interesting, I think, that as we work with staff -- senior staff -- we often see a mismatched knowledge and assumed knowledge. That's something that I think perhaps the board in its public participation and in its structural improvements might need to have a look at. How we can assure that out here at the edges, we don't spend quite so much time establishing what we all think are the basic facts -- and that we do spend more time doing what we all hope to do. That's putting influence and making statements regarding policy development.

Wendy: Oh, someday we'll get there.

Vanda: Yes.

Cheryl: I live in hope.

Wendy: Just a note that Monday is the deadline for any items for the board's agenda.

Cheryl: Yes.

Vanda: Yes.

Cheryl: Thank you very much, all. Thank you, Fatimata. Thank you [inaudible]

Vanda: [inaudible]

Cheryl: I will. I will recover fast.

Vanda: [inaudible]

Wendy: It's that time of day, here.

Cheryl: All right, then. Thank you all. Heidi -- do you want to have a few moments, and then just call me back?

Heidi: Yes. Matthias and I were thinking that we should allow some time for your painkillers to set in.

Cheryl: Oh -- you want me to make sense. All right, then. It's probably best to get me before they set in. You might get more cooperation.

Heidi: Should we just dial back into this?

Vanda: [inaudible] Bye-bye.

Cheryl: I assume you call back into this. But let's say in 10 or 15 minutes?

Heidi: 15. I need to take some cough medicine, as well.

Cheryl: Right-o. Okay. Everybody get their drugs, their rest and their bio-breaks, and we'll talk again in 15 minutes.

Heidi: Okay. Thanks, Cheryl.

Cheryl: Bye-bye.

Heidi: Bye-bye.

V: Bye-bye.

Vs: [farewells]

[session ends]