

ALAC_EN_2009-11-24 0920 APT_268201

Unidentified Participant: Censorship.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You've all been reading the contentious press, obviously.

Unidentified Participant: I don't even have to read the press. I get direct report.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: As far as I know, the general consensus in the room at the next step, with the exception of the Chinese delegation, were talking (inaudible) of the internet governance forum continuing as a non-decision-making meeting in a multi-stakeholder environment.

Unidentified Participant: Yep. I think the Chinese delegation was very (unintelligible) about shutting down IGF (ph).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed. Indeed. They were the exception to what it tended to be a litany of support from all other stakes (ph). So we will wait it with bated breath to see whether or not it continues. If we are able to influence it any way, my guess would be yes as a multi-stakeholder, non-decision-making body exploring the (inaudible) principles.

A number of the workshops were very, very interesting and exceptionally well attended. There was a compression in the time available for workshops because of the first lady, Suzanne Menedic (ph) to do a morning's presentation with all the added security that is involved with having a speaker of her stature in a conference like that. So the Wednesday morning where the workshop should have been running in parallel had to start well before 8:00 a.m. And, unfortunately, I think many of those were not as well attended as they should be. And, of course, we were all quite literally locked into a room during the morning session, which was a very worthwhile and interesting one but did play some degree of chaos in the schedules and planning. And, like all IGFs, but I think perhaps a little worse than most, the multiplicity of streams was such that I think it needs a great rationalization so that we actually have less workshops and that the very hard and very worthwhile work that's being done can be visited and enjoyed and interacted with by more people.

So, that's it. That's one item off our agenda for later on. What we do need to consider, however, is - Do we have quorum yet? Has Dave been rung? Not yet.

Unidentified Participant: He's on the (inaudible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, Dave, we're going to count you as quorum via the Adobe (ph). Okay? So Heidi or someone needs to ensure that we do capture what we're doing in the Adobe room, so Dave is able to contribute that way. And we will, in fact, dial out to him.

All right, bringing us now to the very first item of the agenda tonight at the rather shameful point of some 17, nearly 18, minutes past the hour with quorum, we are now calling for any other business or amendments to the agenda. And I will remind you all that, at this point in time, anyone who has hosted a report, be it a liaison report or a workgroup report, and who wishes to speak to a matter arising from their report or to have a matter discussed, do, please, bring that forward now. I see Alan. Alan, please, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I did add an item that is in my report to the items for discussion at the end of the meeting. I would appreciate it if we have an opportunity to get to it. It's just two minutes. But we really need to do a heads up and an informal decision on how we handle GNSO STI (ph) issue.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. We've got that added. Sebastien, go ahead.

Sebastian Bachollet: Yeah. I need to give feedback on where we are regarding the board review and comments from At-Large. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. Any other adjustments to tonight's agenda? I see nobody asking in the Adobe room. And I hear no one. Anything from Spanish or French channel?

Spanish Interpreter: Nothing from Spanish. I just asked them.

French Interpreter: And there's nobody yet on the French.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, ladies.

Alan Greenberg: And Dave says he's on this call.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Say it again, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Dave says he's on this call. I haven't heard him.

Dave Kissoondoyal: Yes, Alan. I'm on the call.

Alan Greenberg: Good. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent, Alan. I'm pleased to hear that. Thank you, Dave, for joining us. Hopefully we won't have as much problem getting you connected in the future. A little bit of housekeeping, short version. Everything you say is recorded. We simultaneously transcribe-- sorry-- interpret, and everything is transcribed into three languages. So you will need to identify yourself by name if you start to speak. And I will do my best as chair to name you when you are a speaker so that the interpreters' voices into Spanish and French know that it is you speaking as opposed to me or someone else. Okay. Welcome, Dave.

Dave Kissoondoyal: Yeah. [Well understood.]

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry. Thank you, Dave. Did you want to say something else, Dave?

Dave Kissoondoyal: I just said that it is well understood from my side.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent. It's just that not everyone is used to everything being recorded and MP3s being made. So it's important to be aware of that.

I think we've covered apologies and roll call, unless anyone else who's just joined us hasn't had their name listed in the Adobe room as an apology, participant, or listed as absent.

In that case, we will now move to the action items and transcripts from the Seoul meeting. You'll follow those links. And we can, first of all, look at the ALAC and regional leadership session. I'm waiting for my computer to catch up with me.

Alan Greenberg: And can you tell us what item of the agenda this is?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Certainly. This is, she says going back to the other page, item three. Item three.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Item three of section one.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay? Someone's got the transcript open faster than I have. Sebastien, have you got that open? My computer is still opening.

Sebastien Bachollet: Action item - transcript and motion from Seoul meeting. Do you want to go to action item? We need to look at the action item?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Inaudible). Yep.

Sebastian Bachollet: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's just my Adobe was taking a while to open it up. Okay. Is there any--? I've got it open now. We should note that this is a 91-page document. And what I would like to do is see if there is any particular action items arising from that and have those as a short form.

Sebastian Bachollet: There is an action item, just one page. And Heidi just cut and paste it in the other [Beechnut] room.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent. Thank you. That would be nice to have as part of our agenda as well. It makes it easier.

Reading that very small print in the Adobe room, then, what do we have as outstanding action items?

The IAC we've dealt with. What else?

The TLD managers, regional meetings, training-- that's still a work in progress. Patrick, would you like to speak to that matter now? I know you and I met with some of the ISOC people about looking at working smarter not harder with the TLD training proposal you put forward. Patrick?

Patrick Vande Walle: Well, I think the situation hasn't changed since we discussed this matter in Seoul in the sense that you remember, Cheryl, that we had this meeting with some people. I also had a chat with ICANN staff in charge of providing the content for the ccTLD training sessions.

But that's the current situation. Currently, they think that, for example, the (unintelligible) is not really a priority. But, if there is sufficient demand from the ccTLDs, then, of course, they would include it in the course. But this has to come from the ccTLDs and not something top-down that ICANN and ISOC would impose in the course. They wanted to meet the request rather than come up with knowledge that people will not use.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. I'm wondering, Patrick, whether this is something that we need to perhaps keep a watching brief on and, Ron, whether or not this is something we might want to raise in the world of ccTLD via U.N. Rudi (ph). Ron, would you care to respond to that?

Ron Sherwood: I was just on muted. Can you repeat the question, please? I don't want to speak on behalf of Rudi. This is--

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible). This is really as a response to what Patrick has just reported to us-- that any requests for (unintelligible) or the training-- the sorts of things that the ALAC was discussing and was concerned about having some, perhaps, joint working opportunities where ICANN, ISOC, and the various RIR training that goes on for the ccTLD operators might be more harmonized. And, as Patrick was just saying, the feedback is that, of course, such a thing is possible, but the requests and desire for such training needs to come from the (unintelligible)-- in other words, from the ccTLD operators. And I was perhaps just to raising it with you and Rudi, in absentia, that this might be a matter for us to discuss further down the track but one that we might want to keep a watching brief on.

Ron Sherwood: Can I ask--? Are we specifically talking about what we were looking at-- in other words, working together in the regions? Or are we discussing the training that goes on at ICANN meetings. Don't forget we have our tech day, and always there is a request for topics that would or could or would like to be discussed and training done at that tech day at each meeting. And I know that Everhart (ph) would like input from other people, as meetings are not just for ccTLDs; they are open to outsiders - people that are not ccTLD operators. So are we discussing the tech day, or are we discussing going forward in the educational process that you and I and Rudi have been discussing in the past?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think you'll find the answer is both, but I'm going to let Patrick make that response. Go ahead, Patrick, and then, Vanda, you're next.

Patrick Vande Walle: Yes. Well, actually, it's not so much about the (unintelligible) workshops that are being held in ICANN meetings, which have been a standard by CCEN/gTLD (ph) operators. Actually, these are trainings given in the region. It's a joint effort financed by ICANN and ISOC and RIRs. And they target the ccTLD operators, especially the smallest ones. And I wish to emphasize that although, obviously, ccNSO input is most welcome. Many of the ccTLDs never attend ICANN meetings, and there may not be members of the ccNSO. So it's sort of a process which is being run outside the usual ICANN circles, although it's partially financed by ICANN.

Ron Sherwood: All right. From a personal perspective, it's highly desirable. I've discussed it with ccNSO members and with the council. They seem to have been-- to have warmed to the idea. We don't yet have in place a system for making this happen, and I was hoping that we would get a bit closer to that. At the last meeting, you will recall that we discussed polling the ccTLDs to find out which-- members of (ph) ccNSO, at least, do run this type of training program and do have a community outreach relationship and do involve themselves in technical training amongst other kinds of educational process.

It's on the agenda or was on the agenda for today. It was in my report to the ccNSO for today's council meeting, which was due to be held three hours ago and which was

canceled, unfortunately, in the early hours of the morning due to a number of counselors being unavailable and, unfortunately, Chris being sick on his return from the conference that you were at. So that meeting did not happen this morning. And, therefore, as much as I would like to have reported on it, I'm not able to.

But the understanding between the chair of ccNSO and the chair of ALAC, myself, and Rudi is that this should happen-- that there are many ways of manifesting this cooperation. We want to move forward with it. It's just unfortunate that I didn't get the response from my report to ccNSO in this morning's meeting because it didn't happen.

But, yes, I'm all in favor of it. Certainly, ccNSO has warmed to the idea. They weren't all that warm to it a year ago, but I believe that this will happen if we push it and go forward with it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Ron. Patrick, just back to you before we move to Vanda, do you agree that we should keep this as a matter for continued pursuit but not at a particularly high priority?

Patrick Vande Walle: Oh, yes. Certainly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Vanda, go ahead.

Spanish Interpreter: One second, please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's all right. While you're doing that--

Vanda Scartezini: What we did want to say is that this is an opportunity in concert with a generic DDS (ph) to absolutely speak about the issues related to security. The meeting where we're at today in Sao Paulo this week-- later on we will be in Buenos Aires. So I think that that idea of working in concert and really gathering our efforts is going to be for the better interest of ICANN. And I think it would be good to involve the other participants in training, especially in issues that are related to security; for example, here in Brazil, there is myself, there's Sylvia, there's other people. And it would allow us to have more CC meetings. I know that there are other members in Buenos Aires as well that will be getting together and that will be able to contribute for training groups. So it's a good opportunity to use the concerted efforts that ICANN is proposing in order to propose the new gTLDs in order to be able to bring the people together that are interested or be registrants in order to be able to provide the this training at some point.

You know, at this point, we're all together talking about security and other issues. So I do think that it's a good idea. And it would be a good thing to accelerate this process. (Unintelligible) from ICANN. Thank you. That is all.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Vanda. Patrick, I'm thinking that what we might do is revisit this item at our next meeting but perhaps take some time between now and our next meeting to have an online discussion and see how we might approach this as a next step or as an ongoing item. Would that be appropriate, Patrick?

Patrick Vande Walle: Yes. Certainly. We could do that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, because what you raised and what we all agreed to in Seoul I think is very, very important. And I'm hearing nothing but good reasons why we should continue on. Any other--?

Ron Sherwood: Madame chair, this is Ron Sherwood.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Go ahead, Ron.

Ron Sherwood: Could I be a party to any discussion on that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'd be more than happy to welcome you on board, Ron. Any other speakers on this matter? It's not under, I guess, item three. I would note that the residual items that we had discussed in the Seoul meeting are all as part of tonight's agenda, so we'll cover those within our agenda tonight.

This brings us to agenda item four, review of recently approved and outstanding ALS applications. We wish to welcome NEXTI from LACRALO as our newest At-Large structure. Welcome aboard, and looking forward to great things from Brazil. Congratulations, Vanda and your team, on getting this organization as an At-Large structure and, no doubt, furthering very much the types of things, including (unintelligible) and new gTLD conversations within your region. And we note to current-

-

Say it again. Go ahead, Vanda.

Vanda Scartezini: And thank you. And all of the women here-- We just really thank you for that welcome.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It is our pleasure. We have two current applications, both in the Asia-Pacific regional At-Large organization space, one from ISOC Pakistan, and one from the Pakistan ICT (ph) policy monitor has had its due diligence done and has gone for regional advice. And the other is undergoing due diligence at the moment. Is that the case, staff? And, if so, is there anything I've missed or anything that you need to add?

Heidi Ullrich: Cheryl, this is Heidi. That is absolutely correct. The ISOC Pakistan due diligence was sent out to the regions-- to APRALO yesterday. And Karaitiana distributed that, asking for regional advice. And the Pakistan ICT policy monitor due diligence will be completed today.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent. Thank you very much for that. Any discussion or questions on the current new or outstanding ALS applicants? I seen no one in the Adobe room, in which case, we will move on to our next agenda item.

And this is the liaison reports. We have requests, and it will be at this point in time, Alan, that I'll be handing the microphone to you for speaking to your report briefly. And I would like to simply note to the record Vanda's initial report in her new role as board liaison and thank her very much for her report. We will consider it tabled. And we look forward to continuing having a great advocate and powerful ally amongst the board members, having the experience of you in the board and you from the GAC (ph) being our voice is one that, as you can see in the Adobe room, Sebastien and, I'm sure, several others are applauding. So thank you very much for your work at Seoul and the ongoing work that you will be doing and, of course, being an effective part of the ALAC team, which we know you will be continuing, not the least of which, of course, with the ALS NEXTI.

Alan, the microphone is yours.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Thank you. The GNSO STI special trademark issue group has been meeting very actively. We've had six meetings to date, after Seoul - one at Seoul and six meetings

since, at a rate of two meetings a week - one on the URS and one on the clearinghouse. We are a lot farther along than some of us thought we would be. That does not mean we're at closure. Right now there are still some very contentious issues.

The target of the group was to deliver a report to the GNSO for its meeting yesterday. We clearly did not do that. And I think that was a dream to begin with.

Our current schedule is that-- The original board request was that the GNSO report back to the board by the 14th of December. We have revised that slightly in that the GNSO has a meeting on the 17th of December, and we have informal acceptance from the board, through staff, that a delay of three days will not cause a problem.

So the intent is to deliver a report to the GNSO, preferably, by the 7th of December, which is a Monday or, at latest, Wednesday, which gives a week for constituencies to look at the report and decide whether they're supporting it in a formal vote to be taken on the 17th. ALAC does not have a vote, but we are expected, I think, to either put thumbs up or thumbs down to the same document.

My intent is, by the end-- We currently have straw man proposals on both of the issues that are being gone-- going through. And my belief is, by the end of the meeting this week, we will have a revised straw man, and I intend to send that out, certainly, to the names issues group but also to the ALAC. And, to the extent people want me too, I will do it to At-Large in general, the point being that we will have about seven days to decide whether the final report is acceptable or not. This early version, although it will not be the same, will give people an idea of where it's going. So far, I have had support on most of the issues that have been raised from the name issue group that we have, so I'm not expecting any major perturbations. But you never know.

We need to decide-- Is the ALAC going to formally vote to support this? Are we going to take an informal poll? And, if so, what do we do so that, by the meeting of the 17th, I will have the wisdom. If we want a formal vote, I think we need to schedule it, essentially, on the 7th or 9th of December, with the understanding that people will read the document and then vote as soon as they have the opportunity. It's not a lot of time, but that's the schedule we're working on.

There is a belief that, if we come to a general consensus but it's not a full consensus, we may ask the board for an extension of a month or so and try to have a face-to-face meeting in January to finalize things and dot all the Is. It's not clear whether that will happen or whether it will be approved, but there is discussion of it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Which way are you advising us in terms of to take a formal vote or to--?

Alan Greenberg: I would like to see a formal vote, but if the ALAC wants to at this meeting delegated to the names issue group, that's ALAC call. I think, given that we have been included in this process, I think we owe the-- we have a responsibility to take it seriously. If we decide to agree that, too, (ph) we do it formally.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Thanks for that. Can I ask the ALAC now to discuss that proposal? It's not a motion as such, but I think it's certainly something that I would prefer to see have as a formal vote. Would anybody like to speak to this matter or discuss this matter? Sebastien is typing. Is there anyone who disagrees with Alan's proposal for us to put a vote forward starting on the 9th or thereabouts-- 9th of December for the ALAC to vote on this?

Spanish Interpreter: We are in agreement says the Spanish channel.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. So I hear Sylvia, Vanda, and Sebastien and James. I see James in support of that. I'm certainly in support of that. Would anybody disagree with that as a way forward? Put a great, big, red X up if you're in the Adobe room. Or yell very loudly at me, and I'll recognize your name and record you for the permanent record that you disagree with the intelligence and good sense of everyone else at this meeting. Thank you.

It sounds to me like we're going to do a formal vote. So let's just make it happen. Thank you, Dave. Good to see your support as well.

Alan Greenberg: When I have the draft document, should I send it to At-Large also?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think that would be--

Alan Greenberg: I see no reason not to.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think that would be essential. And, in fact, I would like to think that At-Large and the regional ALSs would also like to put some sort of input in via their regions and their reps. And, of course, some of the regions may be directing their delegates into the ALAC (unintelligible). So I think that's very important.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Lastly, I want to give full credit to Olivier, who's been a marvelous companion on this process.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think huge thanks to both you and Olivier. I'm not sure if anyone hasn't lived through the type of intense meeting schedule that these sorts of commitments require from people. It really does subsume your lives totally.

Alan Greenberg: I will say I do have thanks to IGF, which reduced the level of work a little bit last week. But, for the first two weeks after Seoul, it was virtually a fulltime job. And I'm quite proud of the fact I'm becoming an expert on trademark issues.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just what we need, Alan - another trademark expert. I must say we probably should note Olivier's attention to this went above and beyond the call of duty. I mentioned earlier that we had the first lady as a speaker on the Wednesday morning. And, Alan, you know very well that there was an STI (ph) meeting just a few hours prior to that. And I can assure you we were all very pleased to see that Olivier was not actually arrested, simply escorted with dogs and guns, holding security guards and a great deal of kafuttle (ph) from the building because he was the only person still in the place while he was still having the meeting (unintelligible) for bombs and security.

Alan Greenberg: He did allude to that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think that was above and beyond the call of duty. Vanda, finally being beaten, you were the only other person that had been removed from a building with security-- because they had stayed on so long after an ALAC meeting. So you've got competition, you two.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. If we've got no further discussion on that--

Vanda Scartezini: I do want to say, like you said it, Cheryl, they've (ph) definitely beat me to that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Now, just back to you, Vanda, we don't need you to up the ante. You can rest on your laurels. We don't need to make this a competition.

Working group reports. Sebastien has mentioned that he wishes to speak in any other business on that. And we will note any of the RALO reports that have been (unintelligible) by way of information only, which brings us to the new business and the for-decision part of today's meeting.

The first item is the review of the At-Large policy development schedule, the PAD (ph). Has Carlton joined us, Heidi? Was he able to be dialed out too?

Spanish Interpreter: I'm sorry. This is the Spanish interpreter, Cheryl. Carlos just joined us. He highly apologizes. He just had a car accident on the way to work. So he is a bit still shaken up. But the point was to attend the meeting, so here he is now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The main thing is, please, is he okay?

Carlos: Like I said, a bit shaken up, but, yes. Thank God. I'm still whole, so that's always a good thing.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed. Metal is something that can be replaced; humans are much harder. So we're very sorry to hear about his accident and trust that he settles and that not too much damage was done.

Is Carlton on the call, then, Heidi?

Heidi Ullrich: No. He is not.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Obviously, we're going to have to make sure, because (unintelligible)-- the management is the policy advice development schedule, and deadlines is very much in his (unintelligible). So I gather that we will be doing some specific training on the PAD tool. Is that the case?

Heidi Ullrich: Matthias, do you want to speak to that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If you don't mind, too, very briefly. And then we'll be going straight to the PAD schedule and noting the ones that are not currently scheduled and asking the ALAC to decide what they want to do with them. Go ahead, Heidi.

Heidi Ullrich: Matthias is going--

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, Matthias. Go ahead, Matthias.

Matthias Langenegger: I just had a short session with Carlton yesterday to introduce him to the PAD. And, in the future, he will cover this part during the ALAC calls, he said, to give you a short overview of what's happening and what's going on.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Fantastic. That's terrific. Who was trying--? Was that you, Dave? Was someone trying to get my attention earlier?

Unidentified Participant: Let's go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No? Okay. Fine. We have three open consultations which are not presently scheduled for an At-Large response. And we'd like to know at this meeting whether or not any, all, or none of them are going to make it into our policy advice schedule. The first one is expression of interest in new TLDs. The second one is the CAC-proposed amendment to the UDRT's (ph) supplemental rules of the Czech arbitration court. And the third and

final one, which, I must say, is possibly the only one I would be personally supporting going into our policy advice development schedule, is the draft topic paper for policy on introduction of internationalized ccTLDs.

Would anyone like to suggest that the first or the second of those that I read out should be something that we need to put on our advice schedule?

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I would suggest that, on the first one, we don't have the time or the opportunity, really, to have an ALAC statement. On the other hand, if any individuals or RALOs, for that matter, would want to comment on the public comment period, I would think that would be useful.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. So perhaps what we can do is encourage the regional representatives for every region, with the exception of Asia-Pacific, because it won't have met by the 11th of December-- its next meeting will be the 22nd or 23rd of December, to have that on their regional agenda.

Alan Greenberg: Well, I would simply send-- we should send out a message to the ALAC working list pointing out this is open. The ALAC probably will not have an opportunity to respond to it. We encourage individuals or RALOs to do it. That's all.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Alan, would you consider that this is an ideal opportunity to give Carlton a job while he's not in the meeting--

Alan Greenberg: Indeed.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: -- and ask him to do that? Fantastic.

Alan Greenberg: I always support giving people jobs who aren't here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed. I think it's a good part of the aversive conditioning that we need to maintain. Okay. So we'll make that an action item on Carlton, in absentia, for him to do that.

On the second matter, the proposed amendments to the UDRP, does anyone have a burning desire for us to focus on that?

Alan Greenberg: I have a burning desire that we skip that one.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent. Nobody disagrees with that? Good.

Draft topic paper for policy on introduction of internationalized ccTLDs? James, if you are not in support of this, I will be astonished. James, would you care to suggest to us whether or not we should be putting this on our PAD?

James Seng: I think it's important that we participate in (inaudible).

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I have a question.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Is our response going to be we think this is a good document and support it? Or do we have substantive changes and suggestions to make to it?

- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: As somebody who's been part of the development of that document, I'm probably not the person to respond to that. Clearly, I'm happy. So, perhaps, James, if you'd like to respond?
- James Seng: I believe that it's too early to say whether we have substantive changes.
- Alan Greenberg: What is the deadline for this?
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm just clicking into it. Under normal circumstances, we actually put-- It's the 4th of December.
- James Seng: The 4th of December.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: 4th of December.
- Alan Greenberg: That's a week and half from now.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep.
- Alan Greenberg: I would suggest--
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: James, are you in a position to put a motherhood-type statement, brief analysis, and what we expect will be general affirmative paragraph together that we can distribute to the ALAC and At-Large and then use as a response? Or is that not going to be achievable?
- James Seng: I have a question. (unintelligible). I'm happy to put together a document. I think I can-- I should be able to do that-- a statement of some sort. (unintelligible).
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry. Could you just repeat that? You're fading in and out a little bit. Do you do that within what or At-Large?
- James Seng: After I draft the document-- I'm happy to do the document and incorporate it (inaudible). Should I circulate this in the At-Large internally, or should I (unintelligible)?
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Do you circulate with the internal list or the public At-Large list? That's your question?
- James Seng: That's right.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, my answer would be both.
- Alan Greenberg: Cheryl, he said the internal list. I assume you mean the one called the ALAC internal list. Is that what you meant?
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry. My error.
- James Seng: Yes.
- Alan Greenberg: That list should only be used for things that are truly confidential or things like travel arrangements and stuff like that. Virtually everything else, unless there's some real need for confidentiality, should be done on the ALAC working list, which, I assume, is what you meant.
- James Seng: Okay. (Inaudible). I will produce a document by Friday, circulate this (inaudible).

- Alan Greenberg: But with what timeframe are we going to try to formally approve that?
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, I'm happy to have it go through as something that's under current vote, providing we've had time to look at it.
- Alan Greenberg: So it will be produced by Friday. We have a week to look at it, and then we schedule a vote for a week or five days or whatever.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.
- Alan Greenberg: Is that correct? Okay.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Does anyone wish to speak to that, or are we all happy with that plan? Matthias, as Carlton isn't here, will you make those entries into the policy advice development schedule?
- Matthias Langenegger: Cheryl, yes, I will.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. And, James, feel free to interchange with us in the working list as you develop it as well. You can always do an early draft and get some feedback. It doesn't have to be an ultimate draft before it goes to the working list.
- James Seng: I understand. I will do that.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's good. Okay.
- Now, we have a whole list of PAD items not on target. And I would suggest that, with your permission, Sebastien, did you want to speak to your matter in this part of the agenda, then, as well?
- Sebastien Bachollet: Not as well. I can talk now and keep quiet for the next one.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. So we'll move you forward into this part of the agenda then. I must say it was a heroic amount of potential items that we were trying to cover over a face-to-face meeting period. I suspect that none of us will be overly surprised that some of these have fallen behind the schedule. But one or two of these are very, very important, and we do need to, in fact, have the ALAC put in a formal piece of advice to the board, as is its right to do so outside of the public comment period on, at least, a couple of these. I'd be very surprised if the ALAC disagreed with me. But we do need to discuss each of them.
- First of all, looking at the root-scaling (ph) model, we're not past the deadline yet, but we are perilously close. Who was leading that? Was that you, Patrick?
- Patrick Vande Walle: Well, kind of. Actually, the issue with this report is that they are very technical. I have seen some discussions on the SSAC (ph) list, for example, and, even between experts, there are some sorts of religious wars as to how they should proceed. So, for example, SSAC is not yet ready with their comments to both these reports. So I don't think that ALAC has any possibility to provide some helpful advice to the board on these reports. I would really suggest that we skip these ones. If we say we agree, we should be able to say why we agree. And if we say we disagree, we should be able to say why we disagree. And it's so technical I don't think that we are the right agency within the ALAC to comment on these reports.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. So you're proposing that we adjust our PAD to reflect your advice that the current status debate-- the ALAC is not in a position at this time to respond to this public comment period. Correct?

Patrick Vande Walle: Correct.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Does anyone disagree or wish to speak to that matter? I think that's okay. Yes. Go ahead, Sebastien.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yeah, not to disagree with Patrick at all, but to say that it's-- I expected somebody to say that it's really a pity that ICANN staff didn't start work as soon as ICANN decided to introduce a second wave of new gTLDs to have metrics to allow us as a general participant to ICANN world (ph) to understand what is really going on with new gTLD. It was one of the reasons for the introduction of the second wave of gTLD, because at the first one, it was not possible for ICANN to handle that. But it was not done. And then we are in this situation. That's a pity. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So noted, Sebastien. Thank you for that. Any other comments? If not, I would suggest-- Sorry. Yes. Go ahead, Garreth.

Garreth Sherman: I just raise the issue here that I am quite concerned about this whole issue because there is certainly a lot of-- I perceive a lot of concern about this whole issue of what happens with the root-scaling with all the new introductions. And so it's something that we want to make sure that we keep an eye on and be prepared to comment if required.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think I can say Patrick would be in absolute agreement with you there. I'd also like to perhaps take this opportunity, if I may, Patrick, with your permission, to encourage each of the regional representatives in the ALAC to go back to their RALOs and see whether or not there are ALS members or members of At-Large within their region who would like to join the security and stability workgroup because that would be the core group of people who should be maintaining the energy on these things.

Patrick Vande Walle: Yes. Sure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: In which case, Heidi, perhaps an action item on us is for each of us to do that, but that would also need to become part of the agenda building for each of the regional meetings in the following months.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks for that, Garreth.

All right, then. It sounds to me as if what we need to do is make that adjustment to the PAD and make sure that we revitalize our security and stability workgroup and that, indeed, we do keep a very close eye on what is going on here.

Nick, I'll just read that to the record. Nick was proposing in the Adobe room that ALAC could consider a statement about the importance of the issue in question and making the point that it would leave the detailed, technical analysis to those more specialized experts. Your response to that, Patrick?

Patrick Vande Walle: Sorry. I didn't hear the question.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Nick was just suggesting that perhaps ALAC could consider a statement about the importance of this issue-- of the issue in question and making the point that it will leave the detailed, technical analysis to those more specialized experts.

Patrick Vande Walle: Yes. Of course we could do that, but-- Yeah. Is it helpful in any way?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, Gareth seems to be in agreement. And I do say-- I will again read to the record sentiments that, whilst Nick is typing them, I suspect they're being supported by others. Whilst these are very technical things, there's nothing wrong with a political statement. And, in this way, it is clear that ALAC sees the issue as important and is following the discussion. Otherwise, people might think we are not following the issue. Dave is agreeing. And Alan has the microphone. Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I guess I tend to disagree. I think we should be actively limiting our comments to places where we have something of real substance to say. I think, once the RSAC and the SSAC reports come out, we may well have something of substance to say, saying we strongly support their recommendation that such and such. But I'm not sure adding another-- saying, yeah, this is important to really contributes to either the net knowledge of the world or our image.

Patrick Vande Walle: I tend to agree with Alan.

Alan Greenberg: That's just me perhaps.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Sorry. Back to you, Patrick. Say it again.

Patrick Vande Walle: I tend to agree with Alan.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. I think that's so noted. Does anyone wish to argue for a political statement at this stage to go ahead? If not, we revert back to the status quo (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: Dave says he supports the statement on the chat room.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Dave prefers a political view. Anyone else wish to weigh in on that, French or Spanish?

Spanish Interpreter: No.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you.

French Interpreter: The French are not here. We're recording for them.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. Well, it doesn't seem to be a majority that think the support is required. Of course, each and every one of us can make an individual comment. And perhaps some of us should do exactly that. So we close that off with no (ph) change to the PAD and no response going in.

Spanish Interpreter: Cheryl, I'm so sorry, but Carlos couldn't hear because of his connection. Could you just give a brief summary of this final proposal?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Certainly. The current proposal is that we do not make a comment on the root-scaling study team report and that we do not make a simple political statement assuming (ph) how important we think the topic is but, rather, that we make such comments or substantive support at a later date.

There is an alternate view that is being discussed that says we perhaps could make just a generic statement saying we can see that this is an important issue, but we'll leave the technical analysis to those who are better equipped to it.

Carlos: And Carlos does state that the final option is better. At this point it's better to abstain and do it at a later time.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Thank you. It's so noted. Okay, so back to the review. We will stick with that current status quo that we have on the table, which is not putting in a response. But we will encourage individuals and, indeed, regions and ALSSs to put in any particular comments if they so desire to.

Okay. Now, the rest of them. The proposed right to protection mechanisms in new TLDs. That public comment period has closed. The board review-- that public comment. We've got a draft statement, which I think we're going to have speaking (ph) at the moment-- sorry-- to Sebastien in a moment. Domain names registered using a privacy or proxy service. That comment period is closed. And the NomComm review, where we have also got a NARALO statement tabled for tonight's meeting, that comment period has closed.

Each of these matters are very important. Each of these matters are something that an active work group or discussions happened at Seoul with relation to each of these topics. And it is these methods that I would propose we consider putting ALAC statements in outside of the formalized ALAC statements in promptly but outside of the closing deadline. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: On the proposed rights to protection mechanism, I think it quite reasonable that we not comment formally on this but that we put in a minority statement along with the GNSO STI report, if we deem it applicable.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Ah. So you prefer to have it tethered in with the STI report.

Alan Greenberg: I think that's a reasonable way of doing it instead of trying to say everything here late. Excuse me. It had been inaccurately reported that the board-- if the STI group does not come to consensus, the board will simply implement the staff proposals. That was never the intent. The intent is always that whatever will be implemented will be factoring in whatever input is received during this previous comment period and the output of the STI report. So I think it's reasonable, given that we have been an integral part of this group, that we simply take any dissenting opinions on to that statement. I think the names issue group will have to develop that quickly, if indeed there are any. So I would suggest we not worry about it right now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. But that does sound like a very good way forward. Does everyone else think that's a very good way forward? I'm delighted with that proposal. And so I ask, does anyone disagree with that way forward for the proposed right to protection mechanism?

Vanda Scartezini: I do not agree with that, says Vanda.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead, Vanda. You do not agree with that?

Vanda Scartezini: Oh, I'm sorry. No. I do agree with the proposal. Sorry. I didn't hear. I'm so sorry. That was my fault.

Alan Greenberg: Too bad. I thought we were going to have a good argument.

- Vanda Scartezini: Yes. That's a good proposal, says Vanda.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You have no idea what I thought was happening to the timing of our agenda tonight at the when I heard that. Whew. Thank you so much for that. Good. Anyone else wish to speak or give me a heart attack? I'm not sure which. Okay, Alan, that's an excellent plan. Let's do it that way. But we also need to make sure that the new names task force is brought up to date with that. Who is going to take that action item on? You?
- Alan Greenberg: That's part of what I'll be doing in sending out things.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Fantastic. Thanks for that, Alan. Okay.
- Let's bring this to the board review final working group report and the draft statement. We've all got that in front of you. Sebastien, the microphone is yours.
- Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you. I think I would like to say something about the NomComm review at the same time because I just read the NARALO proposal, and I think, of course, the proposal-- the comments on the board review was returned before I read this one. But I think-- I don't know if they read my proposal. But there are a lot of convergence, and that's quite good.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: This is a good thing.
- Sebastien Bachollet: Yeah. It's a very good thing. A point is that I tried to organize a working group meeting tomorrow and on Friday. And, for the moment, we have just four people participating. And I think it's so important that maybe we can do, not tomorrow, but on Friday and to open it to every At-Large participant willing to discuss with us on that and to put on the table the two documents - one, the comments for the board review and the comments for the NomComm. I take (ph) the decision to produce under my name to be not so far from the deadline my comments and saying that it will be under discussion within At-Large and ALAC, but it's not yet done. And, if we say something else, that will be something else. That's not a problem. But I see also that there are very few comments - just one from AUDA (ph) and then one from our side. And there are very few comments on the board review.
- And, in addition, in the NomComm review, we had a long working group during the Seoul meeting. And I guess what was written by NARALO-- it's taking those ideas also and written (ph) what we said during this meeting. My proposal is to ask NARALO to put their statement on behalf of NARALO to the comment period because it was supposed to be closed yesterday and to use the two documents for our working group, let's say, on Friday to discuss that and online of course, and, after that, to have a final document to be brought to ALAC for a final decision.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. But are you saying--? Just to be clear, are you saying that we would not be proposing to put a specific piece of ALAC advice forward from the NomComm review?
- Sebastien Bachollet: No. I say, for both issues, we discuss it on the working group conference on Friday and that we absolutely come with some agreement on both documents and that we put both documents in front of ALAC for final decision - one from the board review and one from the NomComm review.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I just wasn't clear whether we were still maintaining two threads. But you are saying we are. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Two things. Number one, I would like to be included and have an invitation to that meeting, if I already haven't. I must've been I haven't been focusing on a lot of things with the STI work, but I would like to participate in that if it's going on on Friday.

I have a question, though, for Sebastien on the NomComm statement. Do you want to discuss because you believe there are things missing from it, or are there things you don't agree with it?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Back to you, Sebastien.

Sebastien Bachollet: No. It's more-- it's just not yet public sense (ph). As a working group, I just really-- quite quickly. But I have no big disagreement, except I am not sure that we need to say something to decrease the number of the other (ph). We may stick with-- we don't want to decrease our number. I feel it's not fair to say that the GNSO could decrease from one (ph), except if we have real good arguments, not just for decreasing the number of participants--

Alan Greenberg: We are not recommending the GNSO decrease.

Sebastien Bachollet: It's written, if we believe that NomComm currently sized-- it was (unintelligible). But, if the working group is looking for cuts, it could eliminate the double (ph) representation of the business constituency. That part I'm not very comfortable with. But, for the rest, I agree. What I want is it to become from a NARALO document to an At-Large and ALAC document.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Alan? Anything else, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: No. The argument is good. And I would suggest we defer to Friday, but I wouldn't want to see it go much past Friday.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: We're already late.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed. If it's humanly possible, I'll be in that meeting as well. Okay. Well, I think that's a good way forward.

If I can just speak specifically now on the NomComm review, however, certainly I agree with you, Sebastien, in that I wrote back to NARALO today, copied with the executives, the NARALO statement is in great synchronicity with what was discussed in the public workshop regarding the NomComm review in Seoul. And we had a fairly broad representation from our regions in that room. Adam is in fact the one who holds the pin (ph) for us on this. And I think it's also very important that we have Adam's input on this and get him to be a main part of the drafting exercise. So it would be most suitable if he could also join the meeting on Friday. So, if we can perhaps get someone to contact Adam and bring him up to speed on our discussions here tonight and also-- at sorry-- today and also to ensure that he's comfortable with this way forward.

NARALO would like their statement to be endorsed by the ALAC formally, and I think having it as a specific statement within a broader, albeit not very different, piece of advice to the board from the ALAC would be important.

Setting an end deadline, as Alan said, is most important. And, to this end, I would like to think that we could have this presented to the board at their next meeting as a piece of advice. So can I ask - When is the December board meeting?

- Heidi Ullrich: Cheryl, this is Heidi. It's on the 9th of December.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So there is our end date. We have to have this--
- Alan Greenberg: Which means the cutoff for documents is sometime next week.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Exactly. We'd have to have is ready in very short order.
- Alan Greenberg: It's got to go out as a result of the meeting or a bit of word-smithing (ph) afterwards. It can't be any later than that.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Vanda, you're happy with moving this forward then?
- Vanda Scartezini: Yes. That's fine. Yes. That's fine.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent. Is there a possibility, Vanda, that you and some others from LACRALO - Sylvia and Carlos, obviously - might be able to be involved in the meeting on Friday?
- Sebastien Bachollet: Sylvia-- She is already on the meeting on Friday.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent. Okay. Fantastic. All right, then. Well, that's certainly, I think, a sensible way forward that we will be putting in a pair of statements (inaudible) NomComm and board review. Go ahead.
- Carlos: I'm sorry. This is Carlos. I think I might be able to participate in the meeting. I just need you to confirm the time.
- Vanda Scartezini: And Vanda does say-- I know that I can, at least I want to make an effort. I know Sylvia will participate.
- Carlos: And, from Carlos' side-- As long as I get a confirmation on the time.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Well, Sebastien, you're leading that. So, if I can ask you to make sure you reach out to those people, and obviously it will get into my diary as well.
- Alan Greenberg: It's not on our agenda at the moment.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, it needs to be.
- Sebastien Bachollet: It will be.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If Gisela can make sure it gets onto our calendar and to ensure that Adam is integrated into that, as well, from the NomComm review part of it, which brings us back to the domain name registered at using a privacy or proxy service. Again, this would be something that would be fitting in with your areas of interest, Alan, so I'm going to toss it back to you for that.
- Alan Greenberg: I have done absolutely no work on that. I haven't even read the document, to be honest.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Has anyone got a clear memory on who was holding the pin on that? Matthias, do you know who was holding the pin on that? Was it Beau?

Matthias Langenegger: I'm sorry, Cheryl. I was just going to--

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's fine. There's always 15 things open on your desktop. Whenever you want someone-- Whenever someone asks you something, it, of course, is something next task-barred.

Matthias Langenegger: It's the wrong screen. I know.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And it's hard to find. I think it might have been Beau.

Matthias Langenegger: That's what I assume. Yeah. Let me get back to you in just a bit while I--

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Fine. Well, assuming that it is Beau who is holding the pin on that, he's not at today's meeting. How does the ALAC wish to proceed with the domain names registered using a privacy or proxy service? Do we wish to treat it as we did the root-scaling study team report and simply say yes, we're interested, but we really can't deal with it now? Or do we want to have advice from Beau regarding putting in a piece of ALAC advice to the board?

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Again, I haven't read the paper, and probably one should. I suspect this is one where ALAC is going to be divided-- that there are individual-user reasons why we want privacy and there are those why we want to avoid it. And I don't think we're going to come with a single voice. And that may not help the board, but I think that's the reality of the situation. Both privacy and access to information is within our remit.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It is indeed. I believe that we should put a statement in. Do we know when this is going to come to the board's agenda listing? Obviously, we don't. All right. Well, what I want to do-- sorry. Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: This is just a report on what's happening, not a recommendation, if I remember correctly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That is true.

Alan Greenberg: So I'm not sure we need to comment on it. But I guess a couple of people have to read it and come back with a recommendation to us, given that we're already late.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What I'm going to suggest, then, is that we follow up with Beau directly, and we take his specific recommendation on whether we retreat with as much grace and dignity as possible or whether we put forward a separate piece of advice and what time course that would take.

Is that the meeting's view that we should do that? I see nobody disagreeing. Okay, in which case, that's the way we'll go ahead because it is a matter of significant divergence. But that in itself is important to report.

Okay. That brings us to item C then, and that is the draft GNSO business constituency statement on gTLDs and the DAG (ph), version three. Since Seoul, we've had a couple of

interchanges on this, and, also, I think it's quite exciting and quite useful to have constituencies within the GNSO approaching us proactively with their statements to see whether or not we wish to respond, agree, or disagree with any parts of their statements. I like the concept of proactive and cooperative work where possible. It doesn't mean that we're all going to be singing with one voice, but it does mean that we can work effectively together. And this has happened with the-- I'm having a mental blank-- STI activities, as well as with some of the comments from the business constituency on the new gTLD DAG version three.

The proposal here is that-- I'm not quite sure that they're asking us to join (unintelligible) statement, but, rather, they would like our responses. We could go so far as to do that. But we may find that there are some areas of mutual agreement as well as areas of divergence.

The proposal I'd like to put to the meeting tonight is that what we should do is perhaps have a single-purpose teleconference between interested members of At-Large here. I would think the new gTLD working group, possibly members of the STI, and, I would think, the names task force-- the new names task force, as well as any other ALAC and At-Large persons interested in this matter to meet with any reps of the business constituency who wish to discuss it further.

Patrick, go ahead.

Patrick Vande Walle: Yes. I wanted to talk about that document that you may have seen. I've already posted the message on the mailing list earlier. And I've also included the message in the comments on the wiki page, so you might refer to that. And, okay, I think that might be a good idea to discuss that with Ron (ph) directly rather than through e-mail. There are some points on which I think we agree, but I'm wondering what Ron (ph) agenda is because I see so many similarities between the position. The business constituency is pushing and wants-- his company is pushing-- that I'm wondering if it's his company using the business constituency, or what is it that he wants to get at. And I don't think it would be a good idea for ALAC to associate itself with the statement or, at least with all or the entire statement. I think there are some points on which we could agree in this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Thank you, Patrick. And this is one of the reasons I think a teleconference is an ideal way forward. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I'll point out that a fair number of the items that are under discussion in the STI Group. And I would not want to see those being discussed in parallel in a different group. Some of them are not part of the STI, but some of them are.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: -- which is why we should go through them and see which particular parcel we're dealing with-- which of those issues. So, do I have your agreement that we see if we can arrange a teleconference?

Alan Greenberg: Sure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And, in terms of the STI commitment, Alan, while you've still got the microphone, when is the--? You're looking at having it finalized 17th or 18th-- is that right-- of December?

Alan Greenberg: The 17th is the GSO deadline for approving it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Right.

- Alan Greenberg: The STI review team will publish it a week two a week and a half ahead of time, assuming (inaudible) publish.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So sometime in that week or week and a half once it's published would be an ideal time for this call?
- Alan Greenberg: Certainly.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.
- Alan Greenberg: All I'm saying is I don't think we need to rehash in this call the items that are covered by the STI. The ones that are not covered by the STI could be done any time.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But I'd like to be able to say - Here is the published STI outcome. So we've dealt with those in this space; now let's look at this, this, and this.
- Alan Greenberg: In that case, you have a very narrow window of about five working days, if that.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And do you think that's a bad thing? We've had the actual DAG out for long enough. We've had the discussions about the DAG going on throughout Seoul, before Holland (ph), and since. We've got the task force operations. We've got the STI operations going on. We've had plenty of conversations about this. And we've had the views of the business constituency on the table (unintelligible) in Seoul and, certainly, since last week. I'm not sure that that short deadline is going to be too problematic.
- Alan Greenberg: I have no problem with that.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, in which case, we'll aim-- if I could ask staff to see what we can work out as a teleconference in that week prior to the 17th of December-- obviously, earlier the better.
- Alan Greenberg: Remember, we will have a vote ongoing at the same time.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep. That would be great. Okay? So that's the action item on that.
- This brings us now to the remaining open liaison position. We have had, at one point, two of the AFRALO representatives - both Dave Katadil (ph), and Hawa had put themselves forward to AFRALO to be the preferred nominee, to be the representative of AFRALO in the At-Large executive committee. Hawa has-- and it's with great pleasure that we recognize Hawa has been given the opportunity to be the GAC (ph) representative for the state of Mali. I think this is going to be an excellent thing not only for Mali but also for the GAC to have someone in their mix who is experienced in the world of the ALAC but also coming from a least-developed state, who is bringing the voice of the particular concerns of that strata of end users and registrants. It will be very, very worthwhile. So, with Hawa's withdrawal, this leaves us with Dave as the only name on the table.
- So I guess we should formally welcome Dave and make it all official. Welcome aboard, Dave. Your workload has now tripled. Congratulations. And Sebastien is clapping in the room, and we will clap. I'll clap near my microphone, so you can hear it in three languages as well. That is one of the two open liaison positions.
- The second one is the dotMobi liaison appointment. The current person, Andreas, is in fact welcome to continue and is able to continue his term of office for the calendar year 2010. Have we heard back from Andreas that he is--?

Heidi Ullrich: This is Heidi. Yes. Andreas has confirmed that he will continue as the liaison for dotMobi for 2010.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: -- in which case, I'd be delighted to now ask the ALAC two affirm his reappointment to that position by the same acclamation of clap, clap, clap, whether real or virtual. Congratulations to both of those people.

Bringing us now in then to-- I had to clear my throat. I do apologize. -- working groups and committees. The follow-up meeting that the ALAC executives held in Seoul, which we did hold on the Friday afternoon-- and we were very pleased, in fact, to have a couple of regional representatives in the room, so they could see how thrill-packed and exciting the whole time is. And it was, I think, a very productive meeting, particularly when we had our presentation on the reporting options for an expenditure relating to travel support for all parts of ICANN constituency by Kevin Wilson. I'm very pleased that the regional representatives were in the room at that time because I'm sure they found it as informative as we did.

However, one of the pieces of work we did do at that meeting was look at the various At-Large working groups. And if you'd all like to open up that spreadsheet and have a look at the officers and leads in those groups, you will see that there are still some positions that need filling (ph). But we also have a specific question to discuss tonight, and that is the who is (ph) working group based on the fact that there is going to be a number of studies undertaken in the world of who is this year. That's correct; is it not, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, indeed. One could look at (unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I just want it to the record (unintelligible) the who is working group should be retained as an active working group and that a chair be appointed forthwith. So that's the proposal on the table. We have, I think, a strong need for continuation of the who is working group. But we certainly need a strong and active lead. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I'll point out that, in addition to the studies on who is content that are going on, there is also very active work going on on who is technical infrastructure, which may or may not be appropriate for the same person but is also work going on. And if there is a working group, it should be focusing on both of those.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent point, and I certainly would think that that would be the best way forward. The question is: When we're resuscitating in a workgroup, we need people, and we need leadership. And we also need an ALAC lead. So there's a couple of things we need to settle for this, assuming that you are all in agreement that we do need this to continue.

Does anyone disagree? Does anyone feel that we should close the who is working group and hide from the thrill-packed (inaudible) who is. I can understand that if some of you are battle-scarred and brutalized by the last ten years of who is. But I think we just have to suck it up and do it. Okay. Nobody's disagreeing.

Alan Greenberg: I was disagreeing. I want to hide.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: James is leaving the room. James is slipping away. Very clever, James. You've got your work cut out for you with the IDN (ph), so we won't be suggesting that you become-- too much of an active part of the who is. (Inaudible).

Alan Greenberg: I think we need to solicit someone from among those whose name does not show up on that list right now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think that's probably a very good idea. Okay. So we now need to fill in. We can't have blanks here. We'll need an At-Large staff (ph) focal point. They can decide amongst themselves who gets to have the short straw on that. We do need to have a chair, I would like to think that this type of role should have a vice-chair as well. And we need to, certainly, appoint and a ALAC focal point or ALAC lead. What we can do tonight is agree that the work group will be resuscitated and put the call out to the community to do that resuscitation. But what I'd like to do is not only affirm that as a way forward but also to establish who will be the ALAC focal point for that.

And the people who are currently listed as people with a job on this list-- we have Patrick already involved, Sebastien involved, Oh (ph) involved, James involved. (Unintelligible) will need to probably be replaced because she's no longer an ALAC focal point, although she could be a regional focal point. And we have Adam. So the At-Large engagement in ICANN, I'm sure, we can perhaps consider appealing to one of our new members to take up that role.

Carlton Samules: I will take up the role.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent. Sold.

Unidentified Participant: Sorry. Who's going to take up the role?

Carlton Samules: It is Carlton.

Unidentified Participant: Oh, Carlton.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Carlton joined us. Well done, Carlton. Well we've given you all sorts of jobs while you haven't been here earlier on, so you'll have to listen. Fantastic, Carlton. Now you're taking the who is role, I assume.

Carlton Samules: Yeah. I'll take that who is role.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent. So, we will now, then, make an announcement and reach out to our community with Carlton as the ALAC focal point. And let's get this one up and running again. Nick, do you want to pick a staff member now, or you'll get back to us on that?

Alan Greenberg: He'll get back.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. The staff will get back to us on that. We should also have a look-- Carlton, one of the things we'll need to do is have a look at the members of the existing who is workgroup and whoever is subscribed. Matthias will assist you with looking at that-- whoever is subscribed to the who is (unintelligible) list at the moment and make sure that we reach out individually to those people so that we're not rebuilding something without including them if they want to be included.

Matthias Langenegger: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Fantastic. Good. Pleased to hear that. Now, the only other thing is that we do need to appoint a new ALAC focal point or lead to the At-Large engagement in ICANN. Can I ask if either Dave or Sylvia would be interested in that role?

Sebastien Bachollet: Sorry, Cheryl. We will not (inaudible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Say it again. What? One moment, Spanish. Go ahead, please, Sebastien.

- Sebastien Bachollet: It's Sebastien. We were not supposed to shrink some working group or to put together some of them? I recall that we decided, for example, to put together a transparency and accountability and future structure of and governance of ICANN. And I don't remember, but we said something about At-Large engagement in ICANN. I can't remember what. But we said something.
- Carlton Samules: This is Carlton. Sebastien is right. We did agree or, at least the talk was, that we would have consolidated the At-Large engagement in ICANN and the-- There are two of them that are congruent. One of them is the At-Large engagement in ICANN. Those work groups are the right candidates for consolidation. That was one of the conversations we had at Seoul.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I thought that in fact had happened, and we'd simply left the title of it as At-Large engagement in ICANN because we've got a whole lot less on that list now than we had before.
- Carlton Samules: Maybe that's the truth. Maybe all that has changed is not the name. But I know that was agreed.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, because we had a lot more. And I think it's just been rolled in.
- Sebastien Bachollet: Okay. But why I was speaking now is because I am sure that transparency and accountability were supposed to be merged with future structure and governance of ICANN. And it's why I was wondering what happened with At-Large engagement in ICANN. But if it's the result of one merge of something else and that we need to keep it, I'm okay with that.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, I'll ask Heidi to go back and just double check on the record and see that transparency and accountability was to be merged with future structure and governance of ICANN. And, if that's the case, that's not a problem because we've got plenty of people in there. That's simply adding people. I'm interested in making sure we've got people where they're missing. And, at the moment, because (unintelligible) is no longer with us as an ALAC member, she cannot be listed as the ALAC focal point. She can still be involved in the workgroup of the At-Large engagement in ICANN, but she can't be the ALAC focal point. Someone else needs to be that.
- Carlton Samules: Right now, she's listed as the chair and not the focal point.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: She's also listed as the focal point.
- Carlton Samules: (Inaudible).
- Sebastien Bachollet: She's doing both (ph).
- Carlton Samules: Oh, sorry. (Inaudible).
- Sebastien Bachollet: Yes. She's both ALAC focal point and chair.
- Carlton Samules; My last column wasn't on my screen. Okay.
- Unidentified Participant: Okay.

- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So, what I'm suggesting is, as we are very keen to make sure that to our new people get actively engaged, that we ask Dave if he would be willing to take that role. And he has said he doesn't mind if there is consensus.
- Spanish Interpreter: Just so you guys know, from Spanish, Carlos is highly interested in the role. And he's told me twice to tell you. And I do apologize for interpreting.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. No. That's fine. So Carlos wants to be the focal point-- the ALAC focal point for the At-Large engagement in ICANN working group. Correct?
- Spanish Interpreter: That is correct. Yes.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Well, Dave, I'd like you to certainly take on a role in the not-too-distant future, but perhaps taking on a lead role might be a little bit quick. Please join one or more of these. What's the view of the ALAC? The role of the focal point or lead is a very important one. We have a number of-- We do have Spanish representation in that working group with Andreas as vice-chair. I'm a little uncomfortable at having a block of closely related people working together in working groups as well. What does Carlos say to that?
- Carlos: That would be a good idea.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It would be a good idea for him to be the ALAC focal point when the vice-chair-- one of the vice-chairs is Andreas? Have I got that correct?
- Spanish Interpreter: And, asks Carlos-- I'm sorry. You know what? Repeat that question again because I don't think I even got the question.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. My question was: In that working group--
- Spanish Interpreter: And which working group are we talking about now, because--
- Carlton Samules: At-Large engagement in ICANN.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Carlton. Because this is recorded into three languages and we work through French and Spanish channel, it's really important that you identify yourself as you speak. That other voice was Carlton.
- The work group is the one that Carlos expressed interest in being the ALAC focal point in, the At-Large engagement in ICANN. I note that one of the vice-chairs is Andreas and that, if we have a vice-chair-- is Andreas and if the ALAC focal point is Carlos that that it does leave us with very closely related Spanish influence in or one working group and very little Spanish influence in some of the others. What is Carlos' response to that? And, then, I see Sebastien with a microphone.
- Carlos: I personally-- I do like to be in that working group, but if Cheryl-- If you think that I would be better in another working group, I mean, you know, you can obviously decide that as well.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, it's not up to me. I just wanted to know his opinion. Does he feel that that's the only working group he wants to have input into? That's one thing. If he's having input into others, then he may have a choice.
- Sebastien and then Alan. Go ahead.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yeah. I agree with your point, Cheryl. What I suggest is that they be involved and that-- if Carlos wants to stay in this working group, Dave and Carlos and Andreas may share the three slots we have. One could be shared; the other one could be the focal point. If I have a suggestion to make, it's to ask Dave to be the focal point and it to ask Carlos to be the chair because I think it's a good amount of work, and Dave will be coming to the ex-comm (ph) will have a lot of work to do then. I would like to suggest this situation. But I take your point, Cheryl, about the fact that we need for this LACRALO-- but, generally speaking, to a lot of regions to be more participants to the world working groups because it's important, this diversity, at the level of the working group.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Excellent suggestions. We'll discuss those in just one moment. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I'll point out that my understanding of the focal point is that the focal point is the connection between the ALAC committee and the working group. It is not necessarily someone who's very active in the working group and certainly not someone who takes a very lead role because it's supposed to-- that is supposed to be the relatively impartial connection between the ALAC and the working group. So I think we need to make clear that the person selected at the focal point is not someone who is going to be one of the harder workers and drivers of the working group but is someone who's sitting on the side watching and, to some extent, pass messages back and forth, can tell the ALAC that the group is not working effectively, or pass ALAC messages to that group. So I think we want to make sure not to confuse the roles.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Very good point. And, at that point, I think I'd like to go back to Carlos. And, based on both what Sebastien and Alan have said, get his reaction to the proposal that he main fact be better as a chair of this particular workgroup, with Dave as the ALAC focal point.

Dave Kissoondoyal: It's Dave here. Can I--?

Carlos: Yes. You know, I do hear what Alan and Sebastien are saying. They do have a lot of experience. And I think that I definitely want to participate in that group. I definitely think that I would like to, then, take care of that task.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can you just to clarify which task - focal point or chair?

Carlos: President-- I'm sorry. Chair is good.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Thank you. Go ahead, Dave.

Dave Kissoondoyal: Yes. I just want to tell you that's okay. I'm interested to form part of any working group. It really doesn't matter for me whether to be the focal point or the chair. What I'm interested in is to work in the working group for the advancement of the ALAC.

And the second thing is that--

Unidentified Participant: Dave?

Dave Kissoondoyal: Yeah? The second thing is that I never mentioned (unintelligible) ALAC is not doing its work appropriately. I just want to bring my contribution for the advancement of the ALAC. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Dave. And, believe me, this won't be the only role and you end up with; I can assure you.

Okay. It seems to me like we've got a nice way forward. It is a good way for Dave to get used to acting as a lead or a focal point with a very active working group. And it may in fact be, Carlos, if the activities and work become too onerous, of course, we can always look at co-chair relationships as well. So, please get back to us if anyone feels the task or the role they're being given with these workgroups is taking too much time or if we need to shuffle things around or assistance.

Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I'm sorry to interrupt. I'm going to have to leave the call in a few minutes. I have an STI meeting in 30 minutes and I need to talk to Olivier before that starts. So, if there are other things you want me to be active in or involved in, we need to do them moderately soon.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep. I'd be very pleased to be wrapping up the meeting myself, seeing that shortly after STI meeting, we've got another meeting. Okay. So, are we all finished with that then?

Carlton Samules: This is Carlton. I think so. Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent. The cross-community workgroup and the ALAC representatives. There are a few leadership pieces that are remaining unfilled. I think I'd like to put our call out for those to also be considered at the moment. These aren't particular issues that we need to-- the only one that isn't filled at the moment is one that I don't think is actually running yet, and that's the SX/JX/GNSO one - prohibition on redirection. I would assume that Patrick would be taking the lead in that though. Is that not the case, Patrick?

Unidentified Participant: Cheryl, Patrick noted in the chat that he had to leave the call a couple minutes ago.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, I am sorry. I didn't-- I missed that. I'm sorry. Let's assume-- Let's put Patrick in provisionally there. And, in that case, what we have is a full slate. We don't have anything that isn't covered there.

Okay. Moving now to the members-- this is again a piece of affirmation of the finance and budget committee for 2010. I think we actually have a piece (unintelligible) in the listing of incumbent members. Alan, are you still on the call?

Alan Greenberg: I'm still here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Is it your belief that you are the member from NARALO, or was it not Garrett?

Alan Greenberg: I am very sure it's Garrett. I remember the discussion where you attempted to put me on it. And everyone unanimously agreed that Garrett was the better person for it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Garrett, does this fit with your memory?

Garrett Sherman: Yes, it does, Cheryl. I do remember that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So, it's not me being crazy. And, in fact, what we need to do-- What we actually need to do is make sure that the record reflects properly that the NARALO representative is in fact Garrett Sherman and that we do need an AFRALO representative to be a fifth member. And, as the only AFRALO representative on the call at the moment, Dave, guess what I'm going to be suggesting. Well, ladies and gentlemen, I think we can all welcome Dave two his role as the AFRALO representative on the 2010 ALAC finance and budget committee. Congratulations, Dave, and welcome back, Garrett!

- Alan Greenberg: Cheryl, that being said I'm of course willing to continue to contribute whatever knowledge or insight I may have regarding both travel and other finance issues.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I would suggest that you will be an ex officio member. And, indeed, like any of our committees, they are open. But these are the core-- All meetings are open, but these are the core people. So they've all been affirmed.
- The proposed development of a process for--
- Spanish Interpreter: Cheryl, I'm so sorry. Sylvia and Vanda need to go, and they just told me to--
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Understand. Thank them very much for spending their time with us today.
- Alan Greenberg: And thank Sylvia for agreeing to be part of this committee also.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed. Indeed, although she did end up on that back in Seoul. She'd already been put at the firing line for that one.
- The development process for the At-Large community to select a voting (ph) board member. We've just got some next steps, which is the teleconference, which was previously discussed. Is there any discussion or any problems that anyone has with that proposal of next steps planning? I can come to tonight's meeting to assure you that the Asia-Pacific meeting today, APRALO, affirmed their choice of 3c (ph), the vote structure where the electorate is inclusive of the regions, is their preferred option. And I would like to ask if any of the other regions has had a change of heart or if we now have unanimity. If we don't because we don't have all regions still attending at this call, I'd like to see that they let us know to the working-- if regional reps can let us know to the working list as soon as possible so that, as we move forward in this next step, we know that we are all talking about a single, preferred option for the makeup of the electorate.
- Alan Greenberg: Do we have a group responsible for overseeing this little project?
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The committee as a whole is what it was.
- Alan Greenberg: I would suggest, and I say this with some trepidation, given that I'm about to leave, that we really need a small number of people to try to start putting a document in place for what we're going to say to the structure and improvements committee, identifying what we have consensus on and what are the issues still to be resolved.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I really think this is something that will be borne out of the teleconference, but I'd like to think that it has at least one or two regional representatives or at least a representative of each region on that workgroup. So perhaps if we make a call to the working list for at least one rep from each of the regions-- one ALAC rep from each of the regions to become part of an ad hoc workgroup. Would that--?
- Alan Greenberg: Before I drop off, I'll say I'm willing to do that.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent.
- Alan Greenberg: I'm not putting up a demand.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Well, if you're willing (inaudible).
- Carlton Samules: This is Carlton. I'm willing to work with Alan on that too.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I hear Carlton. Let's assume, then, that what we will do is find representatives of the regions not still on the call. So we will work as a subcommittee. Or we could do that as an ex-comm could take that-- could own that if they think half of us are there already. Ex-comm plus whoever. All right. Are we all happy with that way forward for the process, because we would really like to have this in the hands of the structural improvement committee as soon as possible.

Carlton Samules: This is Carlton, chair, just to mention the idea that you started off with by just ensuring that we have consensus across the regions about the procedure that is preferred and then taking up where Alan joined in to say that we have a small group. On that basis we get together, and then we get to work on an unofficial report.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: -- recognizing, of course, Carlton, that the call that is proposed is a community-wide call.

Carlton Samules: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep. Yep. And, in fact, at the Seoul meeting, each of the regions were asked to go away, think over what had been discussed, and come back to this meeting with an affirmation of their preferred choice for mechanisms for the electorate.

Carlton Samules: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Anything else for me before I drop off? It's Alan. Sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No. I'll talk to you shortly.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Take care.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks very much, Alan.

Okay. Now, the final matters that are residual on our agenda tonight-- the matter of access to the ex-comm list. We no longer have quorum, so we can't have an ALAC discussion on that. I'm happy to discuss that in the-- Which list to do we discuss it in? In the working list? The question, however, is a matter that the ex-comm list is publicly accessible with open archives and is published at the At-Large.ICANN.org. The question that we want ALAC to consider is whether or not it should be a list that can be subscribed to on a read-only basis, or shall it be retained as limited subscription? And one of the very important reasons that I am raising this with the ALAC tonight, but we will take this online, is the huge number of spam messages that we have to stop as moderators. There are quite a number of spam messages that we stop or, hopefully, stop. We don't always stop them.

And there is the other question of why, when something is absolutely publicly archived and published, do non-ex-comm members need to be subscribed? That's a preamble to what we will be discussing online.

Have we all had time to look at the At-Large travel support list for Nairobi?

Carlton Samules: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And is there any changes that people wish to make on that?

Evan: Cheryl, this is Evan. Hi.

- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hi, Evan. Don't tell me you don't want to come.
- Evan: Well, no. I haven't seen the list. I just wanted to confirm that the secretariats were still on it.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: My jolly word you all are. Let me read from the top. I have, and I'll only use given names - Dave, Carlos, Sebastien, Beau, Pava (ph), Hawa, Mahabet (ph), Alan, (Unintelligible), Sylvia, Didier, Dave, myself, you, Evan, Wolfe (ph), Adam, Andreas, Carlton, James, (Unintelligible), Gareth, Karaitiana, Darlene (ph), Patrick, and (Unintelligible).
- Evan: Sounds good. I got an e-mail from-- a generic e-mail from the travel support group at ICANN. I don't know if this makes a difference for this conference. But I did a little bit of searching, and it appears that you need to have your airline itinerary in place before you can apply for a visa from some countries.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: In many countries, my own included, that is absolutely the case, which is why this travel support list needs to be approved as early as humanly possible. And I'm suggesting we agree that this is it for tonight so that ticketing can be put in place.
- Carlton Samules: Chair, this is Carlton. Might I say something on this too? If you look at what is available for us in this side of the world to get into Nairobi, there are not a lot of seats. And so the earlier that we can confirm booking, the better it is for us.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent. Yep. Okay. Well, that looks like it's a perfectly good list. I don't see any errors. Does anyone else see any errors? Nick, what are you typing? We need you to not to (ph).
- People: (Inaudible).
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I can't work out what your typing.
- Nick Ashton-Hart: Sorry. I meant we need you to agree not we need two to agree. Sorry about that. One thing I would just highlight, while the visuals go through your head of tutus, is we have assumed the standard convention with respect to RALO leaders or AFRALO, that being that the chair and the secretariat are the persons who are funded to travel. And then, of course, the vice-chair goes if one of the two is unable to attend. We've made that assumption. So the AFRALO have just elected their three regional leaders. So I just wanted to highlight that fact-- that they could do something different, of course. But we would need to know, like, now or within 24 hours. And, unfortunately, there is no one from AFRALO who is attending this call. We have, by e-mail, acquainted them with the situation.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, Dave, are you able to--? Yes, because you certainly are here. Are you able to either shed some light or to make sure that AFRALO get back to us within the 24 hours? The question-- Go ahead, Dave.
- Dave Kissoondoyal: Yeah. Basically, I need to at least contact the chair, the vice-chair, and the secretary before coming back to you. So, okay, I take the commitment to contact the chair and then come back to you within the next 24 hours.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, because it may be that they wish to have the chair and vice-chair go rather than the chair and secretariat. But they need to confirm with us exactly which people, two per region, they are wishing to designate.
- Dave Kissoondoyal: It's limited to only two seats from AFRALO?

- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct.
- Dave Kissoondoyal: Okay. Yeah. I'm going to get back to you within the next 24 hours.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent. Subject to those changes, Nick, I think that the meeting can certainly resolve that that will be the list, pending on a last-minute alteration from the status quo to the listing for AFRALO. Okay? Excellent.
- Residual items on our agenda, then, is the At-Large implementation review plan. Work was done in Seoul. We do not have time at this point to go into this in any detail. I've already done feedback from the IGF and the report on the STIRT (ph). And next steps was encapsulated by Alan's GNSO report earlier. So, when are we going to look at our At-Large implementation plan outline? How do you wish to proceed with this? It is something that I think is better done in conference style rather than in an online style. But what's the view of the meeting? Do we take a large lump of time out of our next agenda and look at this? Is it almost a single-purpose call? Would the majority of our time be dedicated to this? How do you wish to proceed?
- Carlton Samules: This is Carlton, chair. I would suggest that, for this, you might want to just do a single-purpose call to keep it tight.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Are you proposing then, Carlton, a single-purpose call between now and our next scheduled monthly call?
- Carlton Samules: Yes.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I must say that would be my personal preference. We don't have quorum, so we can't make a decision. Our quorum has left at the time that the meeting should have closed. But what we might do based on this informal discussion at the close of this meeting is see if we can organize a date and time in the next fortnight--
- Carlton Samules: Yes.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: -- for a single-purpose call, which will allow more regional representation as well. And, with-- Yes. Doing a doodle (ph) on this would be essential. Thank you, Gareth. We'll do a doodle sometime in the next-- you know, a fortnight out-- 10 to 20 days from here. So, it won't be the first or second week in December, seeing-- or the beginning of the second week in December. It might be the end of the second week in December because we have a number of other calls between now and then.
- I will now make a final call for any other business, which cannot be a substantive matter for decision because we do not have quorum but can be noted and taken in online discussion or put onto a future agenda. Is there any other matter or any other business that anyone on this call wishes to raise? I see nothing in the Adobe room. Anything from Spanish or French?
- French interpreter: Nothing here. French.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Was that a yes?
- Dave Kissoondoyal: Yeah. Dave here. I just need to make a small statement.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Please, Dave, go ahead.

Dave Kissoondoyal: What I'm telling that-- Okay, I am new to the ALAC, and I am really determined to work for the best interest of the ALAC. And I want to do this job properly. I will need the coaching from senior members like you and as I do not pretend to be knowledgeable on everything. I never mentioned that ALAC is not doing its work properly. If any member got this impression from my statement, then I'm really sorry, since I never meant it. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not a problem, Dave, and you're fine. We're in extraordinarily thick-skinned block anyway, so, even if you had have said it, we would just embrace you, or retrain you, and try, and convince you that you've had the wrong idea.

Carlton Samules: I'm sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Look, Carlton, if we can't have fun, once the point of doing all of this, I ask you? Look, ladies and gentlemen, it's been a huge agenda. It's often a huge agenda for the first meeting after the face-to-face meetings. Things tend to pack up before and after face-to-face meetings.

I want to thank each and every one of you for the time and energy you've put into today's meeting. I want to make a sincere welcome to our new ALAC members. And I certainly want to thank the heroic efforts of Tanya and (Unintelligible), our French and Spanish interpreters, who, like me, actually dialed in and joined the Adobe room a whole hour earlier because our calendars still said the meeting was running at 1400 UTC. So we certainly weren't going to be late. But thank you all for being here. And we'll be working inter-sessionally (ph) and having a very exciting year ahead of us. Thank you all. Good morning. Good evening. Good night.

People: Thank you, Cheryl.