

Summary Minutes 5 March 2008

Summit Working Group Teleconference 05 March 2008

Summary Minutes

Present: E Leibovitch (NARALO), D Thompson (NARALO), G Shearman (NARALO), V Scartezini (LACRALO), S Leite (LACRALO), A Piazza (LACRALO), C Langdon-Orr (APRALO), S Bachollet (EURALO), A Muehlberg (EURALO), W Ludwig (EURALO), W Kleinwachter (EURALO), R Vansnick (EURALO)

Staff: N Ashton-Hart, M Langenegger

Apologies: W Drake, V Cretu (EURALO), D Daley

Minutes taken in the first instance by ICANN staff

Teleconference commenced at 23:24 UTC with the roll call and the adoption of the minutes of the preceding meeting.

S Bachollet informed the discussants that the ICANN board adopted a motion at the New Delhi conference related to having an ALS meeting in this calendar year, presumably at the ICANN conference in Cairo. E Leibovitch added that the board was unanimously in favour of an ALS summit in principle but that there is not yet a decision regarding the budget.

At-Large Statement in Paris

There was discussion regarding an At-Large statement coming out of the Paris meeting.

W Kleinwachter proposed to draft two documents: a declaration of principles and a plan of action. While there was interest in that approach among the discussants, there was a different view expressed that documents of more direct bearing on issues within ICANN's remit might be more appropriate. While some declared themselves in favour of having a draft document or documents ready before the start of the Paris meeting, others stressed the need to be more inclusive and involve the ALS present in Paris in the drafting of such a statement.

Finally, there was general agreement with the following proposition. ICANN staff will come up with a draft questionnaire for review by the working group to determine what issues ALSes feel should be focussed on. This should be done asap.

W Kleinwachter proposed to have a teleconference for all ALSes in Paris to discuss a draft statement based on the results of the polling. The final document could then be ready for adoption in Cairo. There was no further discussion on this issue.

Sub working groups

V Scartezini proposed to have smaller working groups in order to carry out tasks more efficiently.

In the following discussion about how to organise the working groups, there were two proposals: E Leibovitch put forward five subjects that should be covered. These include budget, program, publicity/liaison, sponsorship and preparation. W Kleinwachter proposed two subgroups covering procedure and content. W Kleinwachter also proposed that there should be individuals responsible for each subgroup in order to ensure work progressed. The Staff offered to provide the support for logistical and related coordination, with the resulting proposals for the same to be based upon what was required in order to support the programme as decided by the community. This offer was accepted with thanks by the meeting.

After a discussion it was decided by consensus that there would be three working groups covering the following areas:

I. Logistics Sub working group

II. Content Sub Working Group

III. Working on logistics and organisational matters (to be handled by ICANN At-Large staff)

Amendment: The first and the third working group has subsequently been merged)

C Langdon-Orr stressed the need to have representation from all RALOs in each of the subgroups and also the ALAC Budget subcommittee. This concern was widely shared.

Budget for Paris Meeting

S Bachollet informed the discussants that there already was a draft budget for the meeting. In order to get the final approval from the board, some aspects of the budget need to be carved out in detail. Staff specified that this would need to include estimated costs for meeting rooms and interpretation among others, in order to fulfil the Board's directive in the resolution passed in New Delhi that the project should be considered as a part of the currently-ongoing budget preparation process. In this respect, S Bachollet proposed that the ALAC budget subcommittee should take the lead in.

Staff pointed out that there needs to be a solid budget in good time to allow the project to be included in draft budget proposals which are submitted to the community for review so that the final budget can be adopted in June, based upon a final budget package to be produced in May.

E Leibovitch pointed out the fact that some ALS might wish to invite outside speakers to the meeting and that this needed to be included in the budget. S Bachollet declared himself unhappy about the idea to invite outside speakers. He asserted his conviction that it is important to concentrate on the members of the community who are already part of the process instead of waiting for a prophet from outside. There were other voices who supported a possible 'keynote speaker' depending upon whom it would be. Since the time was running out, there was no further discussion on this subject. It is to be carried over to the next meeting.

Planning the next teleconference

At 22:58 UTC it was pointed out that the time of this meeting was rather late for Europeans and that the next summit WG meeting could be either at 2000 UTC or 2100 UTC. S Bachollet set up a doodle page in that regard (<http://www.doodle.ch/participation.html?pollId=zheivh7c4vdsefqd>) to allow others to vote for the time most suitable for them.

The meeting was adjourned at 23:02 UTC.