

**Adigo  
ICANN - ALAC MEETING  
TUESDAY 25 MAY 2009 1400 UTC**

**Conference Participants listed alphabetically:**

.....

**Adam Peake  
Adigo Operator  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr  
Garreth Sherman  
Heidi Ullrich  
Jose Ovidio Salgueiro  
Matthias Langenegger  
Nguyen Thu Hue  
Nick Ashton - Hart  
NNC  
Patrick Vande Walle  
Sebastien Bachollet  
Siva Muthusamy  
Spanish channel  
Vivek Vivekandan**

.....

[French Interpreter joins call]

[Cheryl joins call]

V: Hello, Cheryl. It's [Arizez].

Cheryl: Hello.

[Spanish Interpreter joins call]

[Adigo Operator joins call]

V: Can I have a copy of the people who are going to be on the call? Thank you.

[Nick joins call]

V: Hi, Nick.

V: How do I mute? I thought I was mute.

V: Hi, Nick.

[Sebastien joins call]

Cheryl: Hi, Sebastien.

Sebastien: Hello, Cheryl. How are you?

Cheryl: Good! Yourself?

Sebastien: Hey that's okay. Waking me up.

V: And your French interpreter is here, Cheryl.

Cheryl: Hi, [there].

V: Hi. [Take care].

SI: And Spanish, as well. Good morning.

Cheryl: Good morning.

V: [inaudible]

[Salgueiro, 057... joins call]

Cheryl: Hi, there. Who was that?

Jose: This is Jose, joining.

[Garreth Sherman joins call.]

Cheryl: I heard that. Hi, Garreth.

Garreth: All right.

V: Hi, everyone.

V: I see [Carl] also is in the [adult] room. Is he on the Spanish channel?

SI: I don't think so. Let me check.

V: But yes.

Cheryl: Okay.

Operator: Joined.

Cheryl: Hi, Matthias.

Matthias: Hi, Cheryl.

SI: No, he's not on Spanish, here.

Cheryl: Okay.

[Heidi joins call]

Cheryl: Hi, Heidi!

Heidi: Hi. How are you?

Cheryl: Good.

V: I hope that noise is not on my line.

V: Hey, Heidi -- how's your eye?

Heidi: It's much better. Thank you. Well, it's getting there. I can feel it's getting better.

V: I'm in a noisy place, so I'm going back on mute.

V: Okay.

[Salgueiro 057 leaves call]

V: Wonder who that was?

V: Special Agent Somebody.

[laughter]

V: Something 057.

[Adam joins call]

Cheryl: Hi, there. Who is it?

V: It was Jose, I believe. And they were -- for some reason -- using a string of numbers at the end of his surname.

V: Yes, but...

[Nguyen Thu Hue 271 joins call]

V: [inaudible]

V: Here. Hello.

Cheryl: Hi, there.

V: Hi, there.

Adam: Adam's joined -- and I am not a number.

Cheryl: Adam, I'm glad to hear that.

[laughter]

V: Not yet, Adam. But it will come soon, unfortunately.

Adam: No -- it's not possible.

V: Yes, yes. You will get an IP address and you will be a number.

[laughter]

Cheryl: Jose got disconnected. Can we call Jose up? Can we do a call out to Jose, please?

V: We're on it, Cheryl.

Cheryl: Thank you. Are we just going to run in Adobe Connect and only have Skype for backup?

V: I'm happy to do that.

Cheryl: Has Carlos joined us in the Spanish channel?

SI: He has not joined us, yet. I will let you know. I'm keeping my eye out for him.

Cheryl: Okay.

And I noticed Alan's in Adobe, as well.

SI: And Cheryl, Carlos has now joined us on the Spanish channel.

Cheryl: Thank you very much. And by my count, that makes eight [and a quorum], if we include Alan on Adobe.

Okay. Do we have any [apologies]? At the moment, I'm aware of [Zanda] and [Santamarta].

V: [inaudible] is online. [Santamarta], I'm not sure.

[Salgueiro joins call]

Cheryl: Welcome back, Jose.

Jose: Thank you very much.

Cheryl: And hello, [Howah].

Okay -- I have, at the moment, [Asowah], Sebastian, Jose, Garreth, Carlos, [Suweh], Alan in the Adobe Room -- not on audio -- Adam, [Howah]. Have I missed any ALAC members?

I have apologies from [Vandas] -- and, I believe, [Santamarta].

V: And from [Mohamed], according to the agenda.

Cheryl: Ah, thank you. I'm in the Adobe Room. I haven't looked at these, [yet]. Okay. So that makes it [clear] all accounted for. And we can begin.

Matthias, if you could do the Adobe Room sharing, and bring up the agenda pages and the link pages. [inaudible].

And we'll now move to any other business or reordering of items. And I know that Adam has requested -- and I think very sensibly -- that all vote as early as possible.

[inaudible]

And with Alan in a questionable connection area, I'd like to think that we can discuss and decide on the voting transparency questions early in the agenda. If everyone agrees?

The other matter -- in addition to the agenda -- is that since the agenda was put up, we have in fact got additional public comments.

[Oh, it's a noisy area.]. Hello? Who's that with the very noisy phone?

You'll need to \*6 to mute.

We have the security public comment also open. That needs to be added, when we get to that point in the list.

I know that [inaudible]

Have there been any other additional changes or reordering to the agenda requested?

If not, let's move firstly to the adoption of the [inaudible]

[child screaming]

And I would ask anyone to please mute yourself unless you are speaking. Particularly if you're in a noisy environment.

Okay. If we could perhaps bring up...

I noticed [Santamarta] has just joined us. Thank you, [Santamarta]. Is Adigo calling out to [Santamarta]? Skype has just registered. I'm sorry -- I just missed Adigo's call. I can participate for a maximum of 30 minutes. I'm in the office and have another meeting.

So if we can do a call out to [Santamarta], that would be great.

V: Okay.

Cheryl: Okay. Back to the minutes of the previous meeting, which... Yes, Sebastien. Go ahead.

Sebastien: Yes. I have one point about the previous meeting. It seems that there is a little mix-up in the title, where we speak about the ratification of the [elect] statement on the improving of traditional confidence.

Then there is something about [IRT] activities. From my knowledge, [IRT] activity is belonging to the working group on new gTLDs.

I guess it's missing one title, to go from one subject to the other one -- in-between the two sentences at the beginning of the preparation and ratification of the direct statement on the report on improving and so on and so forth.

Cheryl: You're suggesting that what? A comma or a...?

Sebastien: No. I am suggesting that at the end of the sentence -- ALAC statement and the report of -- under, "Submit Outcome Statement," maybe a dot. But at the end of this dot, there is another title about the new [GDLT] working group.

It's about IP activities belonging to the new [GDLP] working group -- not to the working group on improving [internal] confidence.

Cheryl: Okay. So, in fact...

Sebastien: I can do that, if you agree. It's not that I can't make the change.

Cheryl: The two different sentences are under the one blue heading, rather than two separate headings. Is that the case?

Sebastien: Is that the case.

Cheryl: I think that's a simple enough to change to make. Does everyone agree?

Okay. If you want to go ahead and do that... Are there any other changes to be made?

And Patrick Vande Walle also has asked to be dialed too, please. And we note Vivek asking for an extension for 15 minutes. Thank you. If we can dial in Patrick, that would be great.

Are there any other changes to the minutes that anyone wishes to note? If not, Sebastien... with those alterations, would you care to put those minutes to the vote?

Sebastien: I put it.

Cheryl: Okay. Do I have a second?

Adam: Second -- Adam.

Cheryl: Thank you, Adam.

Does anybody wish to vote against the minutes being a true and accurate record?

Does anybody wish to have his name recorded as an abstention?

In which case -- and I don't know that Patrick has joined us, yet. I see -- and I don't know that [Santamarta] has joined us, yet. I see [Howah], Alan, Adam, [Suweh], Carlos, Garreth, [inaudible]

SI: [Santamarta] is there. Just [inaudible] [Santamarta] is there. She is there.

Cheryl: Thank you. [Santamarta]. Thank you very much, French channel. Sebastien and myself [inaudible] for that.

Okay. On to the April 28<sup>th</sup> meeting action items. And if that can be brought up -- thanks Matthias.

Sorry, Adam. What is the comment on the minutes? Please go ahead.

Matthias: I have...

Cheryl: Put your hand up. I could see you easier if you'd put your hand up.

Matthias: Oh -- I'm sorry. Yes. It's all this technology. It's terribly hard to cope with. Sorry.

I had to leave the last meeting at around about the hour-and-a-half moment. You went on for quite a long time, afterward. I know it's a lot of work to write these minutes -- but if they could be more detailed... Because I think two pages doesn't really do justice for what must've been 2 and a bit hours of conversation.

It would be very helpful. Not only for people who might have missed the call... And I should have listened to the recording, but I didn't... But also, for the community. There are people out there who want to know what we said.

So a bit more detail would be much appreciated. And I recognize the additional work that I'm requesting. Thanks.

Cheryl: How much more detail are you planning? Recognizing that we do have the audio transcript?

Adam: Well, it's difficult. Once you've been on the call for an hour and a half, you can't really start going back and relistening and relistening.

What I wanted to do was to find out more -- for example -- about things that simply happened after the period of the time that I was on the call. It would be things like all the work that Garreth did. And various other things that must've come up.

It's just that the minutes -- I think -- do need more detail. And it's not necessarily for me, but to reflect the discussions accurately and fairly, so that people get a sense of what was discussed in 120 minutes of chat.

Of course, I wasn't on the call after the 90 minutes -- so I can't say what exactly was missed, or what I want fleshed out. But you see what I mean? I don't think two pages is as much as could be.

Cheryl: Any other comments?

[Patrick joins call]

Cheryl: Welcome, Patrick.

Any other comments on Adam's...

Patrick: Hello.

Cheryl: Hello -- who's this?

V: Yes. So where are we right now in the meeting?

Cheryl: We've just

V: [inaudible]

Cheryl: Certainly. I'll bring you up-to-date, Patrick.

We've just passed the minutes for the last meeting. And in the Adobe chatroom, we're about to look at the action items from that 28<sup>th</sup> of April meeting. But Adam has raised an issue where he is requesting far greater detail in the summary minutes.

His point was that at the last meeting, he left the call after 90 minutes, and in fact, the call went on to in-excess of 120 minutes. Whilst he recognizes that he could indeed listen to the audio transcript of the meeting, he would like to think that there were greater detail in the summary minutes. I've just asked for any comments on that topic, in response to what Adam has said.

Patrick: Okay. Thank you, Cheryl.

Cheryl: Not a problem.

So does anybody wish to speak to what Adam has proposed?

Sebastien: It's Sebastien. It's always a balance between the time spent to do that, and the time and the number of people reading it.

I understand the need, and I agree with him to a certain amount. That means that we don't want to spend too much time on that.

While it's sure from my point of view that we need to keep all the important information of the discussion, but not going into too much detail. Because if some of the people want real details, they can refer to the recording.

Cheryl: And I must say, it wouldn't be the only time I've gone through in fact many more than 120 minutes by running the tapeline through to past the time that I'm pretty sure the point of conversation that I'm interested in comes up. And then have a look.

But I do see that greater detail perhaps in point form might be what Adam's after.

Yes, Adam. Go ahead.

Adam: Yes. I want to be clear that it's not particularly about me as an ALAC member. It's about the record that we're making of a committee call.

I think these minutes are... They print out to less than two pages. I don't think we're doing... For a group that is so demanding of transparency and accountability of others... I don't think that's adequate, to be quite frank.

Of course, perhaps the call is summarized perfectly, in this. In which case, in this instance, I'm wrong.

What I'm trying to say is that... Let's make sure that our details -- our minutes -- are detailed. That somebody does not... other than myself or you... have to go through two hours of MP3. Including downloading it and streaming it and whatever else. That they can actually get a gist... A solid, good understanding... of what was discussed from the minutes.

It's not clear to me that our IA drafting team for the discussion called for comment on new consumer constituency. Seconded -- proposed. You know? There should be more of that, and I would like to see that in the future.

Cheryl: Adam -- just to, I think, hopefully wind this up... We might need to see what staff, in fact, can do -- in a reasonable way, to meet your requirements. And that of the rest of the community.

If indeed the community has a burning desire, we could ask them at what level of detail they'd like the minutes expanded.

But I'm wondering... You're not proposing a he-said-she-said type transcript?

Adam: No. No, no, no.

Cheryl: Good! [laughter]

So at what level of greater detail? [inaudible] form? Because they are summary minutes of outcomes, as opposed to a transcript. That's why we've got for audio recording. And yes, we can get transcripts. They are again full transcripts, rather than partial capturing of the details.

Perhaps we should ask staff to see how much greater detail they could put into the minutes.

Matthias?

Matthias: Cheryl? Hi. I don't actually write the minutes. But if it's a question of how much resources we can spend on the minutes, I think it'd probably be best to ask Nick.

Cheryl: Okay, Nick. Could you come up [inaudible]?

He's on mute. I guess he's in a noisy environment.

V: Nick Ashton - Hart.

Cheryl: Okay. Whoever's got that very loud buzzy noise can be muted.

Nick? Are you there? I mean I know you're there. Can you be off-mute?

Nick: I can, indeed.

Cheryl: Yo! Okay! Resources. Adam's request for greater details in the summary minutes. Question goes to how much in resources can we get staff to allocate for this?

Nick: Which summary minutes are we talking about? For which body?

Cheryl: The ALAC monthly meetings.

Nick: Okay.

What we are trying to get to is a point where... Since we produce full transcripts -- which will shortly be available within 24 to 48 hours at a maximum -- of ALAC meetings... And we have full recordings... What we'd like to get to is actually more summarized minutes -- and action items. And not long-term minutes.

Because it simply takes time away from what we could otherwise be spending on other things for you all.

But I guess I'm wondering what purpose do they serve, beyond what can be gotten from the recordings and the transcripts and the action items? To have longer minutes?

Cheryl: I'll see if I can summarize that to some extent. Paraphrase. Although I'll ask Adam, to speak, as well.

What Adam was suggesting, I think, came down to a matter of accountability and transparency. So that the community -- not just the ALAC members -- could have greater detail in the discussion aspects. Not just the outcome aspects.

But Adam, you still actually have the microphone. So please go ahead.

Adam: Yes. I would just add to what you said. ...and ease of understanding.

Nick -- the other thing is, if the transcripts are going to be more immediately available, then no problem. Then just simply listing them almost as-is, is fine.

As an example, the type of minutes the EU RALO minutes were satisfactory, I felt. This particular set from the last meeting, I don't think worked, to be honest. Although, I voted for them. And I thank you for your efforts. I'm not trying to dismiss the efforts that have gone into this. I just think we need to put a bit more in.

Matthias: We're changing transcribers. Adigo can actually do a transcript with a maximum turnaround of 48 hours. Minutes of meetings actually tends to take longer than you think, when you have to go through -- sometimes -- various language recordings, to get an accurate reflection of what people said, and all that.

So to the extent that we can outsource that by providing transcripts, unless... If you all had something that we haven't thought of... It seems to me, that would actually provide the maximum amount of transparency. Because you'd have the full details, actually, in writing.

Cheryl: Yes. All right. Well, let's not gather too much time under our belts for this particular part of the exercise this evening or this morning -- depending on where you are in the world.

Let's look forward to perhaps a little bit more detail. Perhaps in brief bullet point or point form. But we are not intending a he-said-she-said type set of minutes.

The EURALO minutes have been put up as an example by Adam of what he's after. To see whether or not within 48 hours -- transcripts -- which I must say, I think is probably more [inaudible]. And the ability to do a search in a Word or a PDF document, for words. To see exactly everything that I say versus everything Adam says. It would be as [inaudible] as a [inaudible] degree of transparency.

Okay.

If we can now move to the... Adam? Yes. Go ahead. A final word on the matter, perhaps?

Adam: No. I was actually trying to lower my hand.

Cheryl: [laughter]

Matthias: [Being onward].

Cheryl: I think you just have to put your microphone down. There will be a "relinquishing of the microphone" button somewhere, I'm sure.

Okay. [laughter] I just thought you wanted the maximum word.

Wendy has very poor reception. So we should note her as an apology. But perhaps she could...

[Vivek Vivekandan joins call]

Cheryl: Hello. Welcome.

Vivek: Hello. Yes. Yes. Thank you.

Cheryl: We're just up to the action items from the last meeting. We've just had a somewhat lengthy side discussion on the details of the minutes, and the amount of transcription versus point-form versus summarizing it.

Now if you'll join us in the Adobe chatroom, you'll see some chat on that. The short version is that in the near future, we will have transcripts -- written text transcripts -- within about 48 hours of our meetings. We believe with some expanded additional points in our summary minutes, that should satisfy the needs of the community for the transparency and accountability.

Okay. That brings us then back to the action items for reasons. I've noted on my computer... I need to find my window again. Because my shared screen has a very interesting patent on it. And it appears it doesn't seem to have Word on it. Never mind.

Ah -- there we go. So I'm back.

Okay. So the action items for the 28<sup>th</sup> of April are as follow:

The webpages with the [Amenda] Management System. The framework for the FY10 operations plan deadline, which we met. I want to come back to the WIKIs members management, et cetera.

The working group -- including the new IP IIT one -- and the proposed meeting, I believe, which [inaudible] and the ALAC. To ensure workflow structure. That still is needing to be done, and I believe is on tonight's agenda.

But underneath that, Patrick's volunteering to comment on the IIT draft as a completed action. The At-Large offices and work group leaders, which real is a rolling on of the matter in Number 3 in those action items. Where the proposed meeting [of leads] from the work group -- with the ALAC -- really needs to come in under that Point 4, as a result of tonight's meeting.

The At Large offices and work group meeting. We do need to get together. I can't see that happening [inaudible] however, unfortunately.

And the ALAC's vote processing [inaudible] agenda. Going back, first of all, to the first item -- which is the webpage of WIKIs and member management system.

Nick -- while you're perhaps in a slightly quieter area than you were... Can you or one of the staff give us a very, very brief roundup? I noticed there are a few changes that have happened to the WIKIs and things between our last meeting and this. Specifically, some new pages and information. Would you care to speak to those, now?

Or Heidi -- whoever wants to grab it.

Heidi: I'm not able to speak about the Member Management System. Well, actually, they have... Nick?

Cheryl: [inaudible] while he finds the unmute button.

Heidi: Well, everyone has seen that we have now prepared a link that sets out who -- which staff -- are responsible for which activities. And also, the status of each of the issues that ALAC is working on.

Cheryl: Yes.

Heidi: I believe that link was sent out. If Matthias could perhaps put that link into the Adobe Chatroom?

Cheryl: Yes. It did go out to the full ALAC working list.

Heidi: I'm sorry?

Cheryl: Did that go to the ALAC working list? Or internal list?

Heidi: I need to check on that. Where that went to.

Cheryl: Because if not, then it certainly needs to be appended to tonight's documents. And we will need to have a good look at that when we're gathering together in Sydney.

Heidi: Okay.

And also, I have done some work on making most of the RALOs -- and now I will make it in the next few days... all of the RALOs -- to have a similar "Officers' Page." Modeled after the -- I believe it was the -- [Black] RALO page.

So I need to work a little bit more on that. To put terms in, et cetera. But they are now in the same format.

The other action item -- under "Item 1..." The A4... That is a template that will be sent out very shortly to the RALO secretariats, to pass on to their ALSs. This form is...

ALSs will be able to fill them out online and then send them to the staff At-Large emails. Then we will go ahead and compile all that information and put them on the thumbtacks that most RALOs now already have up on their GoogleMaps. Identifying each of the ALSs.

That will provide more information on such things as their governance structure -- their membership -- their communication tools that they use. Including subscription details, which meetings they attend, how often they have meetings with their members, and policy interests related to At-Large issues.

Cheryl: Excellent. Thank you very much for that.

Heidi: Yes.

Cheryl: Nick -- is there anything you want to add onto that before we move on? Or ask for any clarification?

Matthias: Hi, Cheryl. This is Matthias. Nick's just dropped off the call. They will call him back. So he should be back in about a minute.

Cheryl: Okay. Well not being a terribly patient woman, we might move on, anyway. We'll give him the opportunity to come back to that point if we need to.

This brings us then to the ALS applications. If we open up the GoogleDocs, I'm not sure that's going to work terribly well in the Adobe Connect room. [But we'll see].

I have certainly received the advice from the EURALO chair on the regional advice for the ALS applications that they are handling at the moment.

What's the status of any of the others?

Heidi: Cheryl -- Papergate?

Cheryl: Yes. Okay. Is anyone here able to tell us what the NA RALO outcome was for Papergate?

Heidi: Yes. Yesterday I was on a call with Evan and Darlene, and they said that the [NARALO] advice -- regional advice -- will not be to have the ALAC reject. Or that NARALO would like to reject the application on Papergate.

Garreth: This is Garreth: That's correct. We have not had appropriate feedback from them. So we are running on the [inaudible]

Cheryl: Okay. Thanks.

Is there any other? [inaudible] a little bit too small on the screen. I've got plenty of Windows open. I'm not really able to see whom else we have.

V: [inaudible]

[Nick] -- say again?

If we haven't missed any, and if it's on the one -- if it's just Papergate to NARALO... I think there were 3 for EURALO. I'd like to have those now put for a 7-day vote to the ALAC. Remembering that the ALAC members will be voting to accept or reject the regional advice.

So, in this circumstance, we would be voting to accept the regional advice to approve the EURALO ALSs. And to accept the regional advice to reject Papergate as an ALS on the advice of NA RALO. And can we be very, very sure that we make that very, very clear in the preamble to the votes, please?

Any questions anyone needs to raise about that matter? Excellent.

If not, what we might do now is... And I believe... is Alan still with us? Yes -- Alan -- I think you are still with us. Let me just check.

Alan...

Sebastien: During your check, I agreed to go to the Point 5 -- or to any point with Alan, before. But I would like to come back to the At-Large officer. I have two questions on that, when it would be possible. Thank you. It's Sebastien.

Cheryl: Yes, Thank you Sebastien.

Just want to make sure Alan is in fact able to interact with us in the Adobe space. Do you want to just briefly raise the question on the officers [before]?

Sebastien: Okay. No problem.

First of all, it's in the At-Large IRT process. There is at a list of people. I guess it's come from the people who say that they will be happy to participate in this work. I am not sure that it's a full list.

For example, there was somebody from [IZAK] France in the [EURALUR] arena. She is not listed. And I guess it will be better to list Patrick on there, also. Because even if he is not listed, he was the one who made the job.

And my second point is on the future structure and governance of ICANN. I don't know why this working group is without a reporter. I guess we decided that the team of the working group during the summit will be the same. Then may I ask that we accept on this, as a reporter of this working group. Thank you.

Cheryl: Okay. Thanks, Sebastien. But exactly where in the agenda are we looking at those additions?

Under which item? At-Large Officers and Working Group Leaders. Last point in Item 3. Is that where you're proposing those changes need to be made?

There should be a link to whatever page you're referring to, if that's the case.

Heidi -- perhaps you can...

Sebastien: Sorry. I am sorry. I was on mute.

It's under the Item Action of the last meeting. It's Number 4 on this. Action Item. At-Large Officer and Working Group Leaders. There is a link there going to this list of people, and it's this list I was referring to.

Cheryl: Yes. Except that the link that is on last month's action items needs to be put into today's agenda -- under the 4<sup>th</sup> dot point in Item 3 -- for today's agenda. That's where that link belongs and where those changes need to be made.

Sebastien: Okay. No problem. I was thinking that we were going through the action item, and taking each one. But that's okay. No problem.

Cheryl: Okay.

Well I think what we were doing with the action items is the ones that were coming into tonight's agenda, we were doing them in order. And in fact, we've just really dealt with that one in order. That's something that Heidi and I certainly need to continue to work on.

And the second point to that -- which we must have as an action item from today... That is, we need to organize a meeting between the work group leaders and the At-Large group. Either the officers or the whole of the group.

If that could be done before Sydney, fine. If not, it certainly needs to be done either at Sydney or as soon as possible after the Sydney meeting.

Moving then to -- in our order -- matters for decision at this meeting. The vote on the vote. A vote on what? Alan?

We have had as an action item from last week, the request for us all to look at Alan Greenberg's proposal, and to make comments over the 14 days. And we are to make a decision at this meeting, as to how transparent our voting system on [Big Pulse], specifically, will be.

Alan is in the Adobe Chatroom. But I know there has been recent conversation, I believe, between Adam... Was it just you and Alan? Or has someone else raised additional comments on the list that need to be [inaudible] to the record, as well?

Adam: A couple of people. And I will just look at who supported Alan's comments. That's Carlton and Darlene. I.e... They didn't agree with me. I think that's extremely rude of them, but I'll forgive them at this time.

Cheryl: And we'll make sure that's transcribed and put into a [dotpoint].

Adam: Yes. I say that as a joke, because they're lovely.

But no, those were the two comments -- in addition to what I was saying with Alan.

Cheryl: Okay.

For the record then, is there any further brief discussion on this matter before we make some form of decision for the secrecy of the voting?

Sebastien: It's Sebastien. I want to support Adam's position. My fear is that we'll all wait 'til the last minute to vote. It's a joke, but to "Vote like the chair," for example.

If we know we are waiting for somebody else to vote, then we'll vote like him. I'm not sure that's the best way to give the opportunity to each one of us to vote as we want to vote.

I know that we are trying to mimic an in-person meeting. But at an in-person meeting, we raise our hands at the same time. All together. There could be some discussion and some back-and-forth, but...

In the voting system, you don't raise your hands at the same time. You don't vote at the same time. My preference would be that we know where we are on the number of votes "Yes," "No," and "Abstention." But we'll leave the names outside.

My feeling is that it may be one part of the cultural differences between voting in some countries..

Cheryl: Okay. Any other input from any ALAC member on tonight's call?

Operator: Joined.

Cheryl: Hi. Who's that that just joined?

SI: Cheryl -- [inaudible] Santamarta had to leave. She came. She listened to everything and she had to leave.

Cheryl: Okay. Well, that's a shame. Well, she's not here for the vote, unfortunately.

We did try and make it in time. Never mind.

SI: And Carlos has a comment, when you're ready.

Cheryl: Oh, thank you. I was just about to ask for French and Spanish channels. Good morning. Go ahead, Carlos.

Carlos: Well, I do think that this is a point that we have to discuss a bit further.

Cheryl: Yes.

Carlos: I do agree, however, with the proposal from Adam and Sebastien.

Cheryl: Okay. Well, of course, we've had a month to discuss this matter. So we will have to make a decision now. But we should certainly have a few more moments -- minutes -- to look at whether or not the transparency proposed is as full and ongoing as Alan has proposed.

In other words, with the ability to put your hand technically up and then down again and then up again -- or as Adam supported now, at least by Sebastien and Carlos are proposing... the full transparency is apparent at the end of the vote.

Who else would like to raise any points?

Patrick? Any points from you?

Patrick: No. No points from me.

Cheryl: Okay.

Adam: Hi. It's Adam. There is one more thing. One of the points that Alan noted was that

outsiders -- i.e... non-voting members... should be able to view the progress of the vote. I think of that as a good addition.

But it worries me that if the outsiders are seeing how people vote, then they are then able to at some point start trying to influence the lobby of those who are [inaudible] voting.

So it's another reason why I think it's a good idea that how we vote is confidence-essential until the actual vote has ended, and the outcome is published.

I think we should make rules, but that protect against all kinds of possible abuse -- even though it's abuse that we don't have to realistically expect could happen.

I don't think everybody should wait to see which way the chair has voted before they vote. I don't really think that people are going to start lobbying people that are yet to vote.

I think it's probably best to defined against that eventuality. I think rules with that nature are really common sense for procedures like this.

Cheryl: Thank you, Adam.

Just to read into the record, Alan raised the question and made the comment. This one was, "May he ask 'WHY' in capitals, ongoing transparency is bad?" I think I can speak on behalf of those who've raised the point, so far.

I don't think any of you are saying that the ongoing transparency is bad. Simply that it opens some risks to insolence, for example. As Adam was just outlining.

Also, it makes the point that if we use an e-mail for voting, everyone would see the votes as they were cast. However, he then also goes on to say, "I can live with not making votes visible as we go, but it is not my preference." Okay.

So any further discussion? Carlos? Did you have more points to make?

Carlos? Any more points to make? Spanish channel?

Carlos: No, thank you Cheryl. It's great for me.

Cheryl: Okay.

Well, if we look at -- I suggest -- the possibility of having this decision go two ways, with firstly, the option as Alan has proposed. As it is written -- with what I'll describe as, "Complete transparency..." We will assume that Carlos, Sebastien and Adam would not be supportive of that. On tonight's vote, that would mean we have a possibility of a 6 or 7 to 4 vote, in favor of Alan's proposal [in full] -- and indeed, a real possibility of many more of the ALAC agreeing with what Adam has proposed, and has been supported by Sebastien and Carlos.

So, without Alan being verbal, we can't actually hear what he wishes to say -- whether he wants to accept this as a friendly amendment or not. How does the group wish me to pursue this?

[Sebastien]: [C / si].

Cheryl: Both the original vote, and have it open? [Recorded / reported]? Or to propose to Alan that he...

Operator: Left.

Cheryl: ...in fact take a friendly amendment to his proposal to the lower level of transparency?

[inaudible] Adam?

Sebastien: It's Sebastien... Can't we...? I know that we want to... Do we want to vote in the meeting now? And if so, I would like to suggest that we take... Even if it's not a friendly amendment, we have an amendment that maybe we can vote on. And if it's included in the final draft to vote -- and if not, it stays. The draft stays like it is.

But I don't know all the rules from a US company about voting. Sorry.

Cheryl: That's all right. Yes. We can, indeed -- if we go to a vote now, we would be voting on the amendment, first. If that's how you all wish to proceed. The other option, I think, is less satisfactory. That's putting it off for any longer.

We have had a month to go over it. So I would [inaudible]

So, just let me type. I don't know why I'm the only one typing to Alan on this matter, but let me finish typing to Alan that we'll use the term, "Adam's Proposal." Adam -- I'm going to take your name in vain as a shortcut, here.

[laughter]

SI: Another comment from the Spanish channel. When you have a moment.

Cheryl: Yes, please. Go ahead, Spanish channel.

SI: Hi. I just wanted to know what would be the objection to postponing this just a bit longer?

Cheryl: I'm sorry. Can you please repeat? There was background noise.

SI: What would be the objection with postponing this just a bit longer?

Cheryl: Why would we need to postpone it any longer, when it's been discussed for 30 days? And it was an action item at our last meeting that it would be decided upon at this one.

However, if Carlos wants to put to the rest of the thinking that it is extended for discussion, I'm happy to put that to the meeting.

SI: I just thought that maybe it would've been a good idea to discuss this face-to-face and actually be able to resolve this issue in a better manner.

Cheryl: Okay. Well, we have now three layers that we need to discuss. Let's see if we can unravel them. And unfortunately, with Alan not being on the audio part of the call, that will take a little bit of typing. Just one moment.

If anyone else would like to make some comments while I'm typing, that will make dead air on the call more interesting.

Okay. I'm going to put it in the following order. Sorry -- Adam -- question is mine -- not Carlos'. What do you mean? I thought it was Carlos on the Spanish channel that was asking to have it postponed 'til it was face-to-face. Have I got that wrong?

Adam: No. Sorry. It was the way I worded something. I was thinking how Alan might interpret it. Alan [inaudible] think that's me beeping.

What I wrote was, "And Carlos suggested we not vote until Sydney, so we could discuss in person." Then I put, "Question -- is this needed?" I meant those particular words. The question, "Is this needed," were my words -- not Carlos'.

[Gwen Tuhu joins call]

Cheryl: I was typing and I looked up to see that. I just wanted to double-check that I wasn't misleading or misquoting anyone.

Adam: My blathering. Sorry.

Cheryl: Okey dokey.

Well, we have three things that we will be dealing with in now the following order.

The first thing that we are going to be putting to the meeting is Carlos' proposal that this decision on vote is postponed until our face-to-face meeting in Sydney. So let's be clear on what we are now deciding.

The ALAC is called to vote on the following proposal, proposed by Carlos. That's assuming I get a second -- which I'm about to call for, as well.

Carlos proposes that we delay or postpone our vote on this matter of voting transparency for the ALAC, using the BigPulse tool, until the face-to-face meeting in Sydney. Do I have a second for Carlos' proposal?

Patrick: I [pick] seconds.

Cheryl: Thank you, Patrick. Patrick has seconded that. We now put that to the vote.

The vote -- just to remind you all... We are now voting on a delay on the decision on voting transparency until the face-to-face meeting in Sydney.

Does anyone wish to vote against delaying this until Sydney?

V: Vote against delaying.

Cheryl: I will record my name against that motion.

Adam: Can I just be clear? We are voting that we do not want to delay. In other words...

Cheryl: [inaudible]... Carlos is quoting a proposal to say "delay." You are going to vote for him or against his proposal?

Adam: Against his proposal.

Cheryl: I'm calling for those -- as I always do -- who wish to have their names recorded against the proposal. I have said my name is to be recorded against the proposal. In other words, I want to have it decided tonight. Not in Sydney.

Adam: Thank you. Sorry. I vote against the proposal. That's Adam.

Cheryl: I see Cheryl. I see Adam. I see whom else? Anyone else?

Sebastian: Can you add my name, too? Sebastien?

Cheryl: Sebastien. I'll do a roll call. Jose? For or against?

I see Garreth is against. Thu Hue are you for or against today? Thu Hue are you abstaining? Thu Hue are you there?

Jose -- are you voting for or against delay to Sydney?

SI: Thu Hue asked to abstain.

Cheryl: Abstain from power?

SI: Yes. Thank you.

Cheryl: Patrick -- even though you seconded it -- do you wish to vote for or against?

Patrick: Well, I am in favor of delaying the proposal until Sydney. Yes.

Cheryl: Okay. For. Carlos, I assume you're voting for your own proposal?

SI: Of course.

Cheryl: Vivek -- are you voting for or against?

Vivek: Yes. I support Carlos.

Cheryl: You support Carlos. So that is for. And Alan has -- unsurprisingly -- voted against. We'll record Thu Hue as an abstain until such time as [s]he tells us otherwise. Have I missed anyone? Is there anyone on the French or Spanish channel that I've missed?

Okay.

If that's the case, I have in favor of Carlos' proposal to delay -- Carlos, Patrick, Vivek. Does anyone wish to vote in support of Carlos' proposal to delay?

V: Cheryl -- this is Jose. I'm sorry. I was on the phone.

Cheryl: Yes, Jose. How do you wish to vote?

Jose: Yes. I agree with Carlos' proposal.

Cheryl: I was surprised that you didn't say that, actually. [laughter]

Jose: I was on the phone. I was on the phone at that time and I couldn't do both things at the same time.

Cheryl: Ah -- multitasking is a challenge. It's all right. At least...

Jose: Absolutely. This is morning in Caracas, and it's kind of busy for me. I'm sorry.

Cheryl: Oh, no. No problem. Your vote's in. That's what's important.

Jose: Excellent.

Cheryl: I now have [inaudible]

Jose: Thank you very much.

Cheryl: Carlos -- Jose -- Patrick -- Vivek. That's a count of four.

I have against Carlos' proposal... Alan, Adam, Garreth, Sebastien and Cheryl. Anyone else who wishes to have his name recorded against Carlos' proposal?

That's very close, then -- a 4 to 5 vote -- with [inaudible] and Thu Hue being listed as...

Can we please have...

V: I guess -- sorry -- I just -- I don't know. It's Thu Hue. I was under the impression that she said she was against. But I am not sure about that. Because I know it was important. But can you ask her again? Because she's...

Cheryl: Thu Hue?

Thu Hue: Yes?

Cheryl: Do you wish to vote for or against the delay?

Thu Hue: I voted against.

Cheryl: Against. Okay. Thank you very much. Because I had you as an abstention. Thank you, dear. I appreciate that.

So that is now 6 to 4 against. Sorry, Carlos. It has not made it forward.

We'll now vote on what I'm calling, "Adam's Amendment." Okay? So let's see what we're voting for now.

Now -- that we not delay the vote. Vote now. We are now going to vote on Adam's... Sorry, Adam, to take your name. It was easy at the time, that way. Adam's Amendment.

So -- Adam's Amendment. Let's be clear. It's a modification of the Alan Greenberg's [inaudible] whereby

[Nick joins call]

...full transparency is not available to the other voters or the wider community until [inaudible] this way? Or would you care to put it in more accurate words? Adam?

Adam: That's fine. I'm simply asking that the line Alan included in his proposal -- which read, "As the vote is proceeding, we can see how each person has voted," is deleted.

Cheryl: Okay. I'll just put that into the record, so we have that exactly right. And Adam -- if you could just read that again. So everyone knows what they're voting for. If they vote for your proposal, they are voting for the

Adam: They're voting to delete...

Cheryl: ...original proposal with the deletion of the following line...

Please read that to the record again, Adam?

Adam: With the deletion of, "As the vote is proceeding, we can see how each person has voted."

Deleted.

Sebastien: May I...? Sorry, Adam... Don't we want to have this at the end of the vote?

Nick: I had a question similar to that.

Adam: I'm sorry. Yes. That one. Thank you very much. Yes.

Sebastien: Then...

Adam: And replaced with, "And full transparency of how members voted is available at the conclusion of the vote." Or something like that.

Cheryl: Okay.

Sebastien: May I suggest as a for-instance... At the end of the vote, we can see how each person has voted. Then my suggestion is to replace, "As the vote is proceeding," by, "At the end of the vote." Just to change this little sentence.

Sorry, Adam.

Adam: That's much more sensible. Yes.

Nick: I just have a question of understanding.

Cheryl: Yes, Nick. Go ahead.

Nick: All right. Adam -- do you think given that... It's obviously the intent that you do not wish how each person voted during the vote to be visible -- but only at the end. Do you wish for the aggregated, "Yes, no," and "abstain," votes to be visible during the voting?

Cheryl: Yes. That's how I understand it. Adam? Can you clarify it? That's how I understood what you were saying.

Adam: I was simply saying that the number of people who voted...

Sorry... let's go through this.

A vote is taking place. As soon as I vote...

Operator: [joined]

...you would be...

A vote is taking place. As soon as, for example, I have voted, everybody will be able to see that I have voted. They will not see that I have voted, "Yes, no," or abstained. They will simply see that a vote has been cast by Adam, as an ALAC member.

At the end of the vote, how I voted will be revealed. But not during the course of the vote. Because it's just...

Nick: Okay. But alongside that, will it be possible for people to see that there were 8 "yes" votes, for example -- 4 "no" votes -- and 2 abstentions during the voting?

Adam: Not during the voting. No.

Nick: Okay.

Adam: They would simply see that 14 votes had been cast. Or however many that mathematics had added up to.

Cheryl: So how is that different from what we do now? Because I actually thought we would know what the cumulative total was.

Adam: I just think it would be easier not to have that. Just to simply say that "X person," has not voted. I thought the purpose of this was actually to encourage people to get out and vote. And that we would actually be saying, "Adam -- there's a day to go. You will go vote now."

Isn't that the purpose of what we're doing?

Nick: I don't think that was the intent of what Alan had in mind.

Adam: Okay. I thought he was...

Cheryl: In terms of your amendment, Adam, I had interpreted that "Who" had voted in which way would not be obvious. But the total votes in which way would be.

Adam: Okay.

Cheryl: So we do need to discuss it further.

So that [inaudible]

Adam: That gets confusing. Because the first person to vote is going to be...

Nick: Well, this is why I asked. Because I thought this might be a shared confusion that I have with others.

Adam: Yes.

Cheryl: But I don't see, then, Adam, what you're proposing is any different than what we do now. That is that at the end of the vote, we say who voted which way.

Adam: No. The point is that we actually know during the course of the vote who has not yet voted. Right now, we don't know who has voted. We only know when staff tell us.

The community will see on an ongoing basis -- from Day 1 of a vote -- who votes when. They won't see what I've voted, but they'll see when I've made the effort to vote, for example.

Nick: Or not.

Adam: Or not. And they will be able to chase me on it. My RALO will be able to give me a hard time for not doing it. And so on.

Cheryl: Okay. Thank you.

[Howah] has their hand raised. Go ahead, [Howah]. [Howah]?

Howah: Yes. I would like to speak.

Cheryl: Go ahead, [Howah]. Thank you.

[Howah]: I would like to speak a little bit to Cheryl. I'm asking Cheryl to be able to see what the vote would be at Sydney. Then we could have a meeting with Adam -- who will

explain the problem in Sydney -- and how he would like to have the voting done. Then everybody present in Sydney would understand the situation, and be able to give feedback.

Sometimes people have understood or are not sure they've understood. But with a face-to-face meeting in Sydney, then we can give our reaction. And then we can vote on it, there. Is that possible?

Cheryl: Okay. [Hallah] -- from that, it means you are saying that you wish to change your vote from an abstention to one of supporting Carlos' proposal to delay this until Sydney. Is that correct?

[Hallah]: That is correct.

Cheryl: Can I ask -- is anyone else in support of running the vote on Carlos' proposal to delay again? At the moment, we now have a... let me recount... Garreth -- you voted for or against? I had you listed as voting against Carlos' proposal to delay.

SI: And a comment from Carlos in regards to that, please -- when you have a moment.

Cheryl: Yes. Certainly. I'm just retallying. If Carlos would like to speak now, while I'm retallying...

SI: Yes. What I wanted to say is -- if you could please post on the Adobe Connect room the tally of who voted "for," and who voted, "against." Because from what I understood, it was 5 to 5. Because I thought that Garreth had voted for it.

Cheryl: No. It was 6. Let me make it clear.

It is currently 6 to 4, with [inaudible] abstaining. [inaudible] it was 6/4. Because Thu Hue voted with the "against," your motion.

With [Howah] wanting to review now -- and due to the lack of clarity on the Adam Amendment -- has now suggested that she would be supportive of delay until Sydney. That would make it a 6/5 vote.

I am now opening the floor to ask the rest of the group -- "Do we wish to revisit the vote for delay to Sydney?" [inaudible] 6/4, with [Howah] abstaining. If [Howah] changes her vote, it simply makes it 6/5. Being so close, and perhaps sufficient confusion having reined, I'm willing to look at going back to review that vote.

Yes, Adam. Go ahead.

Adam: Yes. I think we just have to take it to Sydney. I didn't realize it was not straightforward. I thought it was pretty straightforward, what we were doing. But it's obviously not. So we'd better take it to Sydney. Or we've got 10 minutes left on the advertised time of this call.

Cheryl: Well, exactly. Not that I'm delighted with that, but there's very little I can do, working within a democracy.

Okay. Adam, you're now then proposing that you would be supporting delay to Sydney? Can I ask is there anyone else who originally voted for decision at tonight's meeting who wishes to now support Carlos' proposal to delay?

We have Carlos -- Jose -- [Howah] -- Vivek and now Adam. Anyone else?

Sebastian: I will go to "abstain." Sebastien. I am confused with what is going on as a discussion. How it's going on. At the same time, it's...

Cheryl: Because there is confusion, I'm also going to support delaying 'til face-to-face at Sydney, and write this whole torturous exercise up for a learning experience in the world of democracy.

We will now have that matter carried over until Sydney.

Sebastien: But may we ask... May I suggest that we ask Alan, Adam and if you want, myself, to draw something for Sydney. So we don't arrive with nothing. We have different points of view, and they're put on the table before the meeting, to allow people to read it. Then we'll discuss it at Sydney.

Cheryl: You're talking about in-excess of all of this information we've shared tonight? And in all of the discussion on the list? Are you, Sebastien?

Sebastien: Yes. Yes.

Cheryl: Okay. So with Alan and Sebastien, [Helen] and Adam -- we're taking a 3-minute rest.

Operator: [left]

Cheryl: To introduce their matter for a 12-minute debate [inaudible]. Okay?

V: That's fine by me. Fine by me.

Cheryl: Okay. Right!

Dare I suggest we actually move beyond Item 2, through the agenda, and actually look at Sydney meeting plans?

Well, we know what one of the things is going to be on the agenda. [laughter]

I feel that we've satisfied one thing. We definitely had the agenda item for our ALAC meeting. It's going to include the discussion of the votes!

If you'd like to look at -- in fact, what I might do is take a sip of water... [inaudible] it is water. I'll ask Heidi if you could take us through the Sydney meeting plan. Not so much the straight meeting-plan page, which is fairly similar -- but the more exciting one, which is the topics for agendas. Which is where we ask the community right out to the ALSs, and certainly, the RALOs, to propose topics for the agendas.

Heidi: Yes. This is an initiative of At-Large, to be bottom-up and transparent to everyone.

We have posted the meetings on this agenda page for people to fill in. ALAC members have posting rights. So we ask that you post your suggestions for the various meetings of At-Large by the 29<sup>th</sup>, by adding your comments here.

You will see on the link that they're in three languages, and there are already some suggestions. Cheryl, do you wish to go through them?

Cheryl: If you'd just do a rough run through. We really need this community to have -- I think -- thought over those and made any additional comments that are clear and obvious, now. Then to give them until no later than the 5<sup>th</sup> to make changes to these documents, before we start finalizing the agenda.

Heidi: Yes. We've given the deadline of the 29<sup>th</sup>, but the 5<sup>th</sup> is absolute deadline. Yes.

In addition to that -- in addition to posting -- the fact is that we may also request that while you're posting these ideas, you think about which documents you'd like to have available during these meetings. And whether they need translation. Also, send those to the At-Large staff. Let us know of those documents, again, by the 29<sup>th</sup>.

If you plan on preparing a Power Point Presentation or presenting that during one of the meetings, please send that to At-Large staff by the 5<sup>th</sup> of June.

Sebastien: Can we... With the translation of the title... for example... We are naturally going to sell the [Travel Derige]. If not, we need a teacher. But I would suggest some changing of the wording in the French part of the document.

V: Okay.

Cheryl, do you want me to go through quickly the meeting?

Cheryl: Yes. We can [inaudible]

Heidi: Okay.

Cheryl: [inaudible] at tonight's meeting.

Heidi: Okay. On Sunday, 21<sup>st</sup> June, between 9 and 1800, we have an ALAC and Regional Leadership Working Session 1. The agenda items currently are: [Review and] post-summit review and planning up to Seoul for that trimester.

Monday, 22<sup>nd</sup> June, ALAC and Secretariats Planning and Resource Allocation. 11 to 1400. Current agenda items are: A review of the Sydney Schedule. Particularly the non-At-Large issues. And to allocate people to cover non-At-Large meetings.

Also on that day, we have an ALAC Policy and Issues Discussion.

[Patrick joins call]

The current item there -- our staff briefings. We need to identify today the topics that you would like to have, there. So we can work with the appropriate staff.

So should I stop there or should I continue?

Cheryl: No, continue.

Heidi: Okay. So that is something that we need to come back to.

Tuesday -- again -- 23<sup>rd</sup> -- between 11 and 12.30 -- there's the ALAC and board members, with Peter Dengate Thrush and Paul Twomey. There are no current agenda items for that. We're still waiting for absolute confirmation from the board on that.

Tuesday, 23<sup>rd</sup> June, between 14 and 15.30, there is a joint session of the GAC and ALAC. Issues on the agenda currently are: IDN ccTLD Fast Track and Implementation of New gTLDs.

Same day between 18.30 and 19.30 -- At-Large and NCUC joint session. Several issues are currently on the agenda, there. GNSO Improvements, and NCSG issues. The Registrant Rights and Responsibilities. Joint ALAC and GNSO Working Group.

The Future RAA Amendments Working Group, and the New gTLDs. This is a breakfast on Tuesday. This is the ALAC and ALAC-Review Working Group, between 7.30 and 9. Currently on the agenda -- "What's next after the final report?"

Moving to Wednesday -- we have the APRALO monthly meeting. That was discussed on today's call.

Moving to Thursday, they're going to be a Regional Secretariat's meeting. This one will be 90 minutes, rather than the usual 60 minutes, because there's been so much interest shown from the RALOs and the Secretariats.

Three issues on the agenda. The first one is to review and to revise the Secretariat work plan that has been discussed at several of the past meetings. I'm surveying the RALOs on that -- how we want to change that.

A review and discussion of current RALO policy -- engagement and outreach activities. And increasing cross-RALO cooperation and coordination.

And on Friday, two meetings. One is the breakfast meeting between the ALAC and Secretariats for a wrap-up. That will be a working breakfast between 7 and 8.30. Currently on the agenda is feedback and reporting back from the non-At-Large meetings, and identifying any action items.

And the final meeting will be the ALAC Executive Committee, between 2 and 6. The current single agenda item is the allocation of responsibilities for follow-up.

Cheryl: Yes.

Heidi: Again, another. There are still two meetings to be confirmed. The other one is the ALAC and Board Breakfast. Again -- no issues on the agenda, currently. We are waiting to hear back for confirmation on that.

Cheryl: Great. Thank you, Heidi.

I'm sure I'll have agreement from the majority of people on the call. This is a great way for us all to be interacting and looking at the development of the important face-to-face agenda. Any off the top-of-your-head comments or proposals that anyone would like to make to the meeting now? Before we move to the next agenda item?

Remembering that now you've all been taken through this document, you should be using it as WIKIs are meant to. That's to put out proposals.

Sebastien: It's Sebastien. It's absolutely a great tool. I hope that we will use it as much as possible. I have just one question. It's that we maybe need to add somewhere a liaison that would participate in the meeting.

For example, maybe the liaison could be at the breakfast. The last breakfast. Or the wrap-up. But there are other places where it could be useful to have them if they are coming to Sydney.

Cheryl: Thanks, Sebastien. Of course, we actually have a two-here meeting, which is devoted totally to working out exactly who is going to be where, and what parts of not just our own meeting schedules, but the whole of the ICANN meeting are going to be covered by each and every one of us.

Adam: Cheryl -- it's Adam. So you don't want suggestions for meeting topics now? You want those put on the WIKI? Is that what you're saying?

Cheryl: Well, only because we have four minutes and a few things to get through. But if you've got something you'd like to propose now very briefly, please go ahead.

Adam: There is actually one thing. That is that I would like to start thinking about how we can begin persuading ICANN that they should orient a meeting toward consumer interest. Consumer organization interests.

To see if we can get Seoul or something... It probably would be Seoul. I don't think Nairobi would be convenient. To make the Seoul meeting somewhat oriented toward the interest of consumer organizations. We could also make this a topic for the board meeting.

It keeps on coming up in various different areas of ICANN discussion -- the importance of including consumer organizations. So, I think this might be something that we should start to plan in some earnest.

Obviously, we'd need all the help from Beau, but also the experience of Heidi and Nick -- who in other lives have done this kind of stuff. If they can take staff hats off and become Internet users.

Cheryl: So are you proposing that for the board breakfast or the board meeting...

Adam: I'd actually rather have it... Well, it depends how the board breakfast is structured. I'd actually rather have it as a discussion with the board members who come to us, and with them knowing that it's going to be an issue that we want them to have thought about collectively, beforehand. Which is actually why I'm raising this now.

Cheryl: Sorry, Adam. Just to cut across you briefly.

My only concern with doing that as an exercise with the meeting of the board members in the formal Tuesday go-round is that when we have discussed the matters that are not purely matters of policy development... And in this case, it was something as radical as the At-Large Summit... We have been literally hauled over the coals as a community, being reported to the whole of the board in a report-card system for naval-gazing and not getting on with policy development.

Adam: Yes.

Cheryl: And with meaningful work, I would be a little fearful of running that exercise again.

Adam: That was something I was thinking of when I actually wanted to raise it now rather than on the WIKI. I wanted to emphasize that it's something we would have to tell them beforehand, so that they were prepared and not shocked by our inability to focus on policy.

[Vivek leaves call]

... So that they could be enthusiastic about our willingness and ability to try to bring in consumer organizations; which they themselves have said are important, and various other processes, as well, have.

Simply, I'm trying to say if we've prepared them first that this is something we want to discuss with them and the board members, then prior to those 3 or 4 board members coming, they should be able to have a discussion on the board list about it. Then, take back that input from us, to the board, again.

I would hope that would prevent the situation you're describing happening again. I am aware that that's happened, and I think it's a shame. I understand your concerns.

Cheryl: Well, particularly because it's very likely that we'll have exactly the same people making exactly the same checklist report card back to the board again. Yes. I'd want to be very careful about that.

However...

Adam: But you see what I mean about the preparation, though? The preparation.

Cheryl: Yes. Yes, I do. And that's where we actually have an opportunity to -- if we're lucky -- get these. And by, "Lucky," I mean to get these. We do get the board members in the room. How much they're listening to us, is my question, during our meeting.

The breakfast scenario actually gets more access to more board members. I thought perhaps it might be worthwhile considering it to be a more potentially likely successful outcome. But let's look at that when we're tidying up [inaudible].

Okay. We're now at the end of our established meeting time, and we have got a helluva lot of work still on our agenda. Can I propose a 10-minute extension to the meeting, and for us to talk specific to deciding on which of the current subjects for public comment -- including security and stability to be added to the list on the agenda we are going to be responding to? And the proposed changes to public consultation -- Yes or No? Go ahead?

Nick: Sorry. I guess [inaudible] you're extending.

Cheryl: Yes. That's what I'm hoping to do. Does anyone object to use extending for 10 minutes? I know that Vivek had to leave, already.

Okay. I see no objections, so we have a 10-minute extension. Go ahead, Nick.

Nick: I just wanted to say, I show that we could use a decision from you all on the statement drafted by Sebastien. In addition to the other points.

Comments were requested to Sebastien's statement on the ALAC internal list, but not in public. So if the ALAC wishes to approve the statement now, that would be helpful to know. Or if it wishes to also [make] public At-Large comments before voting to approve it, that would also be helpful. We could then set the timeline to do either one of those things. I know Sebastien would like this to be moved forward sooner rather than later.

Cheryl: Yes. Indeed. I support him in that.

Sebastien, would you care to speak to that?

Sebastian: Yes. I think that, anyway, we are late to send it to the board and to the working group or to the PSC list or comments list.

I think it's difficult. On one had, even in the working group, we didn't get a lot of feedback. It was much more than just the people from ALAC. From the ALAC internal list, we didn't receive a lot of feedback, either. It's a balance.

Theoretically, I think it's better to go to the At-Large. But in practice, I don't know if we will get a lot of feedback. Then I'm wondering if it's really needed.

It's better, but... I guess I would prefer now to ask for a vote for the ALAC. We can explain that it's just what we already discussed in the working group during the Summit, and on different exchanges where we take that information and try to put that on the last documents from the PSC -- and to draw answers in all comments they have that concern ALAC. That's it.

I guess that's my proposal for today.

Cheryl: Let's be clear, then.

Sebastien: Yes. [laughter]

Cheryl: I'm walking [inaudible]

Sebastien: Sorry, it was not clear. I will say it clearly.

Cheryl: [inaudible] can be confusing, tonight. Believe me.

What you are now proposing, Sebastien, is that the ALAC [inaudible]? Is that correct?

Sebastien: Yes. That is correct.

Cheryl: Okay. So you've all had the opportunity in terms of the internal list, to look at the additional work. The chair -- Sebastien -- of the Work Group -- is now proposing that rather than go out to full At-Large public commentary and then voting... he is calling for us to vote to support or not the addition of work seen in that link by the PSC Work Group as an ALAC statement.

Have I captured that correctly, Sebastien?

Sebastien: Yes.

Cheryl: Would anyone like to support Sebastien in that proposal?

SI: Carlos supports.

Cheryl: Thank you, Carlos. Okay.

Well, is there anyone who wishes to caution us, to say, "This is a dangerous pathway down which we go?"

Sebastien: It is. I know it is. But I think I will take the responsibility for that. I will assume it.

Cheryl: The thing is, though, Sebastien -- it will be a shared responsibility. Regardless of who offers to put their head on the chopping block. It will be us all.

So --

Nick: I'm sorry. When would you like to open and close the vote for that?

Cheryl: Well, in that case... That's what my very next words would be.

Nick: Oh -- sorry.

Cheryl: [laughter] Nick is channeling me tonight.

We can have the vote opened as soon as possible. We'll run that for... Do you want 5 or 7 days? Sebastien? Carlos? Your call.

I think 5 days should do it.

Carlos: Five. Yes. Five days.

Cheryl: All right. We'll set that vote up as soon as possible, then.

Nick: Okay.

Operator: [inaudible]

Nick: We'll schedule that for the 27<sup>th</sup> of May to the 1<sup>st</sup> of June.

Cheryl: Yes. Okay.

Adam: Adam. Just wanted [inaudible]

Cheryl: [inaudible] Adam? Sorry -- there's a huge interference. Adam?

Adam: Sorry.

Can we again make it a very simple vote? "Yes, No," for the document? Could we have a link to the document that we're voting on?

I know they're usually there. But I'm a bit confused about which versions and so on we're voting on. And I'd really like to make sure I read the right thing before I cast my vote. Thank you.

Nick: We will indeed include that.

Cheryl: Yes. That's absolutely. That's non-negotiable.

SI: One more thing from Carlos. I just wanted to make sure. Would it be possible to get translations in Spanish and French for that document?

Nick: We will have them, but we will not have them until after the document is voted on, I'm afraid.

Cheryl: It won't be pre-vote. They'll have to use a Google Translator tool, and get an "As good as it gets," and not, "As good as it could be," in translation.

I think the LACRALO list was also looking at things like [GOOT]. There are a few. Perhaps the LACRALO secretariat could look at that.

SI: I just wanted to say it wasn't even just for me. Really, it was just to be able to share with LACRALO.

Cheryl: That's fine. But we're actually... He just supported a proposal to just have the vote going as an ALAC vote, without wider At-Large community public commentary. Once the vote is done, then yes, the documents will be in all of our languages.

But it won't be able to be done within five days. That's what Nick was saying.

And again, we can use the less-than-perfect tools -- as long as we know that they are less-than-perfect tools and an absolutely accurate translation is in the pot. [inaudible].

Okay?

All right.

We need to now very quickly decide as a group what public comment ones we're going to be putting our efforts into between now and Sydney.

Go ahead, Nick.

Nick: Sorry -- I just have two other questions. The IRT Working Group will issue its final report either today or tomorrow. Something like this.

There will be a consultation that follows it. I'm assuming that At-Large wishes to respond to that final report. I guess I'm checking if that's a correct assumption.

Cheryl: I would think so. But anyone else yell loudly now, if that's not the case.

V: I think the answer is "Yes," and I would like to add that it's absolutely important that we gather all the people who say that they're willing to participate in this work from the At-Large perspective.

May I suggest that we organize a phone conference in the next 10 days to allow those people to participate. To have the time to read it, and then to participate in this discussion. Maybe we could ask Patrick to lead that, because he was the one who made the first draft on our thinking about the previous draft of the document of the IRT Group.

Patrick: I will oblige, if no one minds.

Cheryl: We'd be delighted for you to take that on. Thank you, Patrick.

Nick: I would just note that we are... The IRT has said that they wished to talk with At-Large about its views. And we are in the process of scheduling a teleconference, where you can talk directly with them.

Cheryl: That would be excellent. I think that even is more beneficial than just us having a conversation amongst ourselves. I think it's something that [inaudible] have had time to have read the document before that call happens.

Nick: Yes.

Cheryl: Okay. Well, that needs to be added to the list.

The security and stability, I suspect, is going to be one that we do want to make a public

comment on. I'd be shocked and horrified, in fact, of things we had Working Group Number 5 on that topic, if we did not. Am I correct in that assumption?

I'll take that as a "Yes."

Patrick: What? You want me -- Patrick -- to reply?

I guess that yes, we may want to make some comments on this plan. But I haven't heard yet much activity from the [message] regarding this report. So I'm not sure that we would be able to [inaudible] comments before the 19<sup>th</sup> of June.

Cheryl: Well hopefully, we'll have our briefing before then. And if nothing else, we can reiterate to them the matters that were raised in the now-endorsed aspects of the Summit Declaration from the Working Group.

Nick: I believe there is a Doodle out to select a time for that briefing with Greg [Ratre].

Heidi: Being prepared. It should go out tomorrow.

Nick: Yes. So yes, there will be a briefing within the next -- I don't know -- 10 days or so.

Heidi: Yes.

Nick: Obviously, we're giving people some time. Which should make it easier to create a response.

Cheryl: Adam -- go ahead?

Adam: Yes. I was just wondering. It's really a question for Patrick. The phone is beeping whenever I speak.

Patrick: Yes. I don't hear you.

Adam: Hi. It's Adam. Is the Root Scaling Study going to be included in this? Or will this be a separate issue? I think the Root Scaling thing is [inaudible] interest.

Patrick: No. That's totally a separate issue. It has nothing to do with this security plan, actually.

The goal of the study is to determine what the consequences would be, and when the roots on file will grow, by adding a new [GLDDNS set] piece. [IPV6] addresses and [inaudible]. But it's totally unrelated to this security plan.

Adam: Okay. I'd heard about that from some people. [inaudible] and then radio reports on it. Your monthly reports on that. I think it's [inaudible]

Cheryl: Oh, bad interference.

Adam: It's every time I speak. Is this coming frame... it's a landline in Japan. I'm very sorry if it's me.

I think it's a very important issue, and one we should be concerned about. The technical community has been asked numerous times since the very beginning of the New TTLD process if the root scales. And the community has near-begged for a number.

I remember John [Clenson] standing on stage and saying, "10,000," and so on. So in your committee, Patrick, I think you could just remind them that they really have to review their previous statements. If they start coming up with figures now -- or...

In fact, the statement that came out of Autonomica at the RIPE meeting was immediately picked up by the [GAK]. And immediately picked up by the intellectual property community as a means to reduce the number of new gTLDs. So I think they're being a little bit naive. They're also basically messing with the process.

They've been asked these questions numerous times. So it's about time they started paying attention, frankly. But that may be [inaudible]

Patrick: Regarding the security and stability of the advisory committee, all people are well aware of the potential issues that could come up. And the questions they might get from other groups.

There were already some studies done. Although maybe not directly from an [inaudible]. But several root operators have already tried to simulate what would happen in the case of the roots then growing up to 10,000 gLDs. That does not really seem to be an issue, right now.

Adam: Thanks.

Cheryl: Well, I think we'll certainly have plenty to say on that. I'm very, very keen to have an ALAC statement going during that public comment period.

Can I ask that we extend for another 5 or 10 minutes more? Yes or no?

Patrick: Unfortunately, I will have to leave the call.

Cheryl: Okay. In that case, we're actually going to drop the [live forum], because we've also lost Jose -- and Alan has had to leave, as well.

In which case, we cant make any decisions. But I would like to -- as we're finishing up -- say that of the public comment periods, the one that we obviously also need to make comment on is the... or I'll ask you if we need to make comment on them... Do we need to do anything for the FY10 operating plan and budget?

We'll take the rest of the agenda for tonight to the list. Because we're getting quite compressed in time now between now and Sydney. If we take it to the list, we'll need to decide then on what else we are going to... other than the enhanced security and stability work. What else we're going to put in comments for. Possibilities, of course... Conflicts-of-interest and, of course, the operating plan and budget seem to be the most obvious.

I would encourage you all again to please take the time to make any additional suggestions for the Sydney agenda onto that [inaudible]

[Patrick leaves call]

Cheryl: And thank you all very, very much for your time.

Yes -- Adam -- you want a final word? Go ahead.

Adam: Actually, I was just trying to control these bloody microphone and hand-raising things on my Macintosh. It seems to sometimes double-click up and double-click down.

Cheryl: Okay. Adam -- I'll assume that you were then waiving goodbye to us.

Adam: Yes. I was waving goodbye and all kinds of things. I'm sorry.

Cheryl: And I thank you all very, very much. Perhaps on a Sunday, we might spend a few minutes in the care and feeding of the Adobe Connect Room.

Adam: Yes.

Cheryl: [laughter] All right. Thank you all very much, everybody. We still have a little work to do on the list, and a couple of votes to get on with. Thank you all. Good morning, Good day and Good night.

V: Bye-bye.

Voices: [voicing goodbyes]

**[session ends]**