ALAC ExCom 17.05.2010 Transcript

David Kissondoyal: Thank you, thank you

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent, okay, and we've got Sebastian and Alan have joined us, so I guess that means you either gave up or vertical integration meeting has, in fact, finished for today. And we have Dave on the line, myself, Gisella, Heidi, and apologies from Carlton. So by my reckoning, we're ready to go.

Dave Kissondoyal: Okay.

Alan Greenburg: We sort of hoped you'd get them both done by the time we got here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Ha. Ha. Right, not without neither of the Vice-Chairs, and Dave and I obviously could do everything, but no, we erred on the cautious side and thought we'd wait for at least more than two of the Executive Committee on the call. Leading in immediately, having noted those apologies, to the action items from the 27 April meeting. The items listed are as follows: staff to check on funding source for non-com members, i.e. Olivier; I certainly know from my perspective that he's done, but is there any conversation about that?

Heidi Ullrich: No, everything-

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Heidi, perhaps you should tell the record what view that happened with all the wonderful world of this.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay. In discussing this with staff who are covering the non-com, it was agreed that Olivier Crippen-LeBlan will be on the non-com budget this time, and in replacement we will have Badoin Chambe.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So, Olivier will make himself primarily available for non-com activities, because we're the ones picking up his bill, it does mean that he will be able to join us for the majority of absolutely every part of our activities, which is very good news indeed because it's allowed us to bring another African person, as well. Go ahead, Sebastian.

Sebastian Bachollet: Yeah, I didn't follow in detail all of that obviously, but I am a little bit surprised of the decision and I'm not sure - I hope that it's allow Olivier to be also at the meeting on Sunday for the ALAC, because even if it's taken care by non-com, the dates are not the same. And…
((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: My understanding was we were paying his room and board for the first two nights, and therefore he is ours on Sunday.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct, Alan. That's correct, Alan.

Vanda Scartezini: Now, may I?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes please go ahead Vanda.

Vanda Scartezini: Now just to inform that we rearrange all the Board meetings in Brussels, and to allow us to do a lot of other things. So people, fill the date in on that, so probably this week - in week three, we're going to have a more clear vision of what is going on and what we need to do and change places and change ideas to not follow the same way we keep doing as a Board, probably will be not the Friday there in the last day.

I don't know, it's a lot of hard discussion, and so it's a good idea to wait a little bit, to not make many plans that will impact the ability to get together in main occasion. Here is to have more opportunity to get together with the community. So it's something that I need to have a more clear vision because until now we still exchange completely different ideas from each one.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, thank you Vanda. And obviously the Accountability Transparency Review Team is expecting a large block of formal time with the Board in the Brussels meeting.

Vanda Scartezini: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We will be meeting with as many of the parts of the community as possible. But we are having quite formal meeting times arranged though with the joint GAC and Board working group, with the GAC particularly, and we have expectations of a serious commitment from the Board in Brussels for at least two hours face-to-face with us.

((Crosstalk))

Vanda Scartezini: Yeah, we are trying to rearrange that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: To that end, I think it's very exciting what I'm hearing, because one of the preemptive criticisms that ATRT would be bringing to that table is the enclaving, the disassociation between Board activities and opportunities to interact with the community and BACs and BSOs, during these face-to-face meetings. So, I'm excited even by hearing that the agenda discussions are on the table. Go ahead, Sebastian.

Sebastian Bachollet: Yes, my second point was – and I wanted to say first that I have nothing against Budois – but I want to know how the decision was taken because I thought that it was to be first the region and as a region, and it was the case for Africa. And it will be the case in each continent, that we are unable to organize the general assembly of RALOs. I am wondering if the decision was taken by EURALO not to have another representative to allow multiple from the region to come, or if the decision was taken outside.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Your question goes back specifically to should we offer some accommodation support, rather than someone from EURALO, correct? So I understand, Sebastian.

Sebastian Bachollet: It's my question, yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, thank you. Well two things and I'll throw it to Heidi after that to get the details. The first one is that there was an expenses already needing to be used in a credit from a prior trip for that particular traveler. So we were in a position of losing our existing credit that could only be used for travel for someone up to and including a particular time and date, and it could only be used for that traveler. So I know that influenced my choice of who was on the top of the list to bring across. How EURALO interacted with that, I'm unaware, and at that point we'll toss to Heidi.

Heidi Ullrich: I think, I don't really have anything to add. I think that was one of the key motivating factors for that was that decision, was that this credit could be used.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And on the same token, if I can just weigh in from an Asia-Pacific perspective, the fact that we don't actually have everyone traveling from Asia-Pacific who was on the original list, Asia-Pacific was more than happy because there was beginning to be a critical mass from Africa for what could have been considered by APRALO. But it was not considered by APRALO, as a dividend specifically to their region, to be used for enduring whatever region had the largest number of people and who were doing an outside or allied activity, which happened to be Africa.

So what I would consider perhaps as equally our funds, just like you're considering Olivier's partial funding leftovers to be EURALO funds, to be put to the greatest good. I would suggest that you ask the question of EURALO. If they have a problem with it, then they need to get back to us as an Executive Committee.

((Crosstalk))

Sebastian Bachollet: Okay, so EURALO is meeting tomorrow.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: One more person traveling from what any one region does not make a regional assembly.

Sebastian Bachollet: I know, but - okay, it will be a discussion, I guess, in the EURALO tomorrow and we will come back to the-

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's fine. Remember to take to them, the fact that we had funds already extended that needed to be utilized out of Africa, and you have another region, who I would consider had strong argument for travel support, that decided that a greater good policy was the right way.

Sebastian Bachollet: Yeah, I heard you. I will give all this information to the EURALO, but I know that some of the EURALO people wanted to come and we are asking for funding and the answer was no. Then we are just to be fair and to discuss that in an open manner and I will do that tomorrow at the EURALO call. There is no backmind in my question.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: While Sebastian is preparing his information to take to the EURALO call, didn't we also look at - what happened with the additional NARALO funding? Was that replaced by a NARALO representative or did that also go to the greater good and common call? I'm not sure.

Sebastian Bachollet: It's going to the NARALO.

Heidi Ullrich: Yeah, and again keep in mind that Olivier was the replacement for Desi. And then through working with non-com, we were able to arrange that he goes on the non-com budget. But he, you know, still will be covering for Desi.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: He is, in fact, still actually acting on behalf of EURALO. He will be performing his role. But I think Sebastian's point is that there are members of EURALO who would see those funds should have been released to allow another person from a closer environment to attend, correct?

Sebastian Bachollet: Yeah, yeah. I guess we need to try to set up some rules on that to be sure that we are doing - and I have - it's - I have nothing against inaudible 12.07, it's just I think we need to be aware that we wish to have some questions on that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, indeed. And, in fact, one of the things I did a routine for, and perhaps that's something through the year that we can look at, are for such, assuming we don't get what we ought to get, and that is further along the lines of our greater important self-determination, only our budget in thin. I would be very, very strongly arguing for specific representation to be replaced specifically from regions, and common-source pooled money to go to the common good. So I'd be very, very interested and excited to have that conversation as we move either between Brussels and Cartagena, and Cartagena, on.

((Crosstalk))

Sebastian Bachollet: I was - sorry when?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Let's now go to At-Large improvements – go ahead, Sebastian, I didn't realize you still needed the microphone

Sebastian Bachollet: No, no, sorry, you - it was just to say that I don't know if you see some of the email exchange of the EURALO list, some of the even ALAC members saying that if we can't have a EURALO general assembly, we may close the EURALO organization.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well.

Sebastian Bachollet: And it's all that - it's to be taken into account. But I also notice that you say that one people in addition is not a general assembly, I know all that, but we have to be careful, that's all.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, well there is no way we can fund a EURALO general assembly. And if that means EURALO revisiting the NOU, and another form or subset of regional organization, forming out of that, so be it. That would be a great waste, it would be a great shame, that would be something I would argue very strongly against, but that's actually up to the EURALO Board because…
((Crosstalk))

Sebastian Bachollet: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: … as you know, they're the ones who are in contact with ICANN on that. Okay, moving back now to the next matter on the At-Large 29 , At-Large improvements; three weeks prior to Brussels, see who's going to review the At-Large improvements on regional calls, Ex Comm to review At-Large project plan and provide feedback prior to the meeting of Ex Comm. Actually we've done it prior, but we are doing it today – and the translation to French and Spanish. Can we do that in reverse order? How are we going with translation of the final project plan?

Heidi Ullrich: That has actually been put on hold because over the week - we finished the project plan in time, late last week, but over the weekend we heard from Ray and Marco on some issues on that document. So we will be revising the project plan to incorporate some of the-

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry, Heidi, can you just repeat again; some of us got as far as, "We heard from Ray over the weekend." Could you say again, from that point, please?

Heidi Ullrich: Yes, sorry. Over the weekend, we heard from Ray and Marco on some questions they wanted to have incorporated into the project plan, so we will - Seth and I are working on that and will, for the next week or so. So we've asked for a halt to the translations until that is - the revisions are final. So the aim now-

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Which translations?

Heidi Ullrich: The translations of the-

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: With translators?

Heidi Ullrich: Yes with - the translations into French and Spanish.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And they are starting it, but putting it on hold until this editorial issue is done, correct?

Heidi Ullrich: Correct, correct.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So, the faster we get the editorial issue solved, the faster they get to go back into translation world.

Heidi Ullrich: Correct.

((Crosstalk))

Seth Greene: Are we allowed to know what their concerns were?

Heidi Ullrich: The concerns were-

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's on our agenda; I was about to say, that's on our agenda.

Seth Greene: Sorry, okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So let's get through action items and I can perhaps get into some meaty business in a moment. Also on our action item, to give whatever feedback on the project plan today, so let's move backwards. Seth, I assume you are going to get a bit of time on the regional calls between now and Brussels, then?

Seth Greene: I've actually already begun.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead Seth.

Seth Greene: Hi, hi, let me just make sure I'm not on mute.

Man: You're not.

Seth Greene: Everyone, thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We can here you.

Seth Greene: Yes, I've given relatively brief summaries of the improvements project to two of the RALOs so far. Cheryl, you suggested, and Matthias and I both briefly discussed, that AFRALO is probably best done during the Brussels meeting, rather than before.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Seth Greene: And there's a possibility that I will be on the agenda for tomorrow's EURALO call. So that's actually closer to being done than begun, happily. And I think that the main thing in the next, certainly in the next week, but I suspect looking at the scope of the requested changes, is that my attention's going to be turned back to the project plan.

You know, I don't mind saying, I understand where they're coming from - or at least I understand what they want, if not where they're coming from, but I believe the comments we've gotten are rather extensive and certainly more than editorial.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, great.

Seth Greene: So I do think it's going to take up a significant…

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well let's get to those when we get to that part of the agenda. Is that all right?

Seth Greene: Okay, yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And make that part of the agenda, which means we'll now move to what is definitely an action item done, that is Sebastian's drafting of the ALAC statement on reconsideration. Sebastian, that was done, thank you very much, and I believe it's been voted on. Sebastian, did you want to speak to it before we find out what's happened with, I think, a quorate vote so far?

Sebastian Bachollet: I guess all the votes are collected and was "yes", and this one among the four others can go on and no I think it was good. I have nothing to add to what was sent to the participant.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good, excellent. And Heidi, correct me if I'm wrong; all the votes were quorate, were all of them affirmative?

Heidi Ullrich: They were all quorate and I believe ~~what do you mean by affirmative? If you could~~

Sebastian Bachollet: There is-

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Do we have statements all positive or do we have negative responses? It's all very good being quorate, but the vote is "yay", "nay", or "abstain"?

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, sorry. Yay, in favor.

Sebastian Bachollet: There is between 12 and 13 for each "yes" participant, and all are "yes".

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, unlike some of you I don't actually spend my life looking tick by tick as people vote on these things so I do want that information, and I certainly want it read to the record. Now, I'm aware – and we are going to have any other business – that some of the issues have gone through onto the appropriate public comment. But Heidi have all now, the items that we voted on, been transmitted to the appropriate parts of ICANN?

Heidi Ullrich: I don't believe all, but they - the key ones were yesterday and I will double check the others. I know the consumer one had already been submitted, so I will look in the remaining two.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, so that's either done or is about to be done.

Heidi Ullrich: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Certainly nothing we need to raise an action item over.

Heidi Ullrich: No.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Terrific, okay, bringing ourselves now to review and revise timelines under the PAD. Carlton is not with us this evening, or this morning, depending what part of the world you're in. But, I, while we were waiting for the vertical integration meeting to complete, did make the following proposal and that was as to the registrar accreditation agreement, subsection 3.7.7.3, with its closing date of 9 of July.

It would be an ideal opportunity for us to ensure that people come to Brussels as regional representatives with the information from the regions and At-Large structures on terms of opinion on that, and that we should look to actually drafting something on that while we are in Brussels. And Heidi has looked at the current schedule and we do have time for that, providing it is sufficient. Is that something the rest of the executive committee believes is a good idea?

Man: Sure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. No disagreement? Fantastic, so that brings us to do you want to react or interact with the inaudible 22.00 review draft working group report? Yay or Nay? We didn't respond to the comment period with the regional inaudible 22.17 report, but it may be appropriate to briefly react to now the workgroup's conclusions on the, what was it, I think eight recommendations from inaudible 22.31. What's your view? Alan?

Alan Greenburg: I guess I would - I mean our normal position is that we make a decision based on advice from either the liaison or the workgroup who's responsible for overseeing that area, and I would like to make this decision with that insight.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So that's a full decision at the ALAC meeting and we ask Patrick specific advice on that, remembering that Patrick and - mental blank. Anyway, Patrick is our ALAC member who is involved and acting as interface with the technical issues workgroup, and group service would come under technical issues. Does that work for you then, Sebastian and Dave?

Sebastian Bachollet: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Well let's just - Heidi we just need to make sure that's in the agenda appropriately, please.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay.

Alan Greenburg: Who is the chair of that workgroup?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's Co-Chairs, and I had a mental blank on the other person's name, also from EURALO; it's Patrick and?

Heidi Ullrich: Is it Lutz?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Lutz, thank you, Patrick and Lutz, yes.

Alan Greenburg: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And because it's a newly integrated workgroup and it picks up IP before, it'll like be transitioned, if we wanted to look at a leadership team it would be Patrick, Lutz, and Olivier.

Alan Greenburg: And I think we should ask them - ask for an answer prior to that meeting, prior to the ALAC meeting.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, so…

Alan Greenburg: And we'll make-

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What we're asking for is Patrick to come with the workgroup-specific advice to the ALAC meeting.

Alan Greenburg: That's correct.

Sebastian Bachollet: Cheryl, you can ad me in the group as well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry?

Sebastian Bachollet: You can add me in the group as well.

Alan Greenburg: Are you already in that group?

Sebastian Bachollet: I'm not in the group, but you can include me.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's probably - well, amongst the things that we will be doing in Brussels is making sure that we - with the review of the At-Large structures survey is all working groups get to be actively repopulated. So Dave, I'm sure the doors are open and it would be a good idea if you were involved in what now - it used to be looking at security and stability issues, as they relate to ICANN matters, but it's now technical issues. So yeah, I think that'd be a great idea for you and anyone else you can encourage to get involved with that.

Dave Kissondoyal: Okay. The request to the workgroup should go with - should be for a recommendation, and if the recommendation is yes, be prepared to submit a draft within a day or two after the ALAC meeting.

Sebastian Bachollet: Okay.

Dave Kissondoyal: Otherwise we won't make the approval on time.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep, that sounds like a very good plan. And it really is in respect to we need to react - if we need to react, we need to react with an At-Large opinion on the workgroup reactions and proposals - draft proposals to each of the eight recommendations from the external reviewer. It does actually make it easier because you've got what the external reviewer says, the workgroup's reaction, and so you should be able to get a fairly concise, "We agree", "we disagree", or "we think you should look at this as well."

Good, okay, we've kind of dealt with the statements, five as listed, but is there anything anyone wishes to discuss on any of those five day votes that we're just completed? No? Good, I like it when we don't have anything to say, life's even more efficient than usual. So now that brings us to our items for discussion, RAA amendments; discussion of initial report on the registrant rights charter and next step.

We have an initial report for the RAA group ANB, which will be then presented to the GNSO in Brussels. And we also have an opportunity in our Brussels schedule for a small amount of time which I'm going to throw to you about, Heidi, to tell me exactly when and where for the record, where beginning work can happen on the international rights charter and to see whether there's an opportunity to start now doing more work on that.

We have a public workgroup planned for, hopefully the Monday if not the Wednesday afternoon, looking at a number of issues that At-Large is very keen on and that more enforcement was raised in terms of proposed changes to the RAA. And we also have an opportunity now to have a formal meeting gathering between interested parties under what would call themselves consumer interests in ICANN.

I don't know what date and time has been set by that, but predominantly people from the At-Large world and some commercial stakeholder groups will be involved in that, but not limited to those groups. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenburg: Yeah, assuming we have - we end up deciding to comment on the RAA, Part A public comment period, and I would like to think we will, it would be nice if the optics were a little bit better than they were on the registrar constituency one, where the statement blatantly said, "This was written by the proponent of the registrar constituency in the GNSO for the main proponent."

We should try to have separation of power such that the person recommending something does not write the report for ALAC saying "Yes, it's a good thing." I mean, I understand the overlap and responsibilities, but we should just try to get the optics a little bit better and make sure that there are other people involved.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure, but just to be clear, the initial report is product from two combined - is a combined reporting product from two workgroups, RAA-A and RAA-B, which are pro-shared workgroups. In other words they were - even though it's a GNSO-chartered RAA workgroup, the resolution was to work specifically with the At-Large Advisory Committee. So both RAA-A and RAA-B workgroups have been populated, at least in theory, by a balance of GNSO and ALAC/At-Large interests.

On the 20th, the GNSO will be asked to, I guess, not endorse, but to recognize the input from their part of the equation into this report. And whilst we don't have our meeting until the following week, the reason it's on the Executive Committee meeting agenda today is for us to see whether or not we believe it's a true, reasonable, and accurate record of the report, an initial report on the work of those two workgroups to date, noting that RAA-A workgroup was even co-chaired by an ALAC and a GNSO person, so we had Beau and Michaely coach.

Hearing that, they are of the opinion that the work of RAA Group A, is actually done under the charter for this particular piece of work. But now what continues is the important aspects of next-steps and aspirational documents, which in the workgroup's opinion firmly sits in the world of ALAC and At-Large. So I guess, I think we need to be comfortable that that's a good thing and that nothing has to go back to the beginning. What's your views on that, Alan, and then Sebastian?

Alan Greenburg: I guess I wasn't questioning the whole process. I was simply saying that if ALAC submits a statement on the RAA Group A recommendations and report, it shouldn't be written by the co-chair of the RAA group. I'm just saying the optics look bad where people switch halves.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure.

Alan Greenberg: That's all I was saying. Where the statement on consumer constituency mentioned Beau's name five times in the statement, you know, as the drafter. It was purely the optics of it, that I was suggesting.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Alan, how do you feel the optics from the ALAC point of view is on this draft initial report, remembering that this isn't one that's going out for comment; it's going back to the chartering organization, in this case the GNSO?

Alan Greenburg: It is out for comment, I believe.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not formal public comment, only 3.7.7.3 is-

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Oh, I'm sorry, I misread that; you're right. I think it's important that even though we have very little participation in some of these groups from ALAC members and At-Large members in general, that we do our best to try to get other people involved in the assessment, so it doesn't look like a one-man show, which is what we've been accused of, off and on for years. That was my point.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Well I think - I mean, I'm in both group A and B, so under those terms I'm the last person to comment on the validity of who did the initial report. So Alan and Sebastian and Dave, and to that extent Vanda, none of you are; how are you feeling about the draft initial report? Does it paint us in a good and balanced light or not? I believe it's a true and accurate record, but that's all I can tell you.

Alan Greenburg: Sorry, I'm not in a position to pass judgment today.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, so…

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: But I believe, if we're going to make a recommendation or a statement, it should come from a slightly wider group, and that was all I'm - I wasn't trying to make a big thing.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, no problem. I certainly hear what you're saying. One of the issues would be if we had everybody who is listed, both on the GNSO and on the At-Large side, actually in the workgroup activities throughout it would have been perhaps a very much faster process. But that wasn't the way of the world. Sebastian, do you, based on what Alan is saying, then think we should find time in our already overcrowded ALAC schedule to discuss this?

Or - I mean, at the moment what the Executive is doing is acting as a gatekeeper here. Are we comfortable enough on this draft initial report; yes or no? If we don't believe we can stay comfortable enough with it then it needs to go through to the whole ALAC. So, opinion first form Sebastian and then from Dave.

Sebastian Bachollet: Yeah, I don't think we need to add that for our next ALAC conference call. But it could be one of the subjects on the Sunday meeting in Brussels with the revitalization of the working group, and more importantly, of the participation of the At-Large people participant in each and any activities of our group.

Because it's - I see the question of optics and - but it's true for a lot of things we are doing. I just take the example of what Alan write about the GNSO and saying that liaison must be included and it was written by the liaison. We have always this question of optics, but also participation, and more than the optics I would like very much that we try to find a way to have more participation, more participants to all this work done.

Alan Greenburg: Can't argue with that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, nobody would argue with that, that's for sure. And I think the opportunity when we now have a next step leading from this initial report, which gives us fresh work to do in the world of ALAC, what you're saying is even more important. Dave, go ahead. You might be muted, Dave.

Dave Kissondoyal: Yeah, sorry, I was muted. I think, Cheryl, what we need to do is that of giving in to have like a working group which will go through all these, whatever we need to comment yes or no, and then this group brings each to the agency's committee and then we assign people or chairs of the working group to submit their recommendations.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, actually thank you, Dave, and of course the matters of registrant accreditation agreement, accreditation agreement, we have a long-standing working group that has been running for many, many years. But that's always been a within-At-Large workgroup. These are standing workgroups on the matters, not active workgroups heading into the policy development or potential policy development process.

The RAA workgroup, which was split into part A and B, of course was a particular part of policy development work chartered by the GNSO, and it was one of the early efforts that had an active involvement - in fact, a mandated involvement - by ALAC and At-Large in its processes.

So it was the baby step, it was a very important step. But Alan, coming back to your question on the registry liaison writing things, that's no - that optic shouldn't be applied to this initial report to the GNSO, should it, because all of the reporting has gone through the usual close, due diligence, that a workgroup puts to anything that has been captured by the staff support on there.

Alan Greenburg: I was making two statements. One is the one that Sebastian made clearer. We need to get more involvement. We are the documented and/or self-acclaimed supporters of the public good. We need to take that to heart. And the second is - was a purely semantics issue that the statement should not, to anyone giving a cursory read to it, sound like a one-man show.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure, well…

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Again, I really wasn't trying to get a 15-minute discussion out of this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well that's okay. Just I was quite - for example, the listing of the participants in both workgroups, from the group A and group B for the At-Large input and the GNSO input, is actually very well balanced. I thought this particular paper was an exercise in improving the optics, if not the actuality. Which is why I wanted -

Alan Greenburg: And I was commenting on if we make a public comment on it, an official submission on what we think of it, that was what I was talking about…

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure.

Alan Greenburg: … not the paper itself.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, but with your optics view then we probably need to be very careful how we integrate and organize our next step activity, in terms of work on the aspirational document. Because we don't want the same two or three usual suspects carrying the lion's share of something that needs to have wider input, and that's something that I think Sebastian's proposing we look at very carefully on that Sunday.

Alan Greenburg: I support it 150%.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. All right, so to feed back to the RAA initial report for group A and B, can we ask Heidi to - because she's - Heidi, along with Margie, is sort of co-staff support on these - are we as an Executive comfortable we don't see any glaring issues? Or do you need another 24-36 hours to look over the document?

Heidi Ullrich: I'm fine with that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Do you - the GNSO won't be looking at it until Thursday. So if Alan and Dave and Sebastian and Vanda want to have a - and Carlton as well, want to have a closer look at it and if they see something glaring, get back to you?

Alan Greenburg: I will gladly do that, it just hasn't been on my radar at this point.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure, okay. Well let's do that as an action item on everyone but me. Give ourselves another 24-36 hours, which means Carlton can have a look at it too and see if there - have a look at it for the optics. I can assure you that it is, in view of both workgroup A and workgroup B, a true and accurate record of our activities. But if you have an interested reader's view on it and see if there's anything extra that needs to be put in, that would be excellent, and that should go straight back to Heidi.

And particularly, make sure we have a look at the next step proposal because it's the next steps which will be strongly dependent on At-Large. Notice I'm saying At-Large; ALAC can facilitate the collection of information and the iteration of registrant aspirational rights with other interested parties. Those other interested parties will come from the Non-Commercial Stakeholder's Group, and will come from obviously consumer interests, but they will also come from government, and they will also come from outside of ICANN.

Because that is what we have seen has happened even in this RAA group B process, looking at next changes. And I would like to make sure that we've got people equipped in Brussels, to react to and interact with the forum that will be running on either the Monday or the Wednesday, where we're looking at the desires of particularly law enforcement.

And balancing that with interests of our community is often weighted on such as privacy, such as the ability to know who you are dealing with. It does take us into the murky waters of to proxy or not to proxy, and various levels or pre-registrant accreditation and checking, and it's not unrelated with some compliance issues.

So again, we can have a look at that, at least the compliance aspects, during our Sunday schedule in the At-Large meeting in Brussels. And that brings us a segway, if you will allow me, because I don't see one hand up, into item four for today's agenda: At-Large meeting in Brussels, Heidi, tossing over to you while I have another sip of coffee.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay. If you're on the agenda, the link to the At-Large Brussels meeting agendas is there, and I'm going to actually put it into the Adobe Connect at the moment. Now at this point, we have populated the agendas quite - in some detail, so please do take a look at what those items are.

Okay, I put the link to the agendas in. Again, I'm going to quickly review the meeting. I'm taking into account or into note the request for a possible At-Large /NCSG meeting, as well. So on Sunday we have the ALAC in Regional Leadership, that agenda includes outreach/inreach issues. We're going to be inviting Barbara Clay to that who has already indicated that she's looking forward to speaking with the At-Large representatives.

We're also going to have one hour on the topic of reinvigoration of the At-Large working groups. We're going to have about an hour and 30 minutes - or 15 minutes on the introduction to and training of the new Wiki - the new social - Wiki that we will be transitioning in towards the end of the year, called Confluence Wiki. We are also going to have a two-hour lunch - working lunch with the Accountability and Transparency Review Team. Cheryl, if you'd like to add a little bit more about that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, I will Heidi, and I'll take it back to Confluence Wiki, as well because it's really easy. I know you've been doing an awful lot of training, but it's going to be brand new news to our community and we need to make sure the community's properly prepared when they come to Brussels. We don't need a flurry of people rushing to Google to look up confluence when they see it on the agenda; not until they're in the room.

I think that's something that, as an Executive Committee we need to make sure we start getting information out, and to that end it's probably important that we get informed ourselves. So I'll go back to that as well. With the two hour lunch block, it's unlikely that the Accountability and Transparency Review Team will take up the whole of that, but we will probably take up around 90 minutes, either at the beginning or the end of that.

So ALAC and At-Large regional leaders should look to having at least a sort of a half hour or so, perhaps even a little bit more, of time during the working lunch to do other things. So I would be keen for you to realize that the ATRT isn't coming in and taking over your lives totally. But clearly we think that the At-Large community is a fairly important interface for us to interact with. And…

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Despite our one member-

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead, sorry I've got two speakers; Vanda, go ahead, then Alan.

Vanda Scartezini: This is Vanda, just a minute, I need disconnect it because I just arrived with my client now, so if you will excuse, I will disconnect, okay?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, well thank you, very much. Thanks Vanda.

Vanda Scartezini: I will continue following in the Adobe after that. Okay? Bye, bye. Thank you.

Heidi Ullrich: Bye, bye. Thank you, Vanda.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye. Okay, Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenburg: Sorry, I was just saying that we are an important group, despite the fact we only have one member on the team.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed.

Alan Greenburg: But we compensate it by having really good member on the team.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, well I'm not sure the ATRT, or at least some members would be in rampant agreement with you at the moment, but I'm not planning on being on people's …

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Are you being a shit disturber? If so, you're meeting my criteria.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I may not be seen as much of a sleeper in the group, perhaps you could put it that way. Okay, coming - just to explain what's happening with that two-hour lunch, coming towards that, one of the things that I am particularly keen - and it's only just started to happen, but if we can get our regional meetings between now and Brussels to pay a little attention to getting the message out. We've got a couple of comments that could come into the commons place for the general public and At-Large concerns that people have about accountability and transparency on the Wiki page.

I would love to have, you know, 25 or 30 specific examples in that Wiki page when we meet formally with the ATRT. That is something that very important parts of the ATRT will be very supportive of. We do have a tension between traditional ways of interacting with participants and less traditional ways of interacting with participants. And we have a set of questions that will be going out at the formal public comment period very shortly, which are designed in a very traditional way, for governments and organizations to respond to a set of questions.

The US government input into the ATRT's immediate reaction to the very standard sets of questions and mechanisms was, "That's all very nice and yes we need to go through it, but we need specific examples of concern from communities." And it was rather nice for me to be able to say, "Oh, do you mean like what ALAC and At-Large already had set up and has had out there for several weeks? Here's a link."

So if you spot anything on any of the workgroup lists that you're on which would be fairly classified as an example or specific concern or criticism under accountability and transparency, be it of the Board, of ICANN staff, or of course of ourselves, of any of the ACs and SOs including ourselves, and you could encourage the author of such commentary to put that in the space that we've created as sort of a drop box for concerns, that would be very, very good.

And if we, as regional leaders, can go back to our regions and encourage everyone in the ALSs and men in the street if they're interested to do the same, I think that would be very powerful preparation for that discussion on the Sunday. You want to tell us a bit more about Confluence before you go through the rest of the schedule, Heidi? Or do you want to take it up as any other business later?

Heidi Ullrich: We can have about that at any other business. But I have made an action item that we will develop a communication strategy prior to Brussels. And we are also -staff are developing the At-Large Wiki page for show in Brussels.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Fantastic. Now, just so you wonder or just so you know if you use one of Nick's lines, the reason that we are getting an introduction and initial training on this new tool is that while I was in Marina Del Rey for the ATRT, I had an opportunity to have a quick little look at this project of rolling out this particular tool for ICANN-wide use.

And I said to the project manager, Carol Cornell, "It appears to me that the world of ALAC and the At-Large is one that should be seen as a very good Beta testing for community." They were in fact planning on having it pretty much an in-house tool where everyone was fully familiar and working with it, and then taking it out to the wider community.

But I prevailed on our behalf to see us as very viable community Beta testers, and that appears to have got sufficient support to at least try some training with our regional leaders on the tool in Brussels. So I think that's quite a credit to how we're seen as an important part of the ICANN community. So I really want this to work and that would mean an awful lot of pre-information going out.

But on my very brief little look into it, it seems to have a number of technical advantages, including full text search ability of even included attachments, which are streaks ahead of the Socialtext that we currently are using. So it's rather exciting and I think it will be very good for ALAC and At-Large to be the first cab off the ranch to be using it other than those on payroll. Back to you Heidi.

Alan Greenburg: Is this envisioned as replacing or used just for conference?

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, total migration.

Heidi Ulrich: Yes.

Alan Greenburg: Okay, just for clarity, thank you.

Heidi Ullrich: And again, technical staff will ensure that all of our hyperlinks that are in Socialtext will be migrated over. So they're already actually working on that.

Alan Greenburg: I wasn't worried. I was just asking a question.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, Alan, actually what it does, from my totally biased view, is allow us to tidy up a lot of crap.

Alan Greenburg: Good.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Back to you, Heidi. Oh, I'm sorry, Sebastian, go ahead.

Sebastian Bachollet: Yeah, just a remaining question from yes, where we are with our membership system.

Alan Greenburg: Thank you, for the comedy period.

Heidi Ullrich: Sebastian, we are dealing with that. Nick and our technical staff are in communication on that issue. But again, I think at this level or at this stage it might be an issue that needs to be resolved at the higher level. So that's something that is being worked on.

Alan Greenburg: Add it to the agenda item for Mr. Olive.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, back to you Heidi on our Brussels agenda. Heidi?

Heidi Ullrich: Sorry, I'm talking to myself on mute.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well that doesn't help us, at all.

Heidi Ullrich: Exactly. I was wondering why no one was laughing at my joke. Okay, then moving on, with - we have 30 minutes with David Olive. He's happy to talk about several issues with you on that, on policy development, on the exceptional amount of work that you've been doing in the last several months, etc., and listening to you as well. And then we have 90 minutes on At-Large improvements, including where we are with implementation, including also the issue of the At-Large Director will be under that session, and next steps.

Now because Cheryl has to step out due to her Accountability and Transparency Review Team Activities, the afternoon will need to be covered by the two Vice-Chairs. So, on the current Brussels meeting agenda, you'll see where each session has been assigned to a moderator.

Alan you're going to be moderating if you can - or if you accept, the session with David, and the At-Large improvements. While Sebastian, you'll be doing the last two afternoon agenda items. One is the ALS survey, that is one hour dedicated to that, and then 30 minutes to the allocation of reporting on non-At-Large meetings. And -

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hopefully that appeals to the specific interests that you both have been working in up until now.

Alan Greenburg: May I comment?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Please, go ahead.

Alan Greenburg: Yeah, I have no problem, and I'd be delighted to do it, but the GNSO schedule has not yet been published. So understand that we may need to do some swapping with Sebastian or perhaps get another person involved who would like to take over the Chair temporarily.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, well the other thing is if it's a matter of blocks of time, we can always switch things around in the blocks of time to the best of our ability, because the internal aspects of our agenda is still very much run by ourselves, I guess.

Alan Greenburg: No, no, I'm just saying. You know in the past - in the last meeting I was in ALAC all-Sunday - other meetings have been a little bit more challenging and I don't have a clue what's happening in this one. So we'll revisit that if necessary once schedules become firmer.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, back to you, Heidi.

Heidi Ullrich: Sorry, that takes care of the Sunday. And then next meetings - I'm going to do this a little bit quicker, then we have the APRALO meeting on Tuesday. We have the ALAC Policy Discussion Part 1 and Part 2 on Tuesday. Topics to be covered in those meetings will be vertical integration, we'll be asking Margie Mylon to come talk to the At-Large representatives. We also have 20 minutes with David Gisa on compliance. We'll have 40 minutes to discuss the RAA amendments and aspirational charter, including the new public comments period that Cheryl was talking about earlier. Then on the Policy Discussion II Session, that is going to be a single issue meeting on the - to be out at that time, the Draft Applicant Guidebook Version 4. And Karen Lent will be speaking to us about that issue. Then continuing on Tuesday - continuing on -
((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: 18.

Heidi Ulrich: Sorry?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: One moment, Sebastian's raised his hand. Go ahead, Sebastian.

Sebastian Bachollet: Yeah, I know that it's easier to have the staffs come in to talk to us, but on the vertical integration I would like very much that you, as the Co-Chair of the working group, if they are able to come to us. Thank you.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, I've noted that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Invitation to be sent, fantastic, good idea, thanks, Sebastian.

Heidi Ulrich: Okay.

Alan Greenburg: On the vertical integration, we really are going to need some time to discuss internal to the ALAC if we are taking a specific position or minority positions or things like that. There really is division in At-Large at this point and I don't - again, as custodians of the public good and the main rule of this vertical integration is, look at the interests of the public good.

We know that the people who are going to make money on it have positions and I think At-Large has to come up with a position, or multiple positions, if we can't come to closure, which is quite possible. But I don't think we have the luxury of not doing that, so we should try to allow time sometime in the week to do that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alan, do you have a guesstimate on what size block of time we might need to do, or whether we need to have a block of time that is somewhat minimal and then ask those in Brussels to form a workgroup and do some intercessional work or what way?

Alan Greenburg: It's hard to say what's going to come out of the group right now, and I know we're only a couple of weeks away, but it's really, really difficult.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Alan Greenburg: I think we need at least a half an hour and perhaps we'll need more, but no less than half an hour, if people don't make speeches.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure. I'm wondering – Heidi, as we move closer to-

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Cheryl, are you still there?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, we are. Because we have specific matters out of the bag for - that will be being discussed in our meeting with GAC, i.e. the new GTLDs and morality and public order issue, if we need to tweak any time to give ourselves 30 minutes, specific to the ALAC and At-Large consensus view to go back into the ZI process, can we try and do that in our policy discussion part two on the Tuesday? So it may be, depending on our need, which we will be able to identify by then, and Alan this is meeting your proposal, that we steal the first 20 minutes or so from 9:30 through to say 9:50 to take it to the next level after we've had our staff briefing.

So, maybe even block off 30 minutes. So we'll have had our vertical integration, our compliance information, and some work on the RAA Amendments and Aspirational Charter, of those, the one I believe will have the greatest follow-on requirements, by the sounds of it, will be the vertical integration. And if we can steal up to 30 minutes out of the next block of time, the 9:30 to 11 block of time, we could perhaps look at putting a placeholder in for that now. Alan, how does that work for you?

Alan Greenburg: That sounds fine. I'm really not trying to cry wolf here. We have another month of vertical integration. These processes normally when they start coming to closure do it very close and very close to the end. So we may well end up with a proposal that comes out of that which we can rubber stamp. I just don't know at this point.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, let's just put a little placeholder in there…

Alan Greenburg: Yep.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: …just because internal discussion for matters carrying over for Part 1 and give it 15 or 20 minutes, and then move into the single purpose, new GTLD guidebook discussion, remembering that that also acts as preparatory time for our meeting with the GAC. So we don't want to duplicate efforts, but we do want to have some verification and intelligence in our voice when we go into the GAC room on these matters. Heidi, you've got your hand up. I can't give you anything because you can take whatever you like, whenever you like.

Heidi Ullrich: I just wanted to get in the queue and that was given that we're going to be discussing vertical integration in Policy Discussion Part 2, should we move that down in Policy Part 1 down to the end so it'll just be one smooth transition. And we can do compliance first thing, move the RAA up slightly, and then third issue, be vertical integration for, you know, a long…
((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Are you saying have the briefing and then the discussion?

Heidi Ullrich: No, I'm saying have the vertical integration at its current - in Part 1 that is currently the first item; move that down to the third item in Part 1 and then in Part 2 have that be the first item. So it will just be a long discussion.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But Alan, that would be have the briefing and then the discussion, yes.

Alan Greenburg: I like keeping them separate, otherwise the briefing overruns, someone goes off on a tangent and we never get to the discussion.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, yes.

Alan Greenburg: I like keeping them separate.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, I'll just keep it-

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I don't - keep it as is and put the placeholder in for internal discussion on all the items.

Heidi Ullrich: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bloody hell, sorry, I'm walking around in the dark and I just stood in something.

Alan Greenburg: Too much information.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh god, oh dear. Oh this is not pretty. Okay, just bear with me. Right, while I clean up the large pile of dog vomit with bone from them eating a goat carcass, Alan, could you just take over Chairing for a moment, please? Thank you.

Alan Greenburg: I'm going to still be laughing when you get back. Heidi, you may go ahead.

Heidi Ullrich: Sorry, I'm - thank goodness I'm not eating my lunch at the moment. Okay, so that brings us down - again, continuing on Tuesday. As Cheryl mentioned, we have a meeting with the GAC that's 90 minutes between 11 and 12:30 on Tuesday, and then at 12:45 to 14:00 there's the EURALO Showcase Event. And we had a very good meeting, I think it was about two weeks ago now, with Rudi and the other members of the working group. And they developed their agenda or their speaking - who's going to be speaking and what those general comments will be, so that's moving ahead.

Alan Greenburg: Just for a moment; going back to the meeting with the GAC, who is it that's discussing the various detailed agenda items? New GTLDs is a bit too wide.

Heidi Ullrich: When you say who, is that - I think that's just - those items, the morality and public order and the new GTLDs were basically the two agenda items that will be discussed. With both -

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Okay, I guess it's fitting to wait for the new Applicant Guidebook before deciding the details there. Go ahead, sorry.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, so going back to the EURALO showcase, just very quickly; they've decided to invite Rod Bextram to be opening comments, a keynote speech with the - actually I think it's - they're going to be asking…

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry, I'm listening.

Heidi Ulrich: …some Board members. I think Dennis Jennings was one, Jean Jacques was another, again just very short discussions on the role of At-Large and ICANN in general. Cheryl will be invited to present a few minutes of At-Large, just an overview of at large, and then there will be - the EURALO ALSs who are in Brussels will be asked to say a few words about their ALS and their activities.

So again, it'll be somewhat similar to the AFRALO showcase in Nairobi. Matthias and Rudi will be working on sending out the ALS template to all of the ALSs in EURALO to complete. And that will be - those completed templates then will be displayed in a similar manner as they were for the AFRALO ALSs in Nairobi.

Alan Greenburg: Just out of curiosity, neither the GAC nor the Showcase is listed as a food event. Are we allowed to eat that day?

Heidi Ullrich: The - the - Rudi and the working group on the EURALO Showcase are working on getting sponsors for some kind of food there - some kind of catering. That's still to be under discussion. With meeting with the GAC, no, there's no catering planned for that meeting. Again, moving on with Tuesday, a very busy day; we have between -

((Crosstalk))

Sebastian Bachollet: Just one point on that, on the Tuesday, sorry but we are starting at eight and no stop at all up to 2:00. I think it's not feasible.

Heidi Ullrich: Well, again we have coffee breaks. So we have one coffee break between 10:30 and 11, and again the EURALO Showcase will have some sort of catering.

Alan Greenburg: Okay but, you know, if this is something with little bowls of chips on the table, I think we're going to need a little bit more than that.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, again, as the sponsorship - as we know more about that, then we'll be able to, excuse me, we'll be able to -

((Crosstalk))

Sebastian Bachollet: With, no, ICANN it's very, very poor company and as we - to organize everything and even to find the money to organize the ICANN meeting, it's really nonsense, sorry.

Alan Greenburg: Okay. Point has been made.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay. So moving on more with Tuesday, we have a 3:00-4:00 meeting, ALAC improvements discussion with interested members of the SIC and the BGC. Again, the two items on that agenda will be At-Large Director selection process and the ALAC improvements.

Alan Greenburg: Okay.

Heidi Ulrich: Okay, then there's going to be AFRALO, particularly Tijani and Fatimata working with Ann Rochelle and members of the Afri-ICANN list, will be developing or organizing a joint meeting with the Afri-ICANN. Again, that includes members of the government and the CCTLD operators. Their primary aim for this meeting is to discuss and develop a statement on the same issues being talked about in the JAZZ working group. So, the issue of providing support for developing countries on the new GTLDs.

Alan Greenburg: Okay.

Heidi: Okay, and that's 90 minute. Now, unfortunately, that currently conflicts with a meeting so we're going to be discussing if that timing is going to fit. And then also on Tuesday is the EURALO monthly meeting. Matthias is working with Wolf on the development of that agenda. Moving to Wednesday, at nine to 10 -

((Crosstalk))

Sebastian Bachollet: I want to add one point on that and then I will suggest that tomorrow, even if we don't have a face-to-face general assembly we need a general assembly. And I don't see why it will not be taking place during the Brussels meeting and then why it's not enough for a general assembly for the EURALO, during the Brussels meeting.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, let me just take a look when the Gala night - I think that's actually Wednesday.

Alan Greenburg: The Gala's Wednesday.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, so then we do have time to extend that. So yes, Sebastian, that's fine. If you can discuss that tomorrow I think that would be fine.

Sebastian Bachollet: I will.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, so we'll question that duration, then. Okay, then on Wednesday, currently 9:00 to 10:30 we have the regional secretariats meeting, 12: 30-14:00 we have the ALAC and Board meeting working lunch. Table topics, do you have suggestions for table topics?

Alan Greenburg: Not at this very moment.

Sebastian Bachollet: We will have.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, then on Wednesday immediately after the Board meeting - now this is a currently scheduled meeting that Cheryl was talking about, this is the amending the RAA forum, and that is scheduled for 2:00-3:00 currently. But again, there are strong voices requesting that that meeting be moved to Monday.

So as we see the various schedule developments, changes, we'll have to watch where that meeting is going to be taking place. Then moving more to At-Large meetings on Wednesday, we have the At-Large registrars meeting between - again, this is currently in conflict with the RAA forum and -

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Which would make so sense whatsoever.

Heidi Ullrich: No, that's why we're going to - again, we're assuming that the RAA forum is going to change but we just need to wait to see whether that is going to change.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Put it this way Alan, you've seen the traffic on the ACFC.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: I understand.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Heidi Ullrich: So I've also been in touch with Tim Cole and we're watching that, so it may be that we need to just go later in the afternoon for that session. So - and also, this is one of the issues Alan brought up over the weekend by Bill Drake, the idea of having this joint At-Large NCSG meeting. There is currently a meeting on - a consumer's workshop being planned by members of the At-Large, that's Beau Bremler and Holly Raish, as well as members of the NCSG, Rosemary Sinclair and Aubrey. And that currently is being planned for Wednesday between 16:30 and 17:30. So that would be somewhat of a joint At-Large NCSG meeting.

Alan Greenburg: Yeah, I don't think that will be in there.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If I may, because I'm actually not at the computer so I can't put my hand up just yet, Alan, I would think that this was one of those that if that happens at that time, that's a compulsory meeting for us all.

Alan Greenburg: I would - yes, but I don't think it's the same thing and I'm quite happy if we can try to make this s social event and not a formal meeting.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Alan Greenburg: I don't know if the timing will allow that but we can try.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It might - a formal meeting held then is really important, we then can all go on to the Gala Event. All it does mean is that an opportunity for a social meeting is going to come in on the Thursday.

Alan Greenburg: Okay. I think, among other things, the accountability and transparency review is something that collusion may help with.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, so then on Thursday, then because the public forum is going to be moved to the afternoon, we're going to have the ALAC and regional leadership wrap-up session starting at 8:00, so 8:00 to 9:30.

And we're going to be inviting Kevin Wilson to talk about the fiscal year budget. Now, he's going to be asked to go first because at, I believe, 9:30 - I'll double check this, but he has - actually has his Fiscal Year '11 briefing right in the morning as well. And then for Friday, we have the ALAC executive committee meeting planned between 2:00 and 5:30.

Alan Greenburg: Okay, do you know when the GNSO wrap-up is tentatively scheduled?

Heidi Ullrich: Let me take a look.

Alan Greenburg: Normally it would be Thursday afternoon.

Heidi Ullrich: Yes. Again, this is the current schedule, and that is Thursday between 11:00 and looks like 1:30.

Alan Greenburg: Okay, so it's no conflict, okay.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, any comments or questions on that?

Alan Greenburg: Only that, if possible, you make official or unofficial access to lunch on Friday.

Heidi Ullrich: I didn't quite get that. Lunch…

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Official or unofficial access to lunch on Friday…

Heidi Ulrich: Yes, yes.

Alan Greenburg: …since we're not going to be in a hotel and can't order room service.

Heidi Ulrich: Okay.

Alan Greenburg: It would be appreciated if some kind soul made sure we have food.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, even though it starts at 2:00, which is after the normal lunch period.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, I would have thought we would have had time to go and grab some crisps or something.

Alan Greenburg: Maybe. It depends on when the Board meeting is scheduled when; sometimes they go to 1:30; they don't always go to there, but sometimes they're scheduled to 1:30.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, I'm back now.

Heidi Ullrich: Yes, actually they're scheduled-

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, Sebastian – sorry, can I just ask a question, Alan?

Alan Greenburg: Sure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sebastian's written in the Adobe room two hours for vertical integration for ALAC.

Alan Greenburg: Sebastian, are you asking or questioning why?

Sebastian Bachollet: No, I think that if we want to have a debate on that, with the presentation of the issue and the discussion it will take one and a half hours and not two hours, but it will take time because the people involved, the time it takes to discuss some issue and some documents if will take time to let the people know and then the people react and participate to the reflection of what ALAC will have to do. That's why I was thinking about this time, yes. But the way you set up the meeting will allow some flexibility then it will be okay.

Alan Greenburg: I mean, right now we have close to an hour. I don't remember the exact time,

Heidi Ullrich: Actually we have an hour.

Alan Greenburg: Yeah.

Heidi Ulrich: We have 30 minutes in part one and then 30 minutes in part two.

Alan Greenburg: And I think that's either going to be overkill or under- either more than we need or less than we need by a lot, depending on how things evolve over the next month in the workgroup.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And, Alan, if it's less than we need then I'd be strongly encouraging intercessional work, which may be over lunch on the Monday a group of representatives will gather together and take it to the next level.

Alan Greenburg: That's probably a fine way of doing it. I just don't think we can predict, so I wouldn't want to allocate a lot more time, but we may have to react as things firm up. So, Sebastian, I agree with you. If ALAC is going to have hard decisions to make on who to support, you may well be right.

On the other hand - the tone in the meeting right now Mikey is starting to say out loud that we're looking at an interim solution for the first round and not the ultimate fixing of vertical integration for all time. And if he can convince the various proposers to work towards that I think we may come to some closure, but I don't know.

Sebastian Bachollet: All right.

Alan Greenburg: I mean, he has said that since day one but he hasn't pushed it and half of the people making proposals are making long-term, major, major change ones. Maybe not half, but some of the proposers are suggesting that, and we're going to have to wait for it to play out for another week or so.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, I'm sure we'll all be kept posted on that. Have we moved on to agenda item five?

Alan Greenburg: Well we just finished whatever that, the meeting, was, so I guess that's now five, yes, At-Large improvements.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, terrific. Can I just make the point that we are, with the 10 minute delay, we are now one and a half hours into our meeting, and a mere less than halfway through the agenda. How do you want to proceed with this agenda now?

Alan Greenburg: My schedule's okay to continue.

Sebastian Bachollet: I am okay, too.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, is it possible to reconnect to Dave?

Alan Greenburg: Dave just put something on the chat. Dave said he's okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, just so you know, both Heidi and I are supposed to be in the RAA group B call and have supposed to have been there for the last 15 minutes. So I'm wondering if we could take a 30 minute break and reconvene in 30 minutes to continue our agenda.

Alan Greenburg: That would be fine for me. I wouldn't even mind slightly longer. It means I can go do something else, but whatever time you decide is fine.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, is it possible for us to reconvene this meeting in 45 minutes?

Alan Greenburg: Okay, that's on the hour.

Sebastian Bachollet: That's fine with me.

Alan Greenburg: I'll only have about an hour at that point, but if you think that's sufficient, yes-

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Alan Greenburg: Hour and a quarter, maybe.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well I think we can do that.

Sebastian Bachollet: That's okay with me.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Let's meet in 45 minutes; fantastic.

Sebastian Bachollet: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, very much, for your indulgence.

Alan Greenburg: Okay, reconvene in 45.

Heidi Ullrich: In 45 minutes. Okay. Thank you.

Alan Greenburg: Okay. Bye, bye.

Heidi Ullrich: Bye, bye.

Break in Audio Conference

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Either that or Seth won't be able to join us, but I gather that he has extensively briefed Heidi on where we are fitting out our agenda which is At-Large improvement implementation update and next step. Over to you, Heidi.

Heidi Ullrich: Yes, okay, I just wanted to spend a little bit of time on the comments we received from Ray over the weekend, as well as then from Marco in response or basically interpreting what Ray was requesting. And I think it will take a little bit of time. It's basically to shorten the current project plan, put it all into a simplified version of the simplified outline or what we're calling an Executive Summary of the simplified outline, but in addition to that to put in more information on the idea of what some of the costs are, who's covering that, liability issues, what are some possible liability risks, are there any bylaw changes required?

Well we know the answer to that one for recommendations one and 11, and then does this plan conform to any Board guidance given regarding the preparation of this plan? Well again, that goes back to a resolution passed in Sydney basically saying that the At-Large community as well as staff need to prepare this document. So we also need to stress that a bit more in the project plan.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Heidi Ulrich: But I think that -

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The questions on the liability and cost; we bleated very loud and long about the fact that budget ramifications on improvement plans. not just the ALAC but also the GNSO, but all improvement plans as a result of independent reviews need to be properly budgeted for. How did that get to be our problem again?

Heidi Ullrich: Again, that's the issue. I know - I'm hearing conflicting reports on at this time do we put in estimates of what we believe the improvements will cost. And on the other side, let's put in that yes, they are being covered, there is budget available in the fiscal year '11, and as the working teams start implementing some of these tasks then we will have a better idea. That's what I need to - I'm speaking with David all of today on that issue.

Alan Greenburg: Heidi?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: To some extent it really does fall back to David because David Olive has the budget and he has two parties, the GNSO and the ALAC, underneath that umbrella budget that's going to need a budget allocation out of his piece of cake. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenburg: Yeah, well the final budget is being drafted or is already drafted, I don't know which. ((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It should be drafted.

Alan Greenburg: Is there a number there that has been set aside for ALAC improvements or not?

Heidi Ullrich: Yes, there is. I mean basically -

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Then our answer to Ray is yes, there is $273,000 allocated, which staff believe will be adequate to address the urgent needs in this coming fiscal year.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Alan Greenburg: And it's in the budget. I don't-

Heidi Ullrich: I think we can definitely put in that yes, there is X amount in the budget. But whether that's going to be enough, that remains to be seen as the work teams start developing.
((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's what Alan said, urgent, urgent needs for implementation in this fiscal year. That is assuming it is sufficient for that until we see the budget. That makes that comment a little difficult.

Alan Greenburg: Well yes, I'm assuming that there is a substantial number. If they tell us it's $14,000, then the words around it are somewhat different.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That budget's due for posting today, is it not?

Heidi Ullrich: Indeed, the 17th.

Alan Greenburg: Yes, but is it going to have that level of specificity.

Heidi Ullrich: I would hope so, and if not I can go to Kevin, I would assume.

Alan Greenburg: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If it doesn't then the question also gets raised as to how has this budget responded to considerable weight of community comment on the framework? Because both GNSO and ALAC, asked specifically for those matters to be well addressed.

Heidi Ullrich: And also, what we're planning on doing between now and Brussels and indeed at Brussels is review, and that brings us down to the second level, Part B on this agenda item is the - this status log. We need to work with Cheryl on a regular basis and the Ex Comm, on where we are with all of the tasks.

Because we believe that we have completed or we are moving ahead on many of the tasks outlined. So again, all of this will be needing to be taken into account as we include the update and revision that Ray and Marco are suggesting. So the plan now-

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Are we allowed to see these revisions that Ray and Marco are suggesting?

Heidi Ullrich: Yeah, I think-

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Is this in the in the cloud of "about us and without us" conversations that go on-

Heidi Ullrich: No, no, no, I can include them in here right now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Because it does get confusing sometimes to know what we're supposed to know about the SIC is saying about us, and what we need to know about the SIC is saying about us, and what will actually engage the SIC in conversation about us. Or is that just me?

Alan Greenburg: No, it's not just you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh good.

Alan Greenburg: It may just be the two of us.

Heidi Ullrich: I'm going to put it into the Skype chat in just a moment.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, very much. But what this means for our process and program is another layer of documentation will be created, which is the - I mean simplified At-Large improvement outline already has an Executive Summary, so I'd call it an SIC primer or something rather than an Executive Summary of something that's got an executive summary.

Heidi Ullrich: Basically just take out the narrative, that's what Marco was commenting - and Marco has worked with Ray before and you will see the comments I've just put in to the Ex Comm chat, those are Ray's comments. He prefers - his method - or his preferred method of communication is straightforward outline, table. So basically we're going to repackage it, change the optics to where he can understand it better, perhaps.

Alan Greenburg: So he wants fewer words, less verbiage, and get to the point.

Heidi Ullrich: Yes.

Alan Greenburg: I can live with that, if it means people actually read it.

Heidi Ullrich: So what we're thinking of doing is keeping an Executive Summary, one page, perhaps one page of narrative just for those other members of the SIC who may prefer some narrative. Putting the slightly revised version of the simplified outline into about two or three pages, and then adding a few appendices and I'm going to just now include - this is now what Marco - okay and these are Marco's-

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Are we looking at this being able to be done between now and the ALAC meeting, then?

Heidi Ullrich: No, I think what happening is we'll have something to show you by then, but I spoke with Diane this morning and the ultimate aim is to get it passed or at least through an email is to get the Ex Comm or the ALAC to accept it in the revised state, and the get it to the - submit it by the 7th of June, in time for the Brussels SIC meeting and the Board meeting.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, but we'll have something to look at at the ALAC meeting.

Heidi Ullrich: Yes, that's what I'm having – I've asked Seth to do that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Obviously, that's where it needs to come from; I just needed to hear that that was achievable.

Alan Greenburg: Okay, by the way, without wanting to know personal details, when we get an estimate of the budget it would be nice to know what the estimate of the budget allocation is, excluding Seth's salary. In other words, do we have any money left to actually do anything?

Heidi Ullrich: Yeah, good point, okay.

Alan Greenburg: By the way, the largest liability I can see, to use the word Ray used, is ICANN again being seen to pay lip service and not do anything to try to get the public interest served and try to get the users involved. But I don't think we can quite say that.

Heidi Ullrich: Well, let me put in something - I'll put in just a little bit more that Marco said into the Skype chat.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Alan, the other issue of liability is - and cost to some extent is one that I raised directly from the needs of the ABSD team, the DCEC, with JJ while I was in Marina Del Ray. I should probably leave Heidi to describe any dynamics around that. But suffice it to day when I left the room it was clear that due diligence on the slate off candidate - in other words the product of the DCEC process.

So this is particular to recommendation two of the improvements program – was firmly in the budget of JJ and was necessary to be carried out at the pre-vote slate level. And he was able to satisfy me that this was doable, and the details on how I can better negotiate value for money with their third-party due diligence people is up to him but seems fine, fair and reasonable to the current Chair of the ALAC and Chair of the BCEC.

Alan Greenburg: Both of them?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, both of them. There was a considerable discussion about any negative replies in a due diligence process, at a slate level, needing to be kept quite clearly confidential inasmuch as we recognize that with the elephant that is the BCEC, some form of negativity comments on a candidate may give privileged information which could be legally or otherwise leveraged later by someone else you're working with from the BCEC, because the nature - incestuous nature of ICANN world, people working elsewhere with people in their real work environment.

And so it was deemed appropriate that the BCEC, certainly this time around, should anything negative come out of the due diligence process for their members of the slate, would simply be given the information of "Unable to confirm" or "Unable to…", sort of very neutral language, no specifics. And the BCEC would therefore, with the absence of information detail, either decide to leave someone on a slate or not, and for them to go through to vote. That had precedence. The candidates who have been put forward for Board positions by other SOs and, I think, ACs have had matters raised in due diligence back to their Selection Committee.

At the time we're talking about the actual appointment process, not the pre-vote process, and those appointing bodies have decided, in the past, that it neither cares nor thinks was particularly valid for their purposes. That's not a luxury we have because we're not making outright appointments. What we do therefore, want to make sure is that there is any red flagging that comes up doesn't be seen as red flag as such, and could be interpreted by the community At-Large as something negative about the person, because that would have some liability issues for ICANN and indeed, the rest of us.

I indicated to JJ that from my perspective, the independence from decision making this time around of the BCEC chair. In other words, having a BCEC chair that acts in a non-voting or influential way, was a very good thing, because if we tripped over these issues this time, at least you know that a red flag information should is need to be passed on, could be handled in as neutral and as confidential way as possible.

But it does raise the matter for future BCEC designs and for the review that the ADSD team needs to do on this process, as to whether or not we do need an at-arms-length relationship with someone in future BCECs where full, frank, and fearless information can be exchanged without compromise to confidentiality of all parties and risk of liability.

Alan Greenburg: What happens with the non-com right, now if someone does not have due diligence? Does the non-com get that information? Or do they automatically take the second in line?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It changes each time apparently.

Alan Greenburg: Pardon me, sorry. The phone slipped. I didn't hear.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If it's occurred, actually when they do due diligence has changed each time. So we don't actually have a clear precedent. So this time they're getting two layers of due diligence; non-com is getting two levels of due diligence. They're getting a general health and sanity check of the accuracy of the claims made in the declarations of statements, etc, etc. And then on the potential appointments, a deeper dive will be done; that's this year.

Alan Greenburg: Okay, but the question was, if the deeper dive says there's a big problem - there's a problem who does that go to? Does it go right now to the non-com? Or is it handled at an executive level of chair, or whatever?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It, at the moment, would be handled, if they used the same precedent as has happened in the past, with not the non-com, but with another appointment, it would go to the Executive. The problem with our situation is rather than having a fairly tightly controlled Executive making an appointment process and held under such strict confidentiality agreements as can be exercised elsewhere, we don't actually have an Executive.

Alan Greenburg: When you say the Executive, the Executive of what?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alright, well for example, if there was a hypothetical appointment to the Board from an AC or an SO, where in deep dive there was a matter that ICANN legal considered worthy of informing the appointees of, it is up to the appointees to say whether or not they are or are not concerned about that red flag.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Okay, but in the GNSO, for instance, it's the whole GNSO that votes

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: In the past, such a situation has occurred and they have decided they are not

Alan Greenburg: Concerned, I understand.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: …concerned about the red flag. But that's a vast difference between a group of however many we are, 10 plus one, and two people.

Alan Greenburg: But if it's the GNSO, it's the whole GNSO that decides. It's not - there is no Executive.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, so far you've never had the challenge where anyone you put forward has raised flags.

Alan Greenburg: Could well be.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And that, can I just say, based on my conversation with JJ, good luck, not good management.

Alan Greenburg: Yep, I understand.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What I can say is it has happened, there is precedent, and the Executive, and it was Executive, decided the flag was not important.

Alan Greenburg: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I don't think, and I agree with JJ, I do not think that's a luxury we can afford a whole BCEC model.

Alan Greenburg: No, I agree. Have fun.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Status log, Heidi.

Heidi Ullrich: Yes. So I've put the status -

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: By the way, I'm glad you got - you didn't -I'm glad the end result is they understand it's an item they have to fund.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Alan Greenburg: That was not guaranteed in my mind. Sorry to interrupt.

Heidi Ullrich: No, no, no. I think actually the face-to-face that Cheryl and JJ had while in MDR was very useful, for that. Going on to the status log, I have put the link - this is again just a framework of the status log in the Adobe Connect chat. Over weekly calls with Cheryl, Stef and myself, we will start inputting materials, populating this status log, which will then feed into the revised project plan as well.

Alan Greenburg: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And it's even going to be color coded because they asked me, and I like color coding.

Heidi Ullrich: So again, this is going to be - we're looking - Seth is working with our Wiki expert on staff and we're looking at how we're going to include the status log already into the Confluence. And again, Confluence will offer a lot of advantages in terms of color coding, in terms of incorporating PDFs and other images, etc. So we are working on that. But because Confluence is going to be in transition, the status log may be in transition over the next month or two months, as well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Heidi Ulrich: So I'm not sure this if that last discussion, this recent discussion on the due diligence, was that already under item six?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think so. I think we've boosted across into item six. So some of that should go in under item six, but there are other matters. Not the least of which is we are now at the point where BCEC is ready to draft its small selection of words to go around the call for statements of interest.

It has a meeting scheduled this week, but it would appear that there is less than the necessary quorum and most importantly, less than the required regional diversity to run that meeting. So I haven't delved into my emails yet, Heidi you might want to double check with Gisella, but I know Gisella was going to see whether that core needed to be rescheduled or not. If it is rescheduled it will only be rescheduled by a short amount of time, so we're still looking at the next week and 10 days.

Alan Greenburg: ICANN legal is still happy with you making the call for applicants even though the process has not yet been approved?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The - taking the words out of my mouth before I actually got to say them, in my meeting with JJ, it - and our basic - as we struggled to help him understand so he could struggle to help people on other committees understand, as we were given self-determination and a task, it is my view that there is nothing stopping us going through up until, but not including the point of vote.

Alan Greenburg: Okay, how many times have you had to respond to the question, why is this so complex when everyone else does it simpler? And the answer being, "Because you told us to do it that way."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, that is the answer and the number of times, for example, one of the issues they were most concerned about – now by "they", I am - this is an amorphous "they", this is an unnamed subset of what I can only assume to be the Board, it is in no way indicating that that it is the Board Governance Committee or Structural Improvements Committee.

But there is a faceless person or persons, who according to JJ, is still most concerned about the risk of capture. And I said, well I hope they are equally concerned about the risk of capture in every AC and SO appointment to the Board, because there is no difference in the modeling in what we're doing; in fact there is higher levels of integrity and crosscheck and community input, and less risk of capture in what we have created, monster that it is, than in any of the other in our currently comfortable mechanism.

Alan Greenburg: Can't argue with that. I think I used words similar to that in saying, "To the extent one is worried about the composition of our RALOs and our ALSs, one should be similarly worried about the composition of stakeholder groups and constituencies in the GNSO."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep. And if we ever need an example, I spent some time discussing with Louis Lee on the arcane intricacies, and they are arcane and intricate, mechanisms of the appointments for the two Board seats coming out of the ASO, and if they want to worry, boy, can I give them something to worry about.

Alan Greenburg: Okay, yeah, but those people are part of the in-group already so you can't worry about them.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Look, it's one of those be careful what you wish for, because we can give it right back to them if needs be now.

Alan Greenburg: Okay. Sorry to go off track.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, it is an important part of the election - of the At-Large Director selection process. I actually think this is looking good. I think what's important is that we haven't drifted, even with the going up to but not including the selection process. We're still not being given any indication that the Board has other than the intent to have an At-Large selected Director seated in the December meeting. So that's all good news.

Alan Greenburg: Alright, as one of my last parting gestures on this process I was planning to revise what was a very hurriedly put-together document to the SIC, and, you know, just to do - and any clean-up. Does any changes need to be made to that section regarding directed votes?

Heidi Ulrich: No.

Alan Greenburg: For any more clarity?

Heidi Ullrich: I have heard nothing from Sam. I think basically what we talked about, both Cheryl and Alan, is that in the process, just to be clear, we need to provide transcripts, we need to have recordings, so it's everything that we're already doing. Just be -

Alan Greenburg: Okay, so they're not worried that it's not in the principles of operation of a mandate

Heidi Ulrich: No.

Alan Greenburg: As long as the RALO makes the conscious decision on the - in the process to direct.

Heidi Ullrich: If they do that, yes, if they do that just make it transparent; provide, you know, clear language in that and on the transcript.

Alan Greenburg: Okay, just out of curiosity, the North American RALO, which is the only one I actively participate in, I went to our website and found out there's something like 20 ALSs in North America, assuming the Website is up to date. I wonder - and a quorum is half of them. I wonder how many RALO meetings are held where decisions are made where there are actually 10 ALSs in attendance. And that's the level of care I think we and they will have to exercise.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think perhaps that's a question that we should ask all of the RALOs. I can speak for Asia-Pacific and we only conduct business at quorate meetings.

Alan Greenburg: I understand that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But, I think it's important because at the moment that piece of information is held within the RALOs and it really needs to be obvious beyond just the RALO executive and management people.

Alan Greenburg: Well in would think in that case, some of the RALOs don't even think about the concept of quorum, just is there a bunch of people on the call.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm wondering, while Sebastian is on the call, with the Board structure for EURALO, what happens there?

Sebastian Bachollet: I will not answer to the discussion today because I am not sure that even for the Board we are taking care of the quorum.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, perhaps it's something that might need to get onto the to-do list then.

Sebastian Bachollet: I will take that with me for tomorrow meeting. No worries.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You're going to have a hell of a meeting tomorrow, Sebastian, aren't you?

Alan Greenburg: Yes, but that's why I suggested to Heidi, and I think she copied it to you, that the RALO leadership has to be reminded that, in this particular item and all the decisions associated with it, it needs to be squeaky clean and honorable.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep, the absolute highest level. Okay.

Alan Greenburg: So if they don't - if their rules of procedure are not implementable, someone should think of changing them quickly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. We're probably at a point - this is a slight aside but it does come more to item five of the agenda than six where we are now - and that is certainly by the end of this calendar year, looking at our planning for the calendar year 2011, I would like to think that it probably is time for RALOs, preferably in a funded general assembly model, to revisit and look at their operational procedures and guidelines, because, you know, we've matured and changed. It may be that no need is - that there is no need for change. Some regions have done some updating. But it probably is a good time to declare it time to look at it.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Yeah, and the rules may well be okay in all of them, but they need to be followed and they need to be demonstrably - have been demonstrably followed was the issue.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh yeah, yeah, absolutely.

Alan Greenburg: And, you know, if a RALO cannot manage to get quorum, according to the current rules, they also aren't going to be able to change their by-laws. So we have a real chicken and egg problem.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed, indeed. Dave, what's happening in the wonderful world of Africa? It probably is important for the AFRALO regional leadership to be aware that this will be coming up as an issue, both directly as a result of the Director selection process, but in the medium turn as an opportunity for review points for regional documentation and rules and procedures.

Dave Kissondoyal: Basically, as you know, that I was cut off for a while at the AFRALO for nearly one month, but I'm going to raise this issue in the next AFRALO meeting. Concerning the survey, Mohammed has sent reminder today also, if that's okay, the survey's going to DHS so I think that all the ALSs are going to take this survey.

Alan Greenburg: Yes, but -

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, okay, I must say I'm happy to extend the survey for a couple of days, and perhaps through to Sunday, because I have been concerned about the number of ALSs who have so far responded in all regions. Without picking on any particular region, each and every one of us needs to do a whole lot better. But if, like Sebastian is taking these matters to the EURALO meeting, if we can prevail upon you to take these matters to the AFRALO meeting I think that would be very good indeed. Alan is obviously doing it with NARALO, that's an action item on Carlton, is to make sure that he is engaged and ensuring that what's going on currently in LACRALO is fitting with these desires and needs, as identified by ALAC and the Executive Committee. And I'll do the same for APRALO.

Dave Kissondoyal: Yeah, Cheryl, what I suggest if you can extend it to the end of this week, because of these surveys, for me I think that it's really important so that we have the maximum number of ALSs participating. So if you could extend it by Sunday.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, in as much as it's my call, I'm happy to extend it to Sunday and if we don't have any dissenting view on this call let's make that so.

Dave Kissondoyal: Thank you, very much, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Nobody disagrees? Okay. Dave in Africa, happy, Sebastian agrees, Alan, I assume you're agreeing because you're an agreeable person.

Alan Greenburg: I was the one who put on the note reminding people that Sylvia pleaded for an extension, so.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, well that's a note for Sunday then.

Alan Greenburg: And since I don't have an ALS, I don't have to fill one in so I don't care.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, neither does Dave of course, so, which actually, if I might, brings me to another matter that I'd like to bring out.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: No, no Dave happens to be a member of an ALS though, I don't.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's true, he does.

Dave Kissondoyal: No, no, I'm not.

Alan Greenburg: I'm in At-Large. No?

Dave Kissondoyal: Yeah, no, I'm not a member of any ALS.

Alan Greenburg: Oh, I thought you were.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, nope. Okay, anything more on six then? Heidi, have we dropped the ball on anything?

Heidi Ullrich: I think we've covered everything there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good. So how's this agenda for the ALAC meeting? It's already full, please don't add much more. Could you put the link into the current ALAC agenda, please?

Heidi Ullrich: Yes, but I warn you that it has not been updated.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well that's alright, we're flexible and friendly.

Heidi Ullrich: So it's still - it'll still be the agenda from last time.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, well we're made a couple of additions out of today's meeting. Anybody want to put anything vitally important forward now? We obviously have to look at the proforma stuff. Are we happy with the boiler plate?

Alan Greenburg: I think stat one can say they're happy with it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: There will need to be - there will be a couple of other action items coming out on our meeting today that will be going on there. One of which is our need to discuss the next review team numbers, structure, and cause, which we have on our agenda as an item here. But there will be a matter based on what we discuss will have to go to the ALAC meeting. So I think anything that hasn't been captured in today's meeting will just go be a moment of brilliance under any other business when we get back to the meeting on the 25th.

Alan Greenburg: Under minor bookkeeping, can we make sure that the URL for the agenda is on the calendar?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, yes, please. That makes such a difference if it's on the calendar.

Alan Greenburg: One can actually find it then.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, yep.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well that was painless. Update on Accountability and Transparency Review Team, the At-Large workspace on Accountability and Transparency Review Team I alluded to earlier in our conversation. I think it's incredibly useful and very important that we encourage anyone on any list, and in fact, ask anyone would we be in a position to proxy their information into that repository, because I can assure you there are powerful parts of the Accountability and Transparency Review Team who want to see real examples put forward by community as sort of little benchmarking issues, so that we can take those and look at how much of them are historical concerns.

How much of them are actual real issues? And, in fact, how much of them and in fact the names at the matter that ICANN, the organization, thinks it's dealing with, but are doing such a piss-poor performance in letting the community know that they're dealing with it, that the community doesn't know that there's a mechanism that they should be more comfortable with.

So there's a couple of things that the ATRT is doing. We're putting out for public comment a bunch of questions. Sorry I have a dog loose and I need to get it back under control. The questions, because the drafting team on those questions, come from predominantly European Union and more traditional government and organization-type structures, that they need to have very general questions where duly considered lengthy written and verbose responses can come in, so that will be happening.

But we'll also be putting together, as was encourage in the Survey SRN Skype chat, a set of more survey-like questions where we can measure things such as general feelings of people. So, how much did you agree or disagree with the following sentence on a scale of one to five, type stuff? That will be happening and we want to use the big, sorry guys. Okay just one dog trying to steal another dog's piece of goat; all's better now. I don't really care if that's redacted from the transcript or recording or not.

Alan Greenburg: We should all be grateful you don't talk to us like that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, how little do you know about the nature of the beast you deal with.

Alan Greenburg: To our faces, anyway.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. All my beasts are under control. And one of the boys has got his goat leg back so he's very happy. You don't want - one is an intact male and one is his son, but his son is actually body-weight bigger and the last thing you want is two 48-50 kilo dogs arguing over something.

Alan Greenburg: I've got to go away for a minute.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, so with the ATRT we're going to have a number of layers of interchange opportunities. We're also going to have formal face-to-face opportunities for people to bring forward issues, points of concern, and that is for us to look at an analyze at obviously the Brussels meeting, but in a number of other for as well. And I just think that what is actually a very clever little thing, this sort of common design where anyone can log onto the Wiki and say, "Look, what the hell's happening here?" Or, "I'm concerned about this, that, or the other," is a very good way to start accumulating things that we can measure and hopefully measure improvement on between now and the next Review Team activity.

The review of the meeting on the 5th and 6th of May, I go down on bended knee and humbly apologize for our inability to get the full features of the Adobe room accepted as being important and useful. That has changed. The experience on the days of 5th and 6th of May mean that from even halfway through the 5th of May we were contemplating having the full features, the shared documentation, shared presentations on screen, and chat space that an Adobe room can offer to come online.

It was the decision, which I supported, of the Chairman that we did not do that for the rest of the 5th or the 6th of May, simply because we had not had the opportunity to flag to the community that we would be making that change. That change however will be standard for all our other meetings from now on and into the future between now and December. We also need to apologize for not having the at least brief notes and reports up as soon as they needed to be. We had hoped to have them up within 24 hours. That didn't happen, but you'll notice the recordings and minutes are up now.

There will be, however, a set of minutes that are the notes from what was the in camera discussion with staff. We have currently looked at those and have moved those or will be removing those from the discussion list, the email discussion list, which is about to go public. It's a landmark decision where the Accountability and Transparency Review Team actually manages to agree that their mailing list should be transparent.

Alan Greenburg: I'm back.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And so, it is going public. But because we had agreed that certain things would be in camera we will keep them in camera. But what will be published, in keeping with what we believe is best practice, is the summary and reasonings for any decisions made out of anything that happens in camera. So we will give a sanitized view of what was discussed and not the gory details that are in the minutes to the public record. So I'm open to any questions now on ATRT.

Alan Greenburg: A purely mechanical question, do you want people to edit this table or put comments at the bottom and staff will move them up?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I have no idea how the mechanics work. Whatever works is fine. I noticed there's comments in there, Heidi, how is that working?

Heidi Ullrich: We can move them up. Let me just take a look. Are there significant - you said there are only a few at the moment.

Alan Greenburg: Well right now there's two from Evan

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: There's only a few at the moment but I want to see hundreds of them up there. I want them groaning under the weight.

Alan Greenburg: ALAC members can edit themselves, other people cannot. So I think you're saying either way is fine, just don't change someone else's comments.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That would be poor form.

Heidi Ulrich: I also see.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: I could make them better.

Heidi Ullrich: I also see that Ciaran commented.

Alan Greenburg: Ciaran commented?

Heidi Ullrich: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep, Ciaran did, and I expect more from Sharon and -

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Are we looking at the same place I am?

Heidi Ullrich: I'll put into the Adobe Connect where I am looking, at the bottom of the page.

Alan Greenburg: Oh, sorry.

Heidi Ulrich: And what we can do is we can have staff-

Alan Greenburg: It's okay; he did it since I last refreshed the page.

Heidi Ulrich: Oh, wow.

Alan Greenburg: It was like three minutes ago.

Heidi Ulrich: All right, that's good.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And Alan, I mean, you've seen some stuff come out of the vertical integration lists that I believe should be copied onto this.

Alan Greenburg: Remind me.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well the discussion on the Board's understanding on?

Alan Greenburg: Oh yeah! Got it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You know, to me that just - you say to the list, "I can't." But you say to the list, "This really belongs in this repository." You know, do you want to paste it in there or shall I do it on your behalf?

Alan Greenburg: Well I think I may post the timeframe of Kurt saying, "We're not going to tell you anything." While it's clear he already has staff working on doing it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep, I think that's worthwhile.

Alan Greenburg: Okay, I'll try to remember.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I would be encouraging, you know, anyone who - because one of the other issues is we're trying to work out - a lot of what we say and bitch about, this is me wearing a community member hat right now, a lot of what we say apparently does get heard and some of it even gets actions and responded to. What we clearly discovered in our meeting on the 5th of May was, however, there's a missing piece to some of the communications loop and that is, the community doesn't get to hear about that.

So it's really important, even if you've got knowledge of this - the optics on this says one thing but the actuality is that ICANN is doing a better, a more accountable job, it's often a transparency issue than it is accountability issue that we're going to be looking at. And -

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: We -

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, for example, when we all sat there going, "Well, gee, it would have been nice to know about that," when we were told that one of the Denise Michelle's current tasks is going through absolutely every single Board resolution and finding out what actually happened in terms of follow-up. You, know -

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Is that a -

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Really good, interesting, accountable piece of work but-

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Is she doing that in a place where we can read it publically?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, no, not now, but we intend to strongly propose it should be in the future.

Alan Greenburg: Well did you note that Rod was so proud that he had gotten staff to do a summary of the dashboard which staff and the Board see? This talking to the Accountability and Transparency Review group…

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, you know, the other thing is we do have language issues. For example, some people refer to dashboard information, meaning the publically available dashboard on the front of the ICANN site, and others mean information passed on to various component parts, in some cases the Board of ICANN. And a little bit of uniformity, and at least understanding, would go an awfully long way, as well.

Alan Greenburg: To ask Sebastian's question out loud, the third part of the title seems to have been lost. Has it been lost to the team itself? That is the -

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry, I'm still away from my computer. Go ahead, Sebastian.

Alan Greenburg: Sorry, the original title in the accountability - in the affirmation was ensure accountability, transparency and the interest of global internet users. In the interests of shorthand, accountability and transparency are the words being used. Has the last phrase been forgotten completely?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Definitely not.

Alan Greenburg: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And that point wasn't just made by me, it was also made by the Department of Commerce representative, specifically when there was some discussion and intent of narrowing our focus on a couple of points, the DOC, Larry Strickland reminded everyone at the table that that was not the intention.

Alan Greenburg: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sebastian, you do have the microphone; sorry, that was covered by something else in my screen.

Sebastian Bachollet: That's okay, don't worry. First point I just see that it's published today, the mp3 but it's strange, we don't know which day belonging to which day. And we have to guess. And the problem of using Adobe chatroom, it's good but you need to have another way to allow people to listen because I was outside of my home and I was using my iPhone and I wanted to join with the Adobe chatroom and I can't because Adobe needs software not allowed by iPhone.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Flash.

Sebastian Bachollet: Flash, yes. And if we can have posts either be to listen and another way to listen, it would be great.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Sebastian, if you can't use the blessed software, you can't listen.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Say again.

Alan Greenburg: It was a joke. If you cannot use the blessed software, you're not allowed to listen, it's that simple.

Sebastian Bachollet: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, well the reason that we post the mp3 transcripts is to allow for limitations by use of particular proprietary software tools. I can ask if there is an alternate form of audio publication that we could -

((Crosstalk))

Sebastian Bachollet: So if that's a question of mp3 it's okay. My point about mp3 was that we don't know which recording belongs to what date.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I understand and I need to ask Alice to change that. But there's also the matter of having proprietal choices that may or may not be available on everyone's internet connection choices of end-user tool, and mobiles, I can't do the same with my Microsoft Mobile Word operating system on my phone either, so it's not just iPhones. So we do have to look at whether or not I can get them to look towards some form of real time alternative, I don't know. But the mp3s are there, hopefully next time better labeled, so that if you're not listening live you can in fact at least have access to the information and the shared space.

The other thing is one of the reasons that I was keen and it was important to open a Skype chat channel is, at least that is available on a number of mobile handsets and whilst you may not be getting audio, you can at least get punctuated information from the discussion put into that space from people who are able to connect to the Adobe. And I guess the final thing would be you'll notice that by the end of the meeting on the 5th and 6th of May, the ATRT had got a Twitter feed and we will be using #ATRT as a #tag for Twitter feeds from now on and, iffy as it may seem, we actually have a Twitter bot and 10 bot in a Google Wave.

So anyone who is going to engage using social networking tools with the ATRT will be getting sanctioned responses, which we also then hold an archive and record of. So if issues are raised, people don't have to re-raise them in another forum. If they raised it in Twitter, we will be aware of them because they will go into one of our Google Wave chats, so we can't lose any information.

Alan Greenburg: Cheryl, I'm going to have to leave in about 15 minutes or so.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep, let's move on. What's next chab off the rack?

Sebastian Bachollet: Yeah, move on but well done, Cheryl, really, great job.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, no problem. Okay, so that gives us the matters for the upcoming additional review teams. We have both of these starting on the 1st of October, 2010, the one on security, stability and resilience of the DNS and the who is policy. And later on there will be the promoting competition, consumer trust and consumer choice. If I can draw your attention to masages from Janus which both Sebastian and Alan should be aware of because they've gone to the ACSO list.

We've been asked to have a look at a couple of matters, one of which is the mechanism by which we will be putting in pre-endorsements by ACSOs of people, who are then put forward to the selectors, and that's aiming to be June now. And the other matter is the actual size of the teams for these other AOCs. Now we put a lot of words together in our response to the first publication of the method.

We also forged an ad hoc system together before and during Nairobi, which did our very best to try and meet the catch-up needs because of the poor way that the ATRT call for SOIs was made out of sync. Do we want to put onto the ALAC meeting agenda a formalization, and therefore perhaps the creation of an ad hoc work team, for a firm and definitive mechanism for future AC endorsement of members to be put forward for selection for future AOC mandated reviews?

Alan Greenburg: Cheryl, what is the current date they're asking us for the endorsed names by?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: They'd like it basically after Brussels.

Alan Greenburg: Okay. I would suggest - that is not very far away.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Nope.

Alan Greenburg: I would suggest that we not try to craft a set of rules that will work for eternity, but come up with a process for the two selections that we need for the October reviews. The other one is at least two years away, where we will probably - were we would have the A and T one back by then. So I would suggest we set our targets reasonably so we're not trying to build something bulletproof. And yes -

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, so if we -

Alan Greenburg: And yes, I think we do have to put together that process which will deliver something pretty quick, because if we're going to have endorsed names sometime soon after Brussels, we have to put out a call for them soon.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, indeed we do. GNSO has indicated that they will have an internal procedure, which will be adopted in June, and so I misspoke when I said June. The last message from Janas, which is linked to our meeting agenda today, indicates that we should opt to launch recruitment by the end of July, which would include endorsement of volunteers…

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: That's reasonable.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: …by respective AC and SOs. And I think it is -

Alan Greenburg: But I strongly support Chris DeSpain's last message saying if we knew how many people each group was putting on it…

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Honestly.

Alan Greenburg: …it would make our process infinitely better.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, and I would also like to….

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: He didn't say it quite like that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But along those lines. I'd also like to suggest that we raise now, at this point in time, particularly on matters as important to our community as "Who is", why the model of number per AC or SO currently set needs to be continued. Because I would argue that one, the representative from the At-Large Advisory Committee is probably not sufficient.

Alan Greenburg: Well, the model that was proposed in the original document had different numbers for different committees. None of them may have met our targets, but they were different. There was no conception that they all had to be the same. And both Chris has made that point…

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We need to 19.

Alan Greenburg: …and I think we need to make that point…

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, we need to know that, yes.

Alan Greenburg: …that different ones will have different, you know, from his point of view, "Who is" is mainly a GTLD issue so he's not as concerned, but security and stability is. You know, "Who is", may be a bigger issue for us. So yes…

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Alan Greenburg: …they should not necessarily be the same, but knowledge ahead of time will make our process easier.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, can I ask you then, Dave and Sebastian, do you believe this is something that needs to be owned as an Executive Committee function with anyone else from ALAC and At-Large assisting us in crafting this mechanism this time around? And to that extent, I would look towards those who were involved in the Nairobi exercise.

Alan Greenburg: I would say either - sorry, you were asking Dave and Sebastian.

Dave Kissondoyal: Yeah, I would support your - this argument, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Dave Kissondoyal: We have the Executive Committee, but by people who were working before.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Terrific. Sebastian, what's your view on that?

Sebastian Bachollet: I tick my green button; I agree.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alright then. Sorry, Alan, back to you -

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Yeah, I - my only -

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just asking those who don't seem to be very vociferous.

Alan Greenburg: My only modification would be, that say Ex Comm or a subset.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure, okay.

Alan Greenburg: It needs some Ex Comm involvement.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: All right.

Alan Greenburg: If everyone wants to be involved, dandy, but it needs some involvement because -

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah and can I say, I think it's important that we make sure it's open to not just the ALAC but regional leaders as well.

Alan Greenburg: As per usual.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep, but sometimes it needs to be spoon-fed. Alright, so that now is an addition to our full discussion list on the ALAC meeting on the 25th, which brings us to the thrill-packed and exciting word of on the update on the ALS survey. We've extended to Sunday. How recently updated was the list with missing ALS representatives, Heidi?

Heidi Ullrich: I believe this morning, and you'll see on the agenda there is an Excel sheet that has the names of those that have not yet voted. And in addition there will be personal reminders going out today with the new date of the 23rd going out to by Big Polls.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. You needn't send me mine because, of course, I knew that we were going to extend it.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, well if you receive it, disregard it because I think it's going to be just an automatic from -

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's fine; I'm happy to receive it, but please note, what was is, 24 hours ago when Matthias was asking me about this I said, "Well, I hadn't planned on doing mine until, you know, literally the last minute of the deadline because I've been too damn busy." And I may not be the only one who goes that path.

Alan Greenburg: Heidi, you said the spreadsheet says who answered it and who didn't.

Heidi Ullrich: Who did not and -

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: I see a spreadsheet with 93 entries on it. That's the list of those who didn't respond?

Heidi Ullrich: Yes, I believe so. So, again, I have so many -

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: How many ALSs do we have?

Heidi Ullrich: 123.

Alan Greenburg: So you're telling me that 25 responded.

Heidi Ullrich: Yes, so far. That's why we're doing everything we can…

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Okay.

Heidi Ulrich: …to find everyone.

Alan Greenburg: Sorry, I had the impression from the talk before that half of them had responded or something.

Heidi Ullrich: No. But again, I'm hoping that everyone is waiting until the last minute as well. So we've sent out reminders to the regional representatives to send comments or send reminders, giving them not only email addresses but phone numbers, as well as Big Polls will be sending out personal reminders to everyone again today.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, let me give you –

Sebastian Bachollet: I just - I just -

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The facts as I understand them, Alan, was that we had 31 ALSs responding, which was - this was as 5:35pm, 24 hours ago, my local time, so a bit more than 24 hours ago I should say. We had 31 ALSs, which is a little more than 25%. We had some regions doing worse than others. AFRALO had 20 out of 22 missing, North America had 16 out of 22 missing, and at that point - and of course APRALO Secretariat isn't even available at the moment to send out reminders because they are on leave. And it was at that point, that the proposal to extend to Sunday the 23rd of May sounded like a damn good idea.

Alan Greenburg: I support. Let's go on.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Sebastian Bachollet: I just took the time between the two meetings to answer the survey and I think we - staff need to be in support of the ALSs to answer because it's not obvious how to answer, how to use a tool, and language is sometimes quite tricky. And I will not extend now because meeting is very late. But if someone from staff wants to talk with me about that, I will be happy to exchange my experience of the last 20 minutes prior to this meeting. Thank you.

Alan Greenburg: Well, and Sebastian, I thought I had been asked by Heidi to test the survey before it went public. It turned out they had already gone public. But I also gave a half dozen suggestions of changes that I thought were things that were not clear at all, so. And I think I speak English as my native language.

Sebastian Bachollet: Yes, well it was in French for me, but part was in English; that's the problem of 01, not able to translate everything. But there are some way of doing things, not very easy to understand.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, if I may, I did want to read this in under any other business and it's relevant now. As we run towards the end of this survey, I would like to have some of the questions answered. In other words sent to the non-com appointees on the ALAC, I'd like it sent to them and to ask them to respond where appropriate, for example, on the matters of their policy development and communication tool preferences. I think we're missing part of our market, at least within the ALAC, if we don't address some of these questions to our - to one third of our make-up. In other words, Alan and Dave, I think you should go out and -

Alan Greenburg: Understood.

((Crosstalk))

Heidi Ullrich: Yeah, I'll make an action out of it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, thank you, excellent.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Could I ask -

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Update on the Webinar!

Alan Greenburg: Could ask to jump to thirteen?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We can jump to thirteen, yes. Go ahead.

Alan Greenburg: I thought we had decided on a previous call that when we're making statements on comments and things that is not really directed at the Board, that it not be sent to the Board. I think by inundating the Board with a copy of every comment we make, which is not required for them to either understand, necessarily, or take action, we're diluting the ability to say things to them when we need to say things to them.

And I think if we're commenting on a public comment period, where they're not taking immediate action, I think it's quite reasonable for us to just do the public comment and perhaps copy staff and ALAC and At-Large, if we want. And that we should limit things that are sent to the attention of the Board to things that we really feel they need to read, because it's important; it's relevant to decisions they're making, or absolutely crucial to the fact that they know we're taking a position. And I thought we had general agreement on that, but I was surprised yesterday, or today, so I'm raising it again.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The listing of who gets sent what, how does that vary in the operational procedures, Heidi? Is there a - I know it's different groups of copies, too, for different types of things.

Heidi Ullrich: What I can do is send that around. I'll look into the operating principals and send that around on the Ex Comm list.

Alan Greenburg: Good, I mean, I just think, today's example, our comments on the CCT report, or something like that, or even the priority one- if GNSO comes back in the priority and says "You're not going to have a vote- not sure you're going to have a vote - you're not going to participate in the prioritizations", that, we raise to the Board because that's counter to a by-law, and counter to the Board direction. But simply putting the comment in, saying we agree, I don't see why the Board needs to see that, and I think we hurt our ability to speak to the Board when we comment - we copy them on everything we say.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, and one other thing which is not unrelated to this, Alan and Heidi, and I'm sure you were as crestfallen as I was in the RAA Group A meeting recently, where I wanted to make really clear to the non-ALAC people on that workgroup that there is a difference between what is an ALAC statement and what is a piece of advice and what is a comment and what is a voting, endorsed - ALAC endorsed public comment and what might be a reaction to a piece of text by part of what could be considered ALAC, or At-Large. And I was a little disconcerted; when I know we have language that goes on the front of certain things and businesses to do with how we should put in a preamble to the interim report for the RAA Group, Workgroups A and B to the GNSO.

We do have different language for putting on the front cover of something that is a piece of advice to the Board than we do for a formal ALAC statement. And we probably need to do the same for what is a voted-on piece of public commentary by the ALAC. So there's probably a need for us to do a little re-jigging of these standard operational procedures. And as Alan said, this is an ideal time to do that, and the distribution list for each of those different categories is very important.

Why I was saddened is the Chair - the Co-Chair of the workgroup and a duly authorized and elected member of the ALAC found all that information really, really interesting because they had no idea what the difference was between an ALAC statement, a public comment by the ALAC, and advice to the Board. So we actually have to do a bit of in-reach. And we need to do some in-servicing of our own fifteen members, because I found that absolutely embarrassing.

Alan Greenburg: Well, but in all fairness to him, the statement that I reacted to in my e-mail said that this statement was a statement to the Board.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That happened prior to my concerns -

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Today or yesterday I'm talking about, yep. No, no, I understand, you're talking prior, but I'm saying it's not only some ALAC members.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

Alan Greenburg: It's also a staff conception that is blurred.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, we need those SOPs sorted out.

Alan Greenburg: Yep, and -

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I guess that's work for us to do between Brussels and Cartagena.

Alan Greenburg: And we may well do things differently. I mean if I look at the five votes, the reconsideration one, maybe we should copy that one to the Board, you know?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So there might be decision notes and we just need SOPs to operate those properly.

Alan Greenburg: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good, okay.

Alan Greenburg: But I think we want to minimize the noise, so that when we say something it's acted on.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I understand, and we all have agreed to that in the past.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Yep.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But it's really important, when you've got overworked and under-resourced people doing things, that they have a little flip tag system that, you know, if Heidi's hit by a bus, anyone else who becomes Heidi just picks it up and runs with it.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: She's not allowed to be hit by a bus.

Heidi Ullrich: Thank you, Alan.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just while you've got your hand up, there, I'm not trying to jinx you, okay Heidi?

Alan Greenburg: I've got to run, because I've got to be at another meeting shortly. Thank you all for a good meeting.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, well we've just got webinar, and Vanda's not with us, so she'll do item twelve online, and I don't think there's any other business. Thank you, Alan.

Alan Greenburg: Okay, take care.

Heidi Ullrich: Thank you, Alan.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead, Heidi.

Heidi Ullrich: Ok, just as we bring this meeting to a close, just a quick addition to this action item, for a review of the various ALAC statements. Perhaps as a part of the ALAC improvement, as well as the accountability and transparency review team efforts for At-Large, we could do this by developing diagrams of the policy development process.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, yes, and yes again. I think that's and excellent idea, Heidi. I think diagram is really important, but if we can have a little box that drills out and says this means this, and goes to these places. This means that, and goes to these places. Because what we don't want is going back - people bring baggage with them, and we still have, for example, GNSO counselor - and ex-GNSO counselor who currently sits on the ICANN Board and has been returned to the ICANN Board for another term.

And one of his points to me in the past was, in PDP processes in the unimproved GNSO, he always, as a counselor at that stage, never knew whether it was a single voice or opinion being brought forward into the process, or what weight of voice or opinion was being brought into the processes. And we've gone a long way to making sure that that should be a non-issue. We now need to advertise and make clear to everybody what those mechanisms are.

And I'm of the opinion that belongs on the front page of our ICANN Wiki in reading to Confluence. We need to have these really important principles right up there in people's faces as soon as they click into our space.

((Crosstalk))

Heidi Ullrich: So I've call them flow ∤

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The difference between At-Large capitalized and at-large not capitalized; how we do deal with the public good and all that sort of stuff.

Heidi Ulrich: I called them flow charts.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep. Perfect, good, good, good. Okay, as we rapidly go towards the close, it looks to me like we have an update on At-Large Webinar and that will be it. Heidi, back to you.

Heidi Ullrich: Yes. Just very quickly, given all of the work that we need to do between now and Brussels on the At ~~Large improvement with the At -Large director selection~~ given all of that work, plus given that there is going to be a Webinar - a policy development Webinar in the next week or so that is very much at the beginner level, as well as, the requirement of including the At-Large community, or at least the key, interested people in developing the At-Large Webinar, it's been decided, or requesting to be decided- to postpone the At-Large Webinar until post-Brussels.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think Dave, in particular, that's very important so it allows for more African input into that, because what the Webinar can do is go a long way towards meeting some of your outreach, as well as in-reach, needs.

Dave Kissondoyal: Yeah but, Heidi is telling us that she's like overstressed before the meeting.

Heidi Ullrich: That too. Yes, I mean, that is part of the work. The issue of just being overwhelmed with work and limited staff at the moment, that's one of the deciding factors. But also it is because there is going to be this policy Webinar, that is very similar to what was being planned for the At-Large community, taking place in the next week or so. So I think that it would be useful to have the At-Large community postpone theirs until after Brussels.

Dave Kissondoyal: I just -

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And what I'm saying, Dave, is that that should help allow to have greater input from Af-regions on our own Webinar.

Dave Kissondoyal: I think, Cheryl, perhaps, in the future, we could like ask for additional staff, because, again we can see that okay, Heidi, she is doing a lot, and then she's alone. So perhaps we can...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just to be clear, Dave, we can ask until the cows come home, it'll make no iota of difference, when there is a budget and hiring freeze in core - which is being imposed ICANN-wide. We are already one staff-person down. Nick left, Heidi moved up, Matthias moved up, and no one has replaced Matthias. So it's not even a matter of asking. It's a matter of we even need to get back to our basic level of staff, let alone get additional staff. It's an appalling and unacceptable situation.

Dave Kissondoyal: Yeah, perhaps within the meeting that you're going to have with Kevin Wilson you can address this issue.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Kevin should know that those things are going to come out of our mouths and yes, we will do. But it's also in the FY '10 financial year, a much more difficult task.

Dave Kissondoyal: But I personally, I do appreciate all the amount of work that Heidi's doing for us.

Heidi Ullrich: Thank you, Dave, again it is the entire - I mean it is Matthias, it's Gisella, we have Seth now working on the At-Large improvement, but, again, I mean as Cheryl said, we are clearly still one person short. And that's just to get back to the level of where we were before Nick moved up, etc.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Something has to change.

((Crosstalk))

Dave Kissondoyal: In that case, we can have the Webinar after the Brussels meeting.

Heidi Ullrich: Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, I think that's a good plan, Heidi; that's great. With the Webinar, though, Sebastian, you'd like to speak to that matter, go ahead.

Sebastian Bachollet: Not to that matter, to any other business. I just want to be sure that I don't need to do something about the Brussels meeting, because I have no my schedule yet for the train because of a disagreement with a travel group. And I guess we are still waiting for when the meeting of the vertical integration working group will take place to allow discussion with this travel group to decide when I will be allowed to travel. Or do I need to do something else?

Heidi Ullrich: Cheryl, may I?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Please, go ahead.

Heidi Ullrich: Yes, Sebastian, we are in constant communication with Constituency Travel as well as Margie, and your - we will contact you as soon as we know the results of that working group meeting on Saturday.

Dave Kissondoyal: Okay because my -

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can I ask a question first Sebastian, to you? If the working group, if ZI meets on Saturday afternoon, what - I don't know what the schedule of your travel might be. Does that mean you need to arrive on Saturday morning or Friday?

Sebastian Bachollet: I can't - it's just one and a half hour train for me; it's three hours to be door-to-door and it's not a big deal. It's more a question of principle. We are asking to work a lot, a lot, a lot, and we take time and discussion of that. My suggestion, Heidi, to allow the decision taken by the travel group, it's to decide that, if at the end they don't want to pay, I will pay.

And they'd make the reservation on my train, they'd book my hotel, if they decide to pay for me, it will be great; if not, it will be my pocket. Because if we wait too long here, we get trouble with the train and something like that, and I want to avoid that.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, I'm very much hoping that we'll have an answer to this doodle today, and I do believe that your hotel, just in case, for Friday evening has been reserved.

Sebastian Bachollet: Okay, then maybe whether - as I see that the working group on transparencies will meet on Friday, I may decide to travel on Friday morning to allow me possibly to assist with one part of this meeting.

Heidi Ullrich: Sorry, Sebastian, which meeting was that?

Sebastian Bachollet: The Cheryl one, the…

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ATRT.

Sebastian Bachollet: …ATRT. But there is nothing link with the rest. And I will send back asking for earlier train on Friday and then we will be set up. And if ICANN won't allow me to be pay, I will be pay; if not I will pay myself, don't worry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sebastian, there are important points and principles to be raised because, I must say, it has certainly fairly firmly stuck in my craw, and due to recent events has been regurgitated back up into my craw, that I put probably close to $1,200 or $1,300 of my personal dollars into preparing the At-Large summit in Mexico because I had to cover all of my expenses with no per diem and all of my accommodations up until the Friday when ISOC picked up the Friday.

And we of course then worked on the Saturday and Sunday. And as we ask more of community, and particularly when we have matters when there seem to be sufficient importance to have a joint ALAC and GNSO workgroup. And workgroups of a joint nature, I think are, are likely to be of time-critical and very important pieces of work, that it has become more common for important pieces at workgroup activity in the GNSO and joint GNSO/ALAC world happened on the Saturday, that we need to consider how we mark up our travel arrival and date for those sponsored travelers for future meetings.

So I think that is something we need to discuss; it comes into At-Large improvements and it certainly needs to be part of our discussion with Kevin and indeed whoever takes over the role that Doug used to usefully play, in terms of Chief Operations Officer.

Sebastian Bachollet: Yeah, I agree, totally.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, any other, any other business? Sebastian, you did have more any other business?

Sebastian Bachollet: No, that's okay. I am done and thank you for this very -

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I thought you said yes, when I said any other, any other business?

Sebastian Bachollet: That's okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, Dave, anything from you?

Dave Kissondoyal: No, no, I'm good. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well thank you, very much, for your indulgence. We did have a fairly large agenda, and hopefully that means we have a shorter, more efficient agenda at our ALAC meeting. But thank you very much for convening and reconvening, and we'll look forward to perhaps doing a little bit of an edit when we post up, some of the AI's.