Transcription of ALAC and Regional Leadership Working Session 21 June 2009 – Sydney – Part 1

Cheryl: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I'm giving you a two-minute moment, and then we will be beginning. We will be running just shortly after ten past nine, for everybody.

Assuming you are all now plugged -- powered to the bizarre and peculiar Australian electricity system that you're struggling with, and that the screens are readable. I must say -- to me, it's a blur. That's fine. Thank you very much.

As we get ourselves settled, I'm [running now]. Dear me. A whole 65 seconds over my established set times. I'm already behind schedule.

Terrible tragedy. Almost as large a tragedy as when this morning I discovered I hadn't put in matching shoes for this outfit. I've got to tell you, I had to din through the black accessories to tie the black shoes in, because it's just a terrible mess. Awful. [Accessorizing is] a huge, huge problem for me.

However, there is a little bit of housekeeping to start with. So now, as we click to 13 minutes past the hour, we will start our session formally.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. For those of you who may not know me, my name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I'm the chair of the At-Large Advisory Committee.

There are a couple of housekeeping measures, while we have our ALAC and regional meetings sessions here, today. First is the all-important, "How we get to talk to each other in our multiple languages." The interpretative staff are… I feel that we've put them out the back somewhere.

Behind that post there is a bank of interpreters. Thank you so much for being… A wave! Good. Some people can see them. Excellent.

If you're going to be using English, use Channel 1. French is on Channel 2 and Spanish is on Channel 3.

As you can imagine, if you are getting excited about a topic and you're speaking faster and faster, it won't make it very easy for the interpreters to follow you. So please speak clearly -- speak slowly -- and, with the exception of me, because everyone will know my dulceted tones, please say who you are when you begin to speak.

If indeed I am recognizing you to be the next speaker, I will say, "Thank you Rudy," and they will pick up Rudy's name from my welcoming him to speak next. But if you've just waved your hand and I've pointed at you, please identify yourselves first.

Another piece of very important housekeeping… perhaps almost as essential for you to know about as the color of my shoes today… For those alumni, ICANN regional managers,

the selection committee members and various other people that are interested… and that's all of us -- to do with the fellowship in ICANN…

The Sydney Fellows have invited us to have a little spare time... You know all the spare time we have of this week… to share a traditional cocktail reception. They're telling me here that it's good food, beer, wine and a great way to start the week.

I'll help you with the logistics of getting here.

It's running this evening -- and you're all invited -- from 6 PM to 8 PM. It's in the Chairman's Suite at the top floor of the Swiss Hotel. The Swiss Hotel is only up one and turn left. It's just a half-block away. It's an easy walk, and you're all more than welcome.

When you go to the Swiss Hotel, you'll see this tiny little couple of glass doors and a concierge. You'll think, "This is a hotel?" Do not worry. There's a magnificent venue. It just has almost nothing on the street.

So you go in past what looks basically like a glorified luggage room, and you turn right. You go to the left, up to the top floor, and it has one of the very, very beautiful views of Sydney. You'll be treated to an absolutely magnificent evening.

For those of you who are members of Internet Society Chapters, Internet Society is having its first of two meetings at the same time. Unfortunately, those of us who are involved in ISOC chapters won't be able to go to the Swiss Hotel for Fellows. But I'm hoping that we'll have a good 50% of our team over there, supporting the Fellows.

Vanda, you'll be attending that event?

Vanda: Yes. I need to attend. I need to attend the Fellowship, because I'm a member. Yes.

Cheryl: All right. Excellent. Thank you very much.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm sorry about the weather. I'm sorry about my shoes and I'm sorry about the weather.

However, it is important that those of you who've traveled the horrendously long hours to get here -- just the sort of travel I usually do to get to meet with you… that you realize we did not bid. [EADA] and all the Registry International did not bid to run an ICANN meeting.

The ICANN meeting here in Sydney was decided on by logistical reasons by the ICANN staff in Sydney, and with the board's support. There's no way that we would've chosen the middle of our winter to have you at what is normally a brilliant sunny, blue, wonderful part of the country. I don't know how the [life]. You'll still enjoy it, but it'll be in drizzle.

It is, in fact, the shortest day of the year today, so you're here in the winter solstice. Any one with a Yule bent -- I suppose you can understand why it'll be dark by about 4.30 local time. The days get longer from now on.

You're here in Sydney, and I'm sure you all know a lot about Sydney. But I'm about to do something that is close to my heart. It's the reason I'm wearing these colors today, and it's something that many Australians take very, very seriously.

I'm recognizing the traditional owners of the space and land that we are meeting on today. The land we meet on here today belongs to the Cadigal people. The Cadigal people were a mob -- a tribe -- a clan -- that belonged to the larger group around Sydney Harbour called the Eora. The Eora had 29 separate aboriginal clans. The land we're on here today was from the Cadigal group.

Eora borders, in fact, with the much larger land -- until you get to the mountains -- called [Deroog]. It is a shared language of the aboriginal people in this area. Interestingly enough, if you look at what the word, "Eora," means in [Deroog], it means, "I'm from here." [laughter]

So, who are you? Where are you? I'm from here. "Eora."

So we're actually on shore with Eora. We're a separate people. Or whether it was just typical interpretation and misinterpretation of the languages at the time. However…

With respect and with great honor to the traditional owners of the country, I would like to thank them. You'll be seeing a traditional welcome to country at the official opening ceremony. But it is something that we look on rather dimly, if we do not take the time to honor the original and traditional landowners.

The people in the Eora group and -- in fact -- out through the [Deroog] were decimated after the White Invasion. Smallpox meant -- just smallpox and disease meant -- that numbers went down to 3s, 4s and 5s. In some regions, all of the population was lost within the first few years of the invasion. So it's something that we're rather sad about, but we do thank our traditional owners and recognize them here today.

Now we have… Whom do we have online? We have Darwin. Good morning.

[inaudible]

Where's Sylvia? [I'll pass this to Sylvia]. Oh, yes -- Hello, Sylvia. [laughter] Excellent. Very, very good. Okay.

I'm working off the English agenda and gaining back a small amount of time. If you're not wishing to do anything more in terms of looking at our agenda and adding anything to it… Let's start from the top.

We're going to begin with RAA amendments, followed by the all-important mid-morning break. The Post-Summit Review and Reporting of At-Large Working Group Activities.

As you know, several of the summit working groups were working in areas that are directly related not only to new gTLDs, but to the improving of institutional confidence. And of course, looking at ICANN in a post-JPA environment, which is something this meeting is going to be focusing on.

We have the midday break and then a discussion with Kieren McCarthy. So if you can,

please come back promptly for a 2.00 in the afternoon start -- while we have Kieren talking about public participation.

One of the things I was rather hoping some of you might be doing while you're with your laptops is popping information into the ICANN Tweet, the Twitters and the Twibes that Kieren has set up for us. I believe they are in English, French and Spanish.

At the moment, if you just send something to the @ICANN, you'll find a number of the mainstream meetings. I've asked if we can have those displayed. So it'll be another way for us to interact both with those in remote participation and those here.

Agreed Principles and Mechanisms for the At-Large Participation in Public Consultations… That's a document that -- if you haven't read before -- you'd be strongly encouraged to read before we start it at 3.00. Followed by a much-needed mid-afternoon break.

Then when we get into the currently open and common public consultations, what we've done in previous one-day workshops is broken into separate groups.

Sébastien proposed that on these very important topics, we might work as a group as a whole. Do you all agree that for the current public participation we will not do breakout sessions, but work as a group? A full group? Have your support with that? Okay. So that's the way we will do that. Thank you all very much.

Obviously, there's this minor thing called, "Community Travel." Some of us might want to have something to say about that and establish what we're going to be bringing forward to the public forums, here.

Ending up the day, if she's doing her best to see from this end to the other end… New gTLDs -- including IDNs -- and where we have other open issues not covered during the Tuesday session… That really is a catch-up on other things. We go, "Whoops… We need to make a statement on that."

That's where I would like to think that a couple of you will be forming yourselves into ad-hoc work teams for this meeting. We often gather over lunch and do some policy drafting.

Alan -- you had a very particular need to bring a few people together on the key performance indicators. Would you like me to toss it to you, and you can tell what time, and where and how?

Go ahead, Alan.

Alan: I don't know where and how.

[laughter]

We're talking about the group that was asked to look at key performance indicators -- which is me, Cheryl, Carlos and Adam. I haven't seen Carlos or Adam. Are they here?

[inaudible]

Okay. Is Adam here and I don't see him? Or has he changed his look?

Cheryl:		Adam is not in the room. He is in the building.

Alan: Thank you very much. Those people, I would like to meet, but I don't know enough about the schedule to know when that is. I will try to make it at a reasonable time. I think we said perhaps over lunch today.

Cheryl:		We'll track down Adam and Carlos, and suitably embarrass them for not being here at the start of the meeting. We'll see if we can do something over lunch. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan: But before the start of the meeting, could we introduce people around the table? I don't know everybody, and I suspect some of them don't know me.

Cheryl:		Do we have a roving microphone? No?

Okay -- when we finish going around the table, I'm going to ask those sitting around the edges if they could come forward and introduce themselves as well. Bo -- starting with you -- a very quick, "Hello… My name is…"

Beau: Hello. My name is [Beau Bridler] from North America. That's me.

Sylvia:	Sylvia from [inaudible]

Cheryl:		Thank you, Sylvia.

Chong:		My name is [Chong Long David Mill] from Taiwan. "Sydney" in Chinese is translated into "Snow Pear." It is the best kind of Pear. It's crispy and sweet. Just like all the local Australians.

[laughter] [applause].

And Taiwan is also known as "Formosa." It means, "Beautiful Island." Thank you.

Alan: Hi. My name is [Alan John Way Wong]. I'm also from Taiwan. Thank you.

José: José Ovidio Salgueiro from Venezuela. I'm a LACRALO representative to ALAC.

Rick: I'm Andrés Piazza de Argentina. So [inaudible] LACRALO.

Attendee:	Professor [inaudible] LACRALO from Argentina.

Attendee:	[inaudible] Trinidad and Tobago.

Evan: Evan Leibovich -- Chair of NARALO from Toronto.

Darlene:	Darlene Thompson -- Secretary of NARALO from Canada.

Gareth:		Gareth from Canada. Representative to ALAC from NARALO.

Vanda:	Vanda from Brazil. I'm vice-chair of ALAC.

Cheryl:	I think we know Nick. That's Nick, for all those people.

Heidi: This is Mateus. He's here, and I'm Heidi. At-Large.

Vick: I am [Vick Honandon]. I am part of ALAC Asia-Pacific and part of [inaudible].

Alan: Alan Greenberg. I'm North American Nominating Committee Appointee to the ALAC and the GSO liaison.

Patrick:	Patrick Vande Walle from Europe. A member of the ALAC, elected by the European RALO.

Daisy: Daisy Griffen -- RALO Secretary.

Sébastien:	Sébastien Bachollet France Vice-President

Interpreter:	Sébastien Bachollet, France, Vice President.

Attendee:	[inaudible] Afrique.

Interpreter:	I'm representing the African region.

Attendee:	[inaudible] United Kingdom, EURALO.

Pablo:	Pablo Madrani, Secretary at AP RALO.

Attendee:	[Didi Cassoulet], [inaudible]

Attendee:	[inaudible] Secretariat, EURALO.

Cheryl:	Okay. Have we missed anyone online?

V:	We have Alejandro Pisanty and Sylvia Leite online at the moment.

Cheryl:	Good morning, Alejandro. It's lovely to have you here. And of course, welcome and thank you Sylvia for joining us.

If we can now open up the RAA amendments and related documents. Heidi will probably have to pretend to be Mateus to make that happen. [laughter]

Well… somebody's got to make the magic happen!

Because I hate dead air, even though we're not running a radio station, it does make it awkward for the transcript lady. You think it's a very short meeting. You turn off the MP3 and then realize there were another four hours you didn't listen to. That's where all the juicy bits happen.

With the people we have here, a few of you are actually on the charter working group. Can I have a raise of hands? I believe I'm seeing Beau and Evan at the table from that group. Whilst they work out the highly technical logistics, would one of you like to say the story so far from the charter working team? Beau?

Beau: I have to ask for forgiveness. I have not been up and current on that

Cheryl: Sorry. I shouldn't have deferred to you. I do apologize. I wasn't aware of that. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan: Beau has about all the details right.

[laughter]

Cheryl: Oh! It's been that busy! My! Okay!

[laughter]

You haven't missed a thing, by the sound of it, Beau.

V: Yes. I was wondering when everybody else was [inaudible]

Alan: There is currently a drafting team formed. The issue at this point is, we cannot proceed with working groups until we decide exactly what the working groups are doing. The overall task is to write what we are calling the "Charter of Rights." That is not a well-defined term, at this point. So we need to make sure that everyone understands the same thing from it.

In parallel with that, we are starting to do work on overall revisions of the RAA. They are a far wider set of potential changes. That one, of course, is not going to be just a group deciding on what should be, but it's effectively including the registrars and the negotiation process. The overall amendment to the RAA is a more complex process.

So, coming out of the charter group will be the two charters -- or what we think are going to be two charters -- for two different groups. The one I think that… Well, it's not clear who's going to be more interested in one or the other.

The charter of rights is partly essentially a list of existing rights, put into a way that can be understood by registrants. Right now, a lot of the existing rights are not well stated.

If you read your registrant agreement, it may be buried on Page 14 of small legal type. So part of it is simply to put that in a way that people can understand it.

The second part -- which we think the registrant-rights group is going to be talking about… but it hasn't been decided… Is to come up with a list of what we think the rights should be.

We don't have the ability to simply say it's happening. But that group -- we think -- will be deciding and coming up with a list of hopeful rights that we can work toward as we go forward.

It's a little bit vague. The group was supposed to have met over the last week or two in a teleconference. It has not. We are hoping most of the people will be here and we'll have the discussions in the next couple of days. Toward the end of the week -- hopefully -- Evan, Beau and I will be able to give you a more detailed idea of what's going on.

What is clear, however, is there are going to be these two activities going on -- likely, in parallel. It is very important that At-Large participate, and that our voices be heard. Not only that we demand things, but that we involve ourselves in the dicussions and try to come to closure on the things that we believe are mandatory and the things that we believe are nice.

If we're not there, then to a large extent, registrars and the other industry players will make the decisions for us. So as soon as we do come up with a call for participation in the working groups, read it carefully. If it fits the model of what you want to do and you think you can help on it, then we'd accept contributions there.

Cheryl: Thank you, Alan.

What I think is pretty important, and why this definitely has to be discussed here, with the regional leaders. But more importantly, the regional leaders need to then go back to their ALSs and RALOs.

We need to actually prep our communities. Give them a simple language-document that is understandable. To explain the RAA amendments. Obviously, it would be nice to have those in our local languages, as well.

But we really need -- once these phone calls start happening -- I would've thought -- to have our input already coming in from the community. What's going to happen otherwise is, we're going to go well beyond the tight timeframe that this is going to result in.

Is this something that we believe we should be doing regional briefings on? Or having teleconference meetings at the RALO level? Or join RALOs together for this? Go ahead please, Evan.

Evan: On the concept of the charter, there's essentially going to be something that we want to inflict ourselves really on the other constituencies. They don't want to have registrant rights. This is almost by definition something that may be in the works.

But I have a feeling that the parts that we want are going to be things that we are going to have to assert ourselves into the process of, anyway. Do I have that right?

Cheryl: Alan?

Alan: I wouldn't put it so strongly.

One of the groups… Just looking at the first part of registrant's rights -- simply stating clearly what the rights are -- so that people can understand it and know what they have a reasonable right to demand… I think there's strong support from the registrars on that.

I'm not saying 100% of the registrars, but the large registrars, whom I'd typically class as, "The good guys," most of the time, would be delighted to see something in clear language

that the rest of the constituency cannot pretend doesn't exist.

I wouldn't characterize the registrars or even the other constituencies as the "opposition." I think there's opportunity for a win-win situation, here.

Alan: Now surely there are rights that we would like to see that not everyone would prefer to give. Because it's going to cost them money.

But also, it's still contentious right now within the group whether or not this charter is going to simply enumerate existing rights, or online things that we think ought to be there that may not already exist. I think there may be more pushback on that than simply enumerating what's already there.

V: I think it is accepted that this group will create such a list. We simply have to make it clear that simply enumerating the rights we want does not make them happen. There's still a process that has to be gone through. Whether it's a policy-development process or a negotiation with registrars to make it happen.

The list that is going to be made public that all registrars will have to point to is not going to be the wish list. We're really talking about two parallel efforts.

One could say, "Why should we create a wish list that we'd then just have to toss over to the other group to try to negotiate?" The answer is, I think, "Because we're representing users. And we have a significant interest in this."

As I said when I started, this is not a clear picture, right now. Hopefully by the end of the week it will be clearer.

Cheryl: Alan, if it's so very much a work-in-progress, you'd be looking at our Thursday wrap-up agenda now, and slotting a very particular lump of time to revisit this? What's the feeling of the meeting on that?

Alan: I sure hope by that time I'll be able to or we'll be able to say what is going on, and put out a formal call for participation.

I don't know if we need a lot of time to talk about it, but we do need a small slot, there. Beau?

Beau: I just wanted to ask either Alan or Evan if they've had any more communication than I have with the NCUC. Those guys are pretty jazzed up about this whole topic, as well. In fact, they think that they're ahead of us on it.

So -- Bill Drake and those guys… At some point, there is confusion as to who was on the drafting team and who wasn't. Has it even been formally announced who is on the drafting team?

V: Yes. There is a list. I don't have it at my fingertips. But it includes the three of us. It does include -- I think -- Mary and Bill. But we need to…

I haven't seen…

Cheryl: Carlton?

V: Carlton. I haven't seen Bill, yet. I need to talk to him because the e-mail conversation we had basically said, "Maybe ALAC should take the lead on this. Not NCUC." Even though they were the lead on introducing it.

So we need to make sure we're not stepping on peoples' toes, but we need to find someone to lead the project.

Cheryl: Evan?

Evan: Yes. At least based on some of the e-mail chatter that I've seen, the NCUC has been doing some things on this. At least to try to sort out what it is we want from it. To try to figure out that balance between simply enumerating what exists, and trying no figure out something that's a wish list that ICANN has prepared to allow us to impose either through the RAA or through some other things.

Again, it's been very haphazard. It really hasn't gone beyond a couple of e-mail discussions. Really, I'm hoping we'll take it to a much further step while we're here.

Cheryl: I'm particularly concerned that we do -- as Alan said -- I think… "run in parallel" on this. Prepare for the wish list and desires while we're saying we would like to explore this. To actually be out there in the community doing the homework to establish that.

Beau -- in your past life, I would think there's already a reasonable body of work. I know there is from the ccTLD world. Certainly in Australia in a couple of places, where we have industry codes-of-practice -- which involve particular consumer protections.

But are there some documents or spaces that we could perhaps link to our wiki now for the At-Large structures and the regions to be doing homework on to establish some best-practice wishes?

Beau: I'm not aware of any lists of best practices, specifically related to the ICANN world -- except for the one that was done here in Australia. That may be one that we'd want to point to.

We certainly have other examples from consumer groups out there from general bills of consumer rights. But very few of them that I'm aware of pertain to the Internet. I think the Australian work is perhaps the best example of what's gone forward, already.

I am not aware of this, and perhaps it's something to ask some people in the registrar community. But there may be some work that they have already done on self-policing. I don't necessarily recommend that as a solution, but it may be good to reach out to that community. I can volunteer to do that, to see if they've done any work that we could begin to adopt from.

As of a relatively short time ago, it was my understanding that the registrar community was rather upset at the notion that we would be taking lead on this kind of thing, anyway -- as you might expect.

Cheryl: While I'm giggling… Alan?

Alan: Those of you who have watched me work for a while know that I believe one of the best ways to get conversation going is to draft something. It doesn't have to be the right answer, and it doesn't have to be everyone's belief. But once you put something on paper, it's a lot easier for other people to support it, criticize it and change it.

I think if we go into this meeting when it starts with some document that we already have -- that we've created ourselves -- we are not only in a stronger position to get those ideas adopted, but we're in a stronger position to make sure the meetings are productive when they start.

So I support anything we can do ahead of time, to start pulling together something that vaguely resembles what we want to come out with.

Cheryl: God ahead, Beau. They tell me that up to three of these mics can [delete at once]. So if you just all note the red light… They'll start flashing if people do more than three. So just pop your red light on and I'll recognize you. Go ahead, Beau.

Beau: I will volunteer to capture some stuff from the Australian [Zauda] I believe. Right? To capture some material from that -- add to it some bits and pieces from discussions we've had over the last year -- and circulate that to whomever is interested, to serve as a document to go forward from. I'll work on that today.

Cheryl: That would be greatly appreciated. I take it everyone supports that, and any assistance you need, just let us know.

Beau -- the chair of the Industry Self-Regulation Code of Practice Committee gives you her absolute support in any activity. If I can help you in any way. [laughter] It was a unique experience.

It is self-regulation within the industry, but we had our major consumer watchdogs -- our regulators -- and of course, a couple of us as consumer-advocates -- at the table. In fact, I ended up chairing the committee.

It was an odd thing to risk and do, but the outcome -- I think -- is fairly solid. If you need any assistance at all, just wave and we'll be more than happy to give it to you.

I'd be interested to hear perhaps, Andreas… What you feel the Latin American input might be on this. There is going to be the difficulty of course of getting it into the Spanish language for the discussions to happen. But perhaps that's something that the region could look at doing? Just doing some Google Translate? Dev, obviously you need to think about this, as well?

Andreas: Yes. As a matter of fact, lately there was… Andrew… And I'm presenting myself. I'm introducing myself.

We in ACRALO have discussed a lot about the difficulties of the language, in order to contribute. This could be a problem of communication. I understand that the possibility of

being able to communicate in both languages and have the translations ready… and teleconferences with real-time translation…

It's not an obstacle, right now. Using the translator online could be something to strengthen or to help, in this regard.

Nevertheless, there are some difficulties on the list when it comes to finishing with a version. Those that subscribe to both lists don't get the final thing. But we will work on it.

It's going to be [put in an optimum]. I don't think there are difficulties in regards to languages, but -- yes -- we should reinforce the participation because of some turbulence in ACRALO in the past. We are working to fix this.

I'm happy to see here people in the region in remote participation. There will be some people in remote participation from our area -- from our region. This shows progress. This shows we're progressing.

Cheryl: Thank you very much. Dev, do you believe that we're going to have [feedback] I cannot work with squeaking nose. A/V -- make it better. Thank you. Need to talk to the A/V gods.

Okay. This appears to be happening from the conference bridge. Those of you in the Adigo telephone bridge -- if you're on a speakerphone -- that may be causing some very painful feedback here to those of us with headsets on. So perhaps if you're going off speakerphone… or we could always do a "mute," perhaps. Do remember, *6 is your friend. It's certainly mine.

Back to where I was heading with that, Dev.

Do you think that just getting small amounts out with higher frequency, and running parallel discussion on our wikis is going to get the ALSs in your region started on this?

Dev: I think so. I've also noticed that Google's now come up with the Google Translator, too. It allows for side-by-side translation. You have the Spanish version, and people can modify the translations. Maybe that's something that we can take a look at to speed up the translation process.

V: We are in the process of working to switch the ultimate translation engine that's behind the mailing list translations from Systran to Google Translate. As people have noticed, Google Translate is more accurate for all kinds of foreign technical reasons.

It'll probably take a couple of months to do that, because at the same time, we need to remedy a few of the faults that people have found with the translation interface. Such as translating certain phrases like my name in very humorous ways, because it don't know how to ignore signature lines.

I think we've all noticed "Head of Cattle," showing up as a subject line, periodically.

Cheryl: I've always liked that. "Head of Cattle." I like that!

V: It's all capitals. Head of Cattle. So we hope to remove some of these humorous and less-amazing vagaries of the translation engine.

Cheryl: Do we have a similar situation in terms of getting our African aliases? The Francophone part of Africa obviously wants to work in their most comfortable language.

[Howah] and I am very concerned that we do get real input from the ALSs in the regulations, as early as possible on this. Is it in your region something you want to do on a list, as you've heard perhaps LACRALO is going to be focusing on? Or is a dedicated call going to work better for your region? [inaudible] [laughter] You can't hide over there.

V: Yes. [inaudible] entendu?

V: Of course. In our region, translation is a big problem. It is probably necessary to find a solution that's a very practical solution. This is why translation makes sense. We'd rather have a translation where we did some tests with automatic translations on mails. It was a disaster, and we had to stop.

Cheryl: We'll do our best. Dev's obviously looked at this new tool. Perhaps if you two can get together over a break at some point early on in this meeting, to make sure that the regional leadership teams have a clear connection with the work team that's involved in the drafting and with the ongoing work.

That's Alan and Carlton and Beau and Evan. Obviously, the ALAC itself is more than interested to continue its involvement. But we've got to get the homework done in advance of the calls for comments to come out. Particularly on our wish list.

Alan -- with the industry side… What's the pushback? Why do we believe -- as you can see -- that there may be a hesitancy to look at guidelines for best practices or consumer protection? Is it just a matter of cost? Or is it a matter of change?

If it's just change versus cost, we have to approach it differently. We have to come in for consumer protection and head it into the RAA.

Alan: I think there are three different issues. One is, a lot of the things we talk about will end up costing money. Either cost to implement -- or -- cost because business models will no longer work. That's where the revenue comes from.

I think that for a lot of businesses, revenue for registrars does not necessarily come from selling domains, but from the ancillary services they build around it.

I'd like to talk for two minutes before we finish on the post-expiry domain recovery. That's an example of that. A current one, however. Registrars have made a business out of things that they are allowed to do, because no one says they're not allowed to do it.

If we start putting in best-practices or rules, and say that they can't do it, it obviously affects their business model.

The second thing is -- simply -- change. In a business, any change costs money. We have to be pragmatic about that.

I think we're looking at a whole number of things. In some cases, they very strongly disagree that there should be a rule -- whether it costs them money or not. We're talking to people that are coming at it from a different perspective. From the other side of the discussions, in some cases.

That being said, I think a lot of the registrars understand this is where they get their business from -- and there is some merit in keeping customers happy.

I think you'll have to look at all of those aspects. Don't presume that it's going to be a battle in all cases. We have to understand what it is we want, and why we want it, and try to get it.

Cheryl: Evan?

E: I think it's a fairly basic thing to say that if they registrars were doing everything in a way that was concerned with what registrants needed, we wouldn't need this charter.

Almost by definition, there are going to be things in there that go against current practices. If there are things like squatting or things that are going to impact current business models, that's simply going to be a matter of where the public has the right to say, "These are the limits where you draw the line between appropriate use and abuse." I think that's going to be the main definition of the charter.

From the North American perspective, there's been an awful lot of talk within our mailing lists that have really pushed to want to do something like this.

Cheryl: And of course, I think it's important to look back on when the ALAC started to work on this specific thing -- which was March, last year. The need was clearly identified, then. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan: I was just going to comment that it's important when we talk about "The registrars." It's not a monolithic group. There are people with various different models -- all of whom are technically registrars -- and all of whom we are going to be asking to follow specific guidelines and rules. Whatever. Some of them are going to go along quite happily, and some will have to be brought, kicking and screaming.

Even the registrars -- the constituency -- recognizes there are good guys and bad guys. We may not think the good guys are all that good, in some cases. But there are also bad guys. Having something as a formal rule forces them to do it and gives ICANN the ability to monitor them doing it.

These are things that perhaps some of the good guys would do, anyway.

Cheryl: Go ahead. Sorry -- Yes -- Adam? You're going to need to wave at me, more. I didn't see your red light.

Adam: Let me do it that way.

Good morning.

Two issues here from the registrars' points of view. One is that there are contractual compliance issues that come through the policy-development processes that they're required to do. They should then be built into anything that we're doing.

The other is just the general notion of best practice and business best practice. I'm just wondering what the starting point should be.

How close do I have to be? I thought I was doing okay.

Sorry.

Good morning.

I just thought that there were two approaches, here. One is that there are contractual compliance issues. There are consensus-based policies that do have registrar-related best practice. Not best practice, but actually, "You will do such things," within them.

Then there are best practices from a business point of view. There are two approaches that need to be considered. One is contractual and one is best practice. The best practice itself has two approaches. One is what we want to see and what we're trying to not enforce upon them, but encourage them to adopt. The other is the best practices that some of them will have particularly developed in their own right, anyway.

If I'm making sense on this rather tired morning.

V: Part of that is a discussion we had before you came, Adam.

[laughter]

It's not at all clear exactly what things are going to fall into the bill of rights drafting team or working group and the RAA modification working group. There's going to be a linkage between those two.

The first one does not have the rights to change what the current contracts say. But people talking about rights can come up with a list of what they think should be there, to feed into the other process, most likely.

In terms of best practices, we can help develop them. But of course, best practices are only going to be followed by those that want to follow them. That's always a little bit problematic -- since the problem cases come from the worst practices, typically. Not always, but typically.

Cheryl: If I can just go back to what obviously ended up a reasonably successful -- albeit nearly two-year -- process. To get an industry self-regulatory code developed.

The fact that even though it's seen as the regulator, AUDA does the penalties. It was very much a code that was seen as self-regulation. So the "good guys… The "white hats," had huge motivation once they got into the system, to realize that there's market differentiation advantages. There's real, meaningful prodigality. It does, of course, improve the representation of the whole industry by having some rules. That makes the black hat wearers, and scares us consumers, better and more promptly dealt with.

So it was a change-management experience when I went through it 5 or 6 years ago in Australia. That said, a ccTLD environment -- whilst is will be interesting to look at -- is not the space we're playing in, here. We have to recognize very much different drivers.

I'm wondering if we might be able to perhaps -- again, under those in your leadership -- have some fireside chats with identified white hats in that space. To start talking. I'd be more than happy perhaps if we could catch up with Mason [Cole] during this meeting, and see if he's comfortable with that concept. To start doing a little chattering on the side.

If we can do that… Bringing people with you is always easier than forcing them at the point of a gun. It's much nicer to have a cooperative outcome. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan: There's a related subject that I'd like to talk about. I don't know if now is the right time. We're almost out of the slot.

The ALAC has initiated two policy-development processes. The first was the field generally known as Domain Tasting. We started the process. That got a rule in place to say it is basically illegal and cannot be done. It is, to a large extent, eliminated.

Now if we're honest with each other, that was an issue that we felt strongly about -- but it was not affecting -- to a large extent -- the community that we're representing. We thought it was wrong, and it had a lot of second-order effects.

The second policy process that we're now working on is the post-expiration domain-name recovery. That is, what happens to a domain name if you don't renew it before it expires? This is an issue that…

I don't know about the rest of you, but I get a regular stream of complaints from real people saying, "I thought I renewed it and I didn't." Or, "My e-mail address was wrong, and they didn't try to find me. Now they've taken my name and I can't get it back. Or they want to charge me $500 for my $12 domain name." Things like that.

This is affecting real users, and the people that talk to us. The working group, to develop policy on this, is just kicking off. There will be a workshop on Wednesday afternoon. I strongly encourage people to attend the workshop.

Cheryl: Encourage? We'll be taking a role!

Alan: You can say that. We will be looking for people on the working group.

This is an example of what I hope will be a win-win situation, and we will come to closure moderately quickly with registrars, to put something in place that's reasonable for registrants, and reasonable for registrars. That may not happen.

If it doesn't happen all that easily, we are going to need good, vocal, reasonable people on this working group to try to make it happen. The issue is not to have the registrars burnt at the stake, but to come to closure on something that they can live with, and provides the substance of what we need.

This is probably the first thing that At-Large is working on, going through the formal policy process -- which affects the real people we talk to. I'd like to see good turnout at the workshop -- and more important, a small group of people that will work actively over the next 6 to 8 to 12 months, to try to put policy in place.

Cheryl: Ideally, that will be a regionally balanced group of people. Yes, Nick.

Nick: I just wanted to note…   These two working groups are the first true joint working groups between the At-Large community and the GNSO. The working groups of the two communities are very different in the way that they work. So, we at the staff level will try to ease the one on future RAA amendments and the one on the registrant rights and responsibilities.

Alan: If I may correct you -- the RAA amendments one is not a joint effort. It is a GNSO working group with adequate and abundant At-Large participation. But it is not technically a joint working group. The registrants' rights one is a joint working group.

Nick: Yes. I could be wrong. But I get the impression that the idea is that they should "feel" a lot alike. Even though there is this technical difference.

So I take Alan's point. It may or may not be all that different.

I would just say, if you find that someone is approaching you in a way that seems odd to you from the GNSO side, or referencing something…

Cheryl: Then please SMS me immediately, and I will deal with the situation.

Nick: It may be simply that they are used to a way of working that is very different from the very informal working group structure that we have. They're just quite formalized.

So just bear with it. There's probably nothing but a lack of understanding the difference.

Cheryl: Thank you. I must say -- the discussions I've had chair-to-chair or whatever -- we recognize that we're trying to blend two very different cultures in the way policy his discussed and processes happen. This will be an entertaining, challenging and interesting exercise.

So we certainly need people -- when they put their hand up to go on these groups… You're making a serious commitment. These are going to be energy- and time-hungry ones. But that's not to say that the regional leaders should not be ensuring that their communities have got everything just ready to push into this process.

Particularly when you're now dealing with the need to take it into French and into Spanish -- it multiplies the time outside. As we all know! We've all looked at that diagram of how long it actually takes to do policy development. We do it through all the languages. If it's too long, it won't work.

Yes, Alan. Go ahead.

Alan: But note, these working groups do work in English. The documents are in English. There will be no translation along the way in the working groups, other than at various points when reports are done. Obviously, they will be translated.

As much as we want participation from the regions, we also need people that are very comfortable in English -- both spoken and written.

Cheryl: Again, it comes back to the regional leaders, here. Making sure they've got a conduit in local languages that is effective in getting the data together. And that someone with the bilingual skills is representing the region in the working group. Okay?

Ladies and gentlemen, it's mid-morning break. But just before the mid-morning break begins, I couldn't possibly have you come into our country and not expose you to some Australian icons. Matt -- where did that box go?

There's a box behind me. Just let me leave the microphone. Much more fun this way, anyway. I can trot up and down -- which is much more me.

Each of you -- and please, do grab one… There should be more than enough for everybody. It's a little Ozzie icon kiss. It was put together by my own fair hands. Actually, I got a couple of girls at the table to do it -- but I had the idea. I mean I put a lot of effort into it.

Yes. There is vegemite in there. You have to taste the vegemite. That is compulsory. You don't have to like it, but you do have to taste the vegemite.

I've given you a tiny, tiny sample of vegemite with some pickies to try it on. When you open your little vegemite pack, there are some biscuits and a little red thing. That's for you to spread the vegemite on.

Please be aware -- unless you have a very, very strong salt palate -- do spread it thinly on the biscuit.

[laughter]

I can eat it you the teaspoonful, but then, I was born and bred on the stuff.

There is something called an ANZAC Biscuit. In fact, there are four of them. The ANZAC Biscuits quite literally were sent during WWI to the troops. They keep forever. They will be digging them up in a thousand years' time, going, "What is this strange and unusual food?" But do have them perhaps with your cup of tea or coffee at the midmorning break. Even a glass of water goes well with an ANZAC Biscuit.

These are a little special. I had my local bakery make them with Australian wattleseed. Of course, the wattleseed -- which gives it a very nice texture, and takes a little of the sweetness out of the ANZAC biscuit… It has oat in it and it has bottled syrup. So any allergy people -- yes -- there would be a little gluten in there, but it's oaten. You should be fairly safe.

But the wattleseed, however, is one of the major protein sources from the native foods. Wattleseeds are something that you'll find ground up and used in an awful lot. You can buy

them when you go wandering around the tourist traps. You'll find different Australian foods, and wattleseed will often be in there.

There's a caramela koala bear. Now, I'm sorry -- they're actually not koala bears at all. But the marketing people decided they're caramela koalas. It's the only koala-shaped thing that was sweet and had chocolate in it that I could think of. And another couple of little goodies. Please make sure you grab one of these as you have your cup of tea, coffee or glass of water or juice. And be back here in -- shall we say -- 10 minutes?

V: Okay. Thank you.

Cheryl: Thank you all.

Audience: [applause]

I actually do want the photo evidence of the faces as you try the vegemite. All right? Yes. I want to see the looks on those faces when you try the vegemite. Okay?

<mark>15 minute break</mark>

Cheryl: Take your places. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Take your places.

The staff is in absolute absentia. Thank you, Heidi. If someone could make both sides of the screen not identical, it would help me look at an agenda. [laughter]

My point, exactly.

While we're managing the thrill-packed and exciting world of audiovisuals, with the vegemite -- for those of you who were brave enough to try it… It is one of the highest sources of B vitamins we have in this country.

V: You actually like this stuff?

Audience: [laughter]

Cheryl: Not only do I like it… Most people just spread it thinly. I'll have it so thick that even most vegemite eaters go, "Uhh… That's a lot of vegemite."

Audience: And with coffee. Yum!

[laughter]

Cheryl: Yes. The little tiny takeaway food capsule you may have found in there…

V: [inaudible]

Cheryl: Well done! Well done!

In there, you'll find a little square cake. It's called a Lamington. Named after the Earl of Lamington.

The Earl of Lamington had some visitors drop in, in 18… Oh, who was on the trip? When was it? You should remember. Anyway, there's a date. It's the 1800s of some description.

The Earl of Lamington had some important visitors drop in, and the staff had already left. So Lady Lamington had to go to the kitchen herself. Oh, dear. To find something to do with day-old cake, which is all that was in the kitchen.

She quite literally rolled it in some chocolate icing. Then to take the stickiness off the chocolate icing, she popped some desiccated coconut around it. Thus the Australian icon of the Lamington was born.

The Lamington you have also now has jam in the center of it. If we weren't prepacking them several days ago… and again, they last for a long time because of the [inaudible]… We have a bit of distance here in Australia. We need to have food that lasts.

Under normal circumstances, many of the pastry shops these days will put cream in there, as well. But -- A -- those of us who don't eat dairy wouldn't have liked that. And -- B -- I'm not too sure the cream would be doing well on the long-term travel.

So I think we've now mastered the audiovisual exercises. We can look at the post-summit review and reporting of At-Large working groups. I have representatives from each and every one of those working groups here. Which one wants to go first? Who's got Working Group 1?

[Howah]? [inaudible]

I thought we might go with the working groups. I think you're one of the few representatives of Working Group 1.

We haven't had a lot of things happening in Working Group 1 since the summit. Obviously, each of these summit statements have now been voted on and become endorsed ALAC statements. But are we looking to keep Working Group 1 working on aspects of post-[inaudible] environment? Or what?

[laughter]

Ah -- look! We've found a way to keep me quiet! Look at that! That's wonderful. He's got a mouthful of biscuit. He can't get it… There we go.

Nick: Sorry -- just a point of clarification. Working Group 1 is At-Large participation, and not the IIC Working Group. That may be part of the reason why [Howah] is looking confused.

I would also note that the remnant of Working Group 1 does also include the current open internal consultation on the improvements to the public consultation process -- which is later on today.

Cheryl: Thank you. Sebastian.

Sebastian: Yes. Maybe we need -- even if we refer to the group number during the summit, as we change those groups to ALC working groups, it's maybe better in the future to try to keep with those names. If not, it will get us into some trouble.

Cheryl: In fact, if the screen on the left were there when I started talking, I would've been able to use the words. Now they've caught up.

Sebastian: Yes. No problem.

Cheryl: I do agree. Words would be better than numbers.

Sebastian: My second point is, I think that in this working group, there is also following the future of ALAC. What ALAC will be becoming. A lot of things to do.

As a general statement, for the working group, we need to try… all of us here in our RALOs… to keep the momentum of the summit. We need to involve more and more people.

It's obvious that in each region, some work will be done and has to be done in each and every of those subjects, possibly. But we need also to try to keep the cross-RALO work going on. That's an important point.

Today we are almost well-organized at the RALOs level. We still need to try to do what we achieved during the summit. That is to have a change among the regions in each of those subjects.

I know that it's not very easy because of the language question, and because of time and so on. But we need to try.

This group is about the involvement of the At-Large community. When this specific topic could also come down, I guess it's a good time to say that. Thank you.

Cheryl: Are there any other comments? Particularly on the inter-regional work?

If we go through one of those hyperlinks, do we not have the… Pick a hyperlink. Doesn't matter which one it is. The first one will be fine…

Do we not have a description? Scroll down. I thought we had a list of members. That's probably a very important thing that the regional leaders look at these lists, to ensure their regions are in each of these workgroups. That you've got participation. If not, go to an ALS and say, "Here's a choice of three. Which one are you doing?"

They've got the officers and members. If we can go into "Officers and Members." I thought I was right. That is [Howah] on that list. [laughter] You're trying to tell me I'm wrong? I'm very rarely wrong. If I am, it's only ever twice. The second time is admitting to it.

The list there… I think it's very important that we go down and ensure that the regional leaders actually talk to those people and see that they're still actively engaged. If they're not, replace them with someone who will be actively engaged. Or encourage them to be re-energized.

To my knowledge… Correct me if I'm in error here… But that is the list that we went to the summit with. It hasn't been a second call. Or we haven't checked with these people if they're still operating in these workspaces.

Yes, Nick?

Nick: We did of course send out a note to each working group, letting them know of ALAC's decision on the 24th of March to make these standing working groups. Letting everyone know that they could actually participate in more than one, if they wished to -- but that they were encouraged to remain participants in at least one. Even if that meant switching to a different subject that was more interesting to them, now.

Cheryl: Again, I'm coming back to the regional leadership and their role, here.

It's in the region's best interest to ensure that every working group has active representation. Pat said something that might also need a more personal touch at the regional meetings. That [inaudible] might take a point and make it an agenda item in the post-Sydney meeting -- regional meetings.

It's hugely important that these workgroups are running in advance of calls for public comment.

Which? We've got calls for public comment current -- coming on this afternoon. But as far as I can see, every one of those active working groups has something that's either up for comment now or will be in the near future. So every one of those groups needs to be active.

V: [inaudible]

Maybe we should think about how to have some goals to offer for those groups to reach and somehow define -- try to define a space of time.

Once you leave people running without targets, it's very hard to get them really involved. Probably we should just put some goals with times, and encourage them to reach those goals during this period of time.

I believe that I myself -- if I don't have the first target to reach, I start to do another thing in the vicinity of the point. I usually [escape] that. We need to have then more at hand. So that's some suggestion for us to put some goals on that.

Cheryl: Please go ahead, Patrick.

Patrick: Yes. I think we should maybe review this whole working group model. In the sense that on the one hand, we have these five working groups that appear in the framework of the At-Large Summit. They're all focused on some issues.

We made them standing working groups. But I can report, for example, that for the working group I was the vice-chair of, not much has happened since the At-Large Summit.

So it would be quite difficult to report any activity from this group. Mostly because of things like security or -- [inaudible] topic. We would hope as a whole that security issues should be solved. Once they are solved, then we do not have to talk about it any more.

On the other hand, what's also confusing, for example… We have these five working groups as a consequence of the ALAC Summit. But when I go to another page on the ALAC wiki, I find other working groups.

Like, for example now, there is an At-Large IRT process working group. That's more or less an ad-hoc thing that will disappear in a few days' time -- once we are finished with the comments for the IRT process.

Standing working groups have some value. But on the other hand, even the standing working groups do not always have something to do on a permanent basis. So I don't know how we can move forward on this. I'm just asking myself if having standing working groups is finally a good thing -- because most of the issues we work on are on an ad-hoc basis, I would say.

Cheryl: Okay. That's certainly something I think we'll need to revisit when we look at the way we do our policy planning.

Nick -- you're waving at me instead of putting on a red light. Do you want me to ignore you? Then I have Sébastien and Evan.

Nick: Sorry. I just wanted to note that on the policy advice development page -- which you see here… It's the second menu option on AtLarge.Icann.Org. We've listed the working groups. And we've listed their leaders. Above that, we've listed what external working groups there are, and who's involved in them.

But if it is useful, maybe the ALAC could look at… When consultations come open, it could perhaps look at the signing of those consultations to working groups more directly. As people have mentioned, there are actually open consultations that are relevant to each standing working group right now. And in some cases, more than one.

With respect to the working group on At-Large participation ICANN, we're about to enter the phase of implementation of the At-Large Review working groups' proposals. As someone has mentioned.

Well this will lead to a continuing series of work over the course of quite some time. That's just one example.

I think you'll find that these standing working groups will have something to do on an almost permanent basis, based on the current calendar or the current rate at which different subjects are coming up in ICANN. I think you'll see a pretty continuous stream of things applying to each.

Cheryl: Thank you, Nick. I suppose it is fairly important while we've got the regional leaders here… We're looking at this very new page -- which is a consolidation document.

What we've not clearly done is to integrate this with the existing working groups. Yes, Mandy. Go ahead. Then I'll have Sébastien and Evan.

Mandy: Thanks. It's very good to see this continued progress. The board will be discussing the summit work this afternoon and its proposed resolutions, commending the summit work. It'll be helpful to bring back in some of the continued work that's flowed out of it. So I will be collecting links to add to that discussion before I go. Thanks.

Cheryl: Serendipity and perfect timing. Sébastien?

Sebastian: Yes. I wanted that the staff bring the pages to the knowledge of everybody. It's an important work that we've done. We tried to answer the question of when we have to do something and who has to do something.

I feel that the five working group issues from the summit are good tools. There were a lot of questions raised within the ICANN community that fall into one of those five working groups. Maybe some others.

Generally, it's a good framework.

I think if there is no work going on at the ICANN level or the general ICANN level for that topic, maybe we can leave the other working group and do some work.

I think we don't need just to answer to every other people or community saying, "Hey -- I have something to say." But maybe one day we can come with some issue ourselves.

It's already the case in some issue, when we ask for a report for the GNSO. It's one way to be proactive.

I think we need to try to be -- as much as possible -- proactive, also. Then if we have a frame to do that, it could be easier.

We still have the question of how we will work at the general level, and not just the RALO level or the ALAC level. Still, I think the framework is a good tool to be used. Thank you.

Cheryl: Evan -- go ahead.

Evan: I was just going to build onto some of what Patrick was saying. Specifically, things like we have… On one hand, it looks like an ad-hoc thing that we're doing related to the IRT. On the other hand, the IRT is very much inline with some of the things that were done from the gTLD working group that had specific things to say about IP related to new gTLDs.

So while it is ad-hoc, there's definitely some linkage between the two. At least in that aspect.

Cheryl: Yes, indeed. Anyone else like to make a comment under the general heading now of the Feedback, Review and Reporting of the At-Large Working Groups?

Obviously, Sébastien, I would've thought you'd like to raise the additional work that was done by one of the working groups, feeding into the PSC work.

Sebastian: Yes. Thank you. The name of the working group is the Future Structure and Governance of ICANN. We obviously have different topics here. One is institutional confidence. The other one is a [Policy PA]. All of that is going to be linked together.

It's important that ALAC agree on two statements. The one done by the working group during the summit, and the one additional work we do to answer the PSC reports made just during the summit itself, at the ICANN meeting in Mexico.

The time we take to finalize that left us a little bit out of the schedule from the PSC report comments period. We sent it to the staff in charge of that. I don't know if they took that into account.

Now we have a new document that is, "The Way Forward," or "The Next Step." Oh -- "Improving Institutional Confidence." "The Way Forward," I guess, is the name of the document.

I was trying prior to this meeting, but I wasn't able, to…

There is a frame with what was said by the community and the answer or proposal of the staff. And whether we'd like to do its [2 at 1] column with [what the] ALAC and At-Large [sold] on each of these topics. What we already wrote on those topics. To see if it fits with what's going on or not. And to be able to make some additional work on that basis.

I have asked this morning to have the Word Document, because with PDF, it's almost impossible to work and to add something. I was not able to cut and paste. I hope to receive this document in the next few hours, and I'll try to do it as soon as possible to share with the group members.

We need to keep this working group very awake. [inaudible] tomorrow. We have to say things during this week and during the summer for the post-[CPA]. Whatever will be the post-[CPA] situation of ICANN.

I would like to thank all of the participants of this working group during the summit and well as since the summit, for the work done. Thank you.

Cheryl: Is there anyone else from any of the working groups around this table that wants to make any particular statements or reporting of any items or activities? Yes? Please go ahead, [Howah].

Howah: Merci, Cheryl.

V: Thank you. So -- my participation on this topic is according to the discussions of the process. Current discussions of ICANN.

We could proceed with attributing those current topics to the working groups. Depending on the topic.

If there is a topic that relates to one group, it should be given to that group automatically. So they can have a participation in the name of ALAC. But if that's not the case…

If the subject is different from what the working groups are doing, then maybe we could try to get a new working group and ask for participation. And to suggest participants according to the group participation. We could have a teleconference or even a face-to-face in order to have the final contribution from ALAC. This is what I wanted to add.

Cheryl: I think to some extent that comes back to the point that Evan was making in response to Patrick. That is, whilst there was the overarching of new gTLDs, it was appropriate to have a subset ad-hoc workgroup to focus on IP aspects. I guess the decision headed on any number of ALAC meetings. We just keep managing to avoid biting the bullet and discussing it fully.

How we operate these working groups is hugely important. But it's the major space for the At-Large structure and regional input to be formalized and integrated. The regional leaders have to really be involved at this level in these workgroups.

I'd love to think that we'd get to the point -- picking up from particularly what Sébastien was saying -- as we move into a post-JPA environment… Where it'll be much more proactive rather than reactive. Subsets perhaps of like-minded between-region At-Large structures may have brought forward an issue or something that we might eventually run a PDP on. To bring it to the system and say, "This is a problem. Can we look at a son?" That would be -- I think -- still a possibility, using this structure. Providing the structure is used wisely.

What we do need -- and this is coming back to what Amanda was saying… Some well-established deadlines.

Last time I checked, very few of us are paid to work for this space. Most of us have a way of earning our keep, which does not involve doing policy-development work for ICANN.

Unless there is a deadline or unless there is a project plan, we get busy with our own lives and our own workspaces. We go, "Oh, dear. We're supposed to have a comment in by tomorrow."

That's where the regions have such a huge role to play, to make sure that a little forecasting is done. That new page that's being put up is going to be a very useful tool to track what dates are coming up.

Perhaps the leadership within the working groups… And remember -- this should be regional RALOs members leading. We will have an ALAC lead in each working group. But these are your working groups. All right? We're facilitating the conversations.

If that then can be 5 days prior to a critical deadline or a date that's in that master document… [inaudible] yes. Stand up.

V: Yes. Another idea… It's probably what I don't see. That's Inter-RALO meetings. Formally done.

I believe all of the presidents of RALOs should meet once a month [inaudible]. At least, to exchange information and to follow up about the region.

That is something that we have done only three times a year. It will not really work.

Cheryl: We're not wishing to write the agenda for the regional leaders or the secretaries' get-together. I'm sure they heard all of that.

I see Adam, and then I see Andreas. Then I see Carlos.

Adam:	Thank you. I was sort of co-chair with Wolfgang of the Transparency and Accountability Working Group. I think between us, we haven't been at all sure of what to do next. We've got no clue, whatsoever, of what to do next.

I do think this working group should merge or be a subset of the future structure and governance of the ICANN working group. Oddly, it doesn't really live alone, any longer. I thought it was a very useful thing to have at the summit, but its main interests are actually part of that working group.

It would probably be more effective for us to actually do something if we were part of that, without trying to completely shirk any responsibility. But that would be my suggestion, anyway. To make that a subset of the second working group.

Cheryl: Andreas?

Andreas: Yes. Half the moment's gone, but as Amanda talked about -- the possibility. In the last teleconference with staff, and preparing the regional leaders' meeting, I would point out the same issue. Sorry. I have to switch to Spanish. I promised my colleagues that I would [inaudible]

Cheryl: I would like you to use the language that you're most comfortable with. Just because you're very comfortable with English, don't feel committed to use it.

Andreas: Thanks.

V: As a matter of fact, for me particularly, for LACRALO, it would give us impetus to have more interaction with other leaders from the RALOs. We will have a meeting soon, but it's going to be interesting for a more fluid exchange -- which can give us more elements to enlarge our action and scope.

Especially, I am very much enthusiastic with this interaction. Many of the things -- when, for example… When there was a proposal for two officers in the region, we proposed that in Mexico, many things that we were lacking, we saw -- and we could develop. We saw that they worked in the other RALOs a little bit better -- thanks to that input. Through that bridge that joined the leaders. I hope we continue with this.

Cheryl: Carlos?

Carlos: No. We were not wrong. A while ago when we blamed ALAC that we didn't have participation and that it didn't work… We said from the region of the southern part of the Americas that this was a new ALAC. And that it was like a child that had to start walking, and learn to walk, under the conduction of Cheryl.

That learning stage has worked very efficiently and very quickly. I am proud to see with

plenty of satisfaction that these working commissions in Mexico -- these workshops in Mexico -- maintain an activity. They were created for that activity to be carried out, because at the end of Mexico, these groups didn't finish. I am also pleased to hear what they just said. That the leaders or presidents of those working groups have to maintain pressure on those members to keep on working and progressing.

Especially, I was at the Group 2, presented by Sebastian and myself. I think it was very important what was spoken at that group. Especially in that group. They also spoke about -- just like in Group Number 1 -- of the necessity of involvement of participation.

I'm also very pleased to hear about the monthly meeting of all of the leaders of all regions. That is to say, obviously, ALAC starts to walk. It does more than walking.

We were discussing in some meetings now the subject of the participation. Minimum participation required for members of ALAC, and modification of Article Number 21. I think that in this meeting, we will finish completing that work.

I think that from there on, the only thing that is left is to keep on walking, and start running. Really, we've had a very important development. That's marvelous!

But everything is together. Everything is mixed with the effort and the work done -- and the compromise we each are assuming. Congratulations to all!

Olivier?

Olivier: Working groups are ongoing concerns. Ongoing entities. They tackle ad-hoc subjects. Wouldn't it be helpful to have a status page that actually lists all of the working groups, and what ad-hoc subjects they're working on?

Cheryl: Nick?

Nick: We can certainly add that to the single-page policy calendar without any trouble.

Cheryl: It often means that people then can say, "Well, because it's an ad-hoc, I can spend a little block of my time here, and here and here and here, and perhaps feel more casual, but in 10 small blocks of engagement," rather than a huge commitment -- which obviously scares some of us off.

Patrick?

Patrick: Yes. I support Olivier's proposal. Indeed, it's quite confusing to have different pages sometimes on the wiki and sometimes on the main ALAC site. To find out which working groups exist and which ones are standing. Which ones are ad-hock.

It might be a good idea to have… We now have this Google Spreadsheet -- which I was not aware of. So it might be good to have all of these working groups on one single document -- so that we could actually see who is doing what and when.

Cheryl: It certainly is the intent and the desire. I'm now going to ask either Nick or whoever wants to do this…   I think perhaps it's an opportune time to have a look at what is on that spreadsheet in a little bit more detail.

I know we were going to do that this afternoon. But time permitting, perhaps we can look at that now.

Nick: We can certainly go for what is on it. Then we can go into detail about the different comments that are underway.

The top section… This is always… We sent out e-mails notifying you when this was first made. We will keep notifying you. I know how many e-mails people can get… But…

We're also making sure that the larger ICANN community sees this. Because it is the only way you could go to one place and see what is actually happening in the community.

I think that this model or something like this will soon be spread to the other policy communities. I know Denise looked at it and said, "This is something we should do all across the policy communities. It would make life easier for all the volunteers."

At the top, you have basically what consultations ALAC is responding to at any given time. Or what statements are in development -- and a schedule of when they will reach the various stages in development. And a link to the drafts as they are developed. So that you can actually click a link to see what is being said. If you wish to make a comment, you simply hit the comment button and make the comment.

Directly below that is a list of activities that are not in the At-Large community, but which At-Large is following directly. This is still being updated. We keep finding out of more things that people are involved in. That's good news. It's not bad news at all.

Then linked to that are the people from At-Large who are involved in that work. If there is a working group in At-Large that is also connected to it, it's listed. There isn't always. Some things are not part of any working group. Maybe that's something that should be modified, or maybe not. It depends on the subject.

Below that you see a list of each of the working groups, their home pages, and the working group leaders from At-Large. As well as whom the staff lead point is. So that you know where to turn to if you're in a working group and want to ask a question of the staff, or if you want the staff to do something. You can find us listed there.

I will note that in some cases, we don't have the name of the current leaders of working groups. So perhaps later or at some other time in this meeting, Cheryl may call for volunteers that would like to fill in the open slots. There would certainly be no obstacle to us adding another section, perhaps, which listed the working groups and the consultations or subjects that they're following -- whichever and however you would like to see it, basically.

Obviously, this can all be rearranged, as you wish. It gets updated every five minutes.

Cheryl: In fact, you can also watch live edits on this. So when the [inaudible] staff met together to bludgeon this into what you see there, it was important that we were able to all be editing the page at the same time. To see those edits in live time.

I think it's a good way forward. It's a long way to go. I would note that we will be calling. Can you just put that back where it was? Thank you. Ah -- put it back where it was. Thank you.

We have not only chairs and vice-chairs that aren't there, but [Fatamarta] will not be continuing her role with us -- which means we have spaces that right now are going to need to be filled urgently. She's not continuing as a non-com appointee. She didn't stand again.

So we really do need volunteers. I'd really like the ALAC to look long and hard at that list, and see where your name is going to appear. Thank you, Nick. David.

David: Forgive my ignorance. Would somebody explain to us the formal procedure for creating a working group? The formal procedure for [creating] a working group, and also the formal procedure for giving the charge to the working group?

Cheryl: At the moment, all of that's done by the At-Large Advisory Committee, within our monthly ALAC meetings. And we certainly have tended now to set up more ad-hoc subgroups and fewer existing main themes -- rather than populate more and more groups for groups' sake. Things have to have an endpoint.

We certainly don't want to see what I would refer to as, "Scope Creep," where a working group wants to stay alive just because it's a working group. It needs to be productive.

Okay. Any other points or questions?

We thought perhaps we could look at what's on current policy and get a little ahead of ourselves. I'm always happy to get ahead of ourselves. We have some…

V: [inaudible]

Cheryl: Yes. Go ahead. What is it?

V: There's been some very interesting discussion in the At-Large Skype Chat from members attending the GAC and the IDNcc discussions. Perhaps somebody wants to raise that in the policy discussion space.

Cheryl: In fact, if we could get the Skype Chat up on one of the screens, that would be quite useful to have a look.

Have you invited anyone from… Who set that up? Evan?

V: [inaudible]

Cheryl: I'd otherwise just put your computer… We just want to have a look at it right now. You can always take the dongle across and put it up in back of your computer.

You won't [inaudible] but you won't get the history. So you need to take the dongle across.

That's possibly the most complex set of connections I've seen for a very long time. [laughter]

V: [inaudible]

Cheryl: [laughter]

All right. We don't have to worry about the Occupational Health and Safety aspects of that. That's good now. Thank you. [laughter]

V: Do you want me to try to use this screen?

Cheryl: Yes, please.

V: Sure.

Cheryl: For those of you on the phone bridge, we're just -- again -- wrangling with the world of audiovisuals, with Evan's computer. So we get the full history of the ALAC-at-Sydney. The chatspace on Skype can be looked at. There we go. Thank you very much, Evan.

You want to scroll up to the juicy bits? Someone with far better eyes than I will need to read the highlights into the record. Perhaps someone down at that end of the table might have a go.

V: [inaudible]

Cheryl: We're about to look at the open policy discussions. Wendy pointed out that there was some very productive conversation going on in Skype from the people that are in the IDNs and the ccTLD meetings running at the moment.

V: Please talk on the mic.

V: I'm just asking where I should be scrolling.

V: May I?

I started a little bit of the discussion concerning the ccTLDs in regards to Working Group 3 working on new gTLDs.

One of the aspects we have been looking for is how the ccTLDs are corresponding to what is done in regard to policies in gTLDs. It seems that actually, first, they don't pay for participation in the global TLDs. First of all.

Secondly, they have all different policies. Each ccTLD has its own governance and its own policy. That makes it -- in the discussions we have about abuse… very difficult to get a common sense of approach of how to solve cross-border issues, when the ccTLDs don't agree on the more common sense of global policy.

The other point is that we see a lot of ccTLDs just say that they don't want to install and implement IDNs. That makes it already difficult, as I take the example of Belgium. The French-speaking person with an accent in his name cannot book his domain name because it could be taken by a Dutch-speaking person as the IDN is not implemented.

The other point is that we also heard that they don't want to install DNSSEC. So, one of the aspects we have to consider… What if ccTLDs just stay on their island and decide from their point of view how to continue and what is going to happen from the side of the new gTLDs?

If they have to block everything, they have to implement every decision actually on the plate. That's not done by the ccTLDs. What's going to happen? That's one of the aspects I want to ask -- being the ALAC liaison to the ccNSO. It's one of the discussions I would like to try to start up to see how the ccNSO is going to tackle the discussions about the different policies of each ccTLD.

Cheryl: Of course it's a little complicated inasmuch as each of the sovereign states and CCs have longstanding rights -- and quite reasonably -- to organize their own policies. The ccNSO is rather more of a space in place where comparisons, contrasts and communications about what each of the individuals have done more or less successfully to meet their local needs… There are very few points where profitable generic policy -- other than when we're doing things like the IDNcc Fast-Track and things like that…

Has the ccNSO asked for input on this, really?

V: No. Not yet. I have to excuse myself that I have been offline for more than two months, due to private aspects. I'm trying to catch up, now.

But they have also to comment on the new gTLDs process. So there's probably a reason why they're not just starting the discussion today. But if we raise to the Internet consumer the question of how they think it should be done… I think at that moment, they have to start the discussion.

If no one raises the question, they probably won't get to that point.

Cheryl: I'm going to… Ron. You can't hide. You can't try. But seeing as we have our ccNSO representative to us in the room, he's going to have to drag himself toward the microphone. Perhaps if you take over Alan's chair while he's in the GNSO… I think we need you in on this. Thank you.

Just for the record and for those on the phone bridge, Ron Sherwood, who is the ccNSO liaison to the ALAC is now at our table. Good morning, Ron.

I'm not sure whether you heard all of that, but…

Mics, please. Mic.

Ron: I would much prefer if you question me and ask what you'd like to know on specific issues.

Cheryl: Happy to do so.

Rudy -- you raised a couple of -- I think -- points that were a number. If we could have them broken down to individual ones, and if you could pick up the specific chatter from the Skype, and address them point-by-point… Ron can either take them on notice, or give us the lowdown.

Rudy: Well, the first debate, which starts in regards to the new gTLDs… Why the ccTLDs don't have to pay, and why the gTLDs have to suffer from the fact that the whole community is not paying for the domain-name space. That's one of the questions that are being raised during several discussions.

Ron: Well, I understand the question and I understand the concern. I don't know that I have any answer.

That question should be presented to ccTLD, and I will certainly do that on behalf of the ALAC. I'd be very pleased to do that.

Cheryl: Excellent. Next point? We're getting a list here now for you two to work on. Let him get his pen and paper, though. [He's right]. Go ahead.

Rudy: The next item was the implementation of IDNs. If CcTLD just decide not to implement IDNs, what is the next step for having the Internet user participating, if he is not enabled to have his domain name in the domain-name space?

Ron: The question is if a ccTLD is not able -- for financial reasons or for any other reasons -- to institute IDN, what should be the position of the local ALS or the local user? I will certainly bring that to their attention. Thank you.

Cheryl: Next?

Rudy: The next one is the DNSSEC. This is going to be quite an important aspect.

Ron: Yes. DNSSEC is -- I can tell you right now -- is considered to be extremely important by certainly most ccTLDs. If the question is, "Are all ccTLDs going to be involved in moving toward DNSSEC?" Is that the question?

Rudy: Indeed.

Ron: What proportion and when and how? I will bring that question, to.

Cheryl: Before you come to the next question, Rudy… It's an ideal opportunity, Ron, perhaps to think at least in our cloud here in this room… Whether or not in the matter of DNSSEC, the local Internet-using communities -- which ALSs obviously are -- might not be able to have these conversations to think globally and act locally. To encourage or find pathways toward things like DNSSEC.

So we may be able to do something for the greater good by not attacking it, but working on it in both ends. I think that's a possibility, as well.

Ron: I agree. I think that belongs in the discussion that I'd like to extend with you that we had earlier.

Cheryl: Go ahead, Rudy.

Rudy: Yes. The last one is, "What about the abuse policies?" Especially those working cross-border on definitions. Where we have, for instance, in one country, the decision that certain sites are blocked -- while in another ccTLD country [site/side], they decide to not do it. What's the protection for the end-user to [inaudible] if we are implementing filters on every country level by the providers? What is the meaning of the participation [in/and/of] the ccTLD in that aspect?

Ron: All right. You're talking about censorship. You're talking about what's happening in China, today, for example? My goodness. Yes. I can bring that question from ALAC to ccNSO.

[laughter]

Cheryl: ALAC hasn't asked you to bring that question anywhere just yet.

Ron: My goodness. I don't know. I'm more of an ALAC than I am a ccTLD, to be quite frank with you. These are all issues which are -- in my mind, and which I have brought to various people without very much [answer] I might add, in a lot of them.

I have a broader perspective, if I may just say what I said earlier this morning. That is that I absolutely believe that the ccTLDs should and probably must be very much closer. And even participate in the ALAC work.

They're the obvious link between ICANN or what ICANN does and the local community. There are ccTLDs that do this. There are ccTLDs that were doing ALAC work before ALAC.

I would like to think that would could have many, many more -- and that perhaps I can work on that in that regard.

Cheryl: Thank you, Rudy. Here, Ron -- perhaps you ought not leave the table. Evan -- go ahead, please.

Evan: Actually, I just wanted to give maybe a little bit of a more acceptable focus to Rudy's question.

Cheryl: That would be greatly appreciated. Thank you.

[laughter]

Evan: That's a different story.

Cheryl: Ladies and gentlemen… back to the focus. Thank you.

Evan: Oh, yes. Right.

One of the things that was discussed before you came in is that there is going to be a working group in here about things like registrations' rights documents. Not only what exists, but what we'd like to see exist.

I think one of the concerns that was expressed is that, "Well, our comments are right now being focused on the gTLD process." I wonder if there is a concern that the ccTLDs may consider themselves immune and oblivious to any assertions of registrant rights as a consumer issue.

I wonder what your comments are about that, as we move forward, in trying to put together some kind of charter on registrant rights.

Cheryl: Thank you, Evan. I guess it's important to note that some of the few places we've found reasonable efforts at industry self-regulation and registrant-rights protection are in the cc world. That's why it's important to get your either on-notice response or response now.

Ron: I'm the liaison between ccNSO and ALAC. The only cc that I represent is [inaudible]. Obviously, I cannot speak on behalf of all ccs.

I do understand what you just said. I also know that there is a huge difference between the way ccs operate. Don't forget that only 50% -- now 50%… It used to be very much less -- of all ccs even participate in the ccNSO.

I would like to think that those that do and are, are able to address these issues and be willing to address these issues. I know for a fact there are very many of us that will address them, because we do understand the real world. The real world is our clients -- our customers.

Obviously we can't speak for those that don't participate.

V: In the same respect that when we were talking, there was a concept that there were good players and bad players within the registrar community… the same thing may hold true, this way.

I'm just wondering, as we move forward, whether it's considered to be reasonable that when we're asserting things like consumer-related rights documents and things like that… It's reasonable to say that this applies to the cc community, as well as to the generic world.

Ron: Yet, this is one-sided, and you're trying to apply it to all worlds. I think that there is probably going to be some pushback.

If the ccs or even the ccNSO in this case are invited to participate in that work, I think you'd have a far better result.

Cheryl: In fact, one thing I was wondering whether we might task Rudy or your assistant, Ron, to do is… To look at the match between the current ccNSO members and where we have ALSs. It may, in fact, be a mismatch.

We might have an ALS in an area that you have yet to get a member in your SO. We might

find some neutralism that can be worked throughout that encouragement perhaps to come to your table.

Ron: Yes. I think that's an excellent perspective. I really do.

Cheryl: Sheila and then Rudy. Go ahead.

V: Yes. I'm not saying that… Just about half of the ccs participate in ccNSO. Is that a political [inaudible]? Is it because traditionally some countries -- like Russia and China -- have not been participating very much in ICANN meetings, and ICANN has not made an effort to include these countries?

Is it because those countries don't participate in ICANN that the participation [in/of] ccNSO and ccTLDs is limited?

Ron: I think you will find that there are certainly countries -- like China, for example -- that much of the world has problems with -- that are members of ccNSO. As to the reasons that there are not more members, I'm delighted to be able to tell you that we are increasing membership far more rapidly than ever before.

I think it was because many ccs didn't participate in ICANN and didn't know much about ICANN; they didn't want to. I think it's because they are now beginning to learn that there is a real reason to do so.

Another reason, I think, is because ccs thought that they would be required to spend lots of money to participate -- as well as being asked by ICANN for funding. And that the longer they'd stay away from it, the more money they could keep for themselves.

Indeed, many of them don't have any money. A lot of ccs make no money at all. A lot of them are essentially almost hobbies. They have bigger fights working with local governments, for example, than ever they do with ICANN or anyone else.

There are probably many, many reasons -- many of which I don't know -- but those are some of them.

Cheryl: Vanda -- go ahead.

Vanda: Just to state that that's one reason that the Fellowship Program tried to bring people from the ccTLDs all the time, when they cannot afford to move from their regions to participate in ICANN.

It was one big reason we started to [put this problem running]. To try to bring more.

Another issue that I'd like us to remember -- from the developing countries… Most of the ccs have very tough connections with their governments. Sometimes their priorities are driven by governments. Their governments.

For instance, to talk about IDN priorities… Probably the problem is not the case of Belgium, but anyway, in the case of Brazil, it's probably not their first priority. We really don't need it.

So we have a lot of things to do with the money they collected. Probably that was the priority.

I think it's very interesting to have a closer relationship with the ccs. I have been on the ccTLD in Brazil and also in [inaudible] and now in ALAC. There are a lot of common aspects of outreach and information to the public that is concerning to ALAC and is concerning to the cc.

A better effort to get together -- currently -- would bring more consistency for many, many ccTLDs around the world.

Cheryl: Thank you, Vanda.

I feel like we've butchered the table and grilled you around. But I'm really happy that we've got -- I think -- some opportunities to work together and see the mutualism of the SO and us as an AC. Perhaps strengthening on both sides.

Obviously, you two now have a project to do together. But I think that a little more open communication and dialogue… This is going to work incredibly well.

Any comments? You don't have to be at the table. One moment, Rudy. You don't have to be at the table to raise your hand. You can wave at me and I might be generous and notice you. Go ahead, Rudy.

Rudy: Just to conclude… I can confirm that in the last six months, a large number of ccTLDs became members of the ccNSO. I was just wondering myself, "Why all of a sudden so many are joining?" There was no specific reason mentioned why they were joining. That's probably one of the questions we have to bring up in the ccNSO meeting in the coming days.

Ron: I suppose it was the result of an outreach.

Cheryl: Yes. I think it's well done by the ccNSO. Their outreach work is obviously successful. Wouldn't it be nice if ours were equally good?

Olivier?

Olivier: Just as a matter of interest -- what percentage of ccs are now part of the ccNSO?

Ron: I said approximately 50%. I think that we have just reached 97 out of 220, I think. So it may be closer to 40 or 45%.

Cheryl: Thank you very much. Yes -- please go ahead.

Ron: If I may… My understanding is that… And I made this point in my report to the ccNSO last week. There are now or there were, 88 -- I think -- ALS representatives at the summit. Correct?

Cheryl: Yes. We had a couple drop out at the last minute, but yes.

Ron: I thought that was outstanding. I really did.

I noticed that there is a desire to get at least one ALS from every country. Wouldn't it be nice if we could maybe even join together enough to get that kind of representation in ccs as well?

Cheryl: I can't think of a more useful thing for two groups like ours to do. I think that gives us opportunities to leverage the different outreach techs that we have in different ways in civil society. Domain-name industry.

Many of us have connections to government, and yet in other cases, it's the cc that has the better connection to government. So I think there's a lot we could do there.

In Asia-Pacific, of course, there's a significant challenge. Just as there is in -- particularly -- Central Europe. That's an awful lot of countries that we still need to pick up an ALS in. The cc would be perhaps one of the few well-received entrés that we might expect.

We'll talk more on that, I suspect, Ron. Thank you. We'd better get to Chris Disspain and the powers that be, and see what they think of these wonderfully good ideas that we've come up with.

But the regions, too… I think there's an opportunity. I know this isn't specifically cc or ccNSO -- but we have regions that match the nicks. So APRALO and APNICK need to do more together. [FNICK and FRALO] need to do more, perhaps, talking to each other. Seeing where the mutualism and where regional meetings might be able to be leveraged.

So often we have people going to one thing and then another thing. Perhaps we could have those "things" running -- if not at the same time -- end-to-end. So they're discrete, but there are returns on energy and investment. Something I hope that the regional leaders around this table might think about.

Another thing for their agenda, at the end of the week. [laughter] I'm looking at Darlene, who's probably typing up the agenda as we're in the meeting.

V: [inaudible]

Cheryl: Excellent. Okay.

Yes, Evan. Go ahead.

Evan: I'm just curious to know around the table how much interaction there is at these meetings -- between people from At-Large and their respective national registries.

I know at most meetings, there is for instance, a meeting between SIRA and a very, very informal gathering between SIRA and the Canadian people that are here. I'm just wondering to what extent that extends to other people here.

Cheryl: Vanda -- go. Brazil? Brazil -- Australia? Put your hands up. I'll do a headcount. Okay -- obviously, we have Taiwan. We have England. We have --

Evan: So these are people that all are engaged with your national registries?

Cheryl: Yes. Which is looking pretty good. Really. What have we got? 15? 12 or 15 hands up? Excellent. So there's still a long way to the whole lot, though.

Ron: If I may… 15 out of what? 250?

V: Yes.

Cheryl: [inaudible] Yes.

Ron: I don't know whether -- Rudy -- have you…? I don't know whether Rudy had the opportunity to report, though. He was present at our last council meeting. He may have been surprised that I spent a large part of my report introducing ALAC to the ccNSO council.

Now obviously everyone on the council knows about it. But the point I was making is that many ccs do not. I even gave a history and showed the progresses being made. I think I made the important report that the progress has been accelerating, and that now ALAC has representatives of all regions. I think 120 ALSs have signed up.

I shouldn't have had to do that. Everyone on that committee or everyone on that board should have known. But I felt I had to do it because in my discussions with members, ALAC has not even been in their thinking. I think it's very important we change that.

Cheryl: Indeed. Perhaps if we start talking to them at their local structures, it will get that in their minds, because it's that "thinking globally and acting locally," again. Of course, I can't help but put on the record -- because I like doing those sorts of things…

We had a very similar conversation around the breakfast tables for our board breakfast at the summit, as well. There were a number of ICANN board members that quite literally were drawing diagrams to work out the relationship between the At-Large structure and RALO and the ALAC.

Ah -- thank you, Patrick!

Patrick: Yes. I just wanted to point out that I guess many of us around the table interact with their local ccTLDs. Not necessarily with an ALAC or an ALS hat on, but with another hat.

There are [inaudible] reasons. For example, we interact with our local ccTLD with the ISO Luxembourg Chapter hat on. The fact that the chapter has become an At-Large structure is something that happened well after we started having relations with the ccTLD operator. So they might not know that much about ALAC.

I would also like to point out that there are many ccTLDs that are not part of ccNSO.

Cheryl: Yes. That's something that perhaps we can all move forward and try to encourage more full interaction from the global point of view. Dev?

Dev: Yes. Just more or less when they said that "informally" interacting… I was just interested to know how it's done, so that work could be done from my space.

As you pointed out, the understanding of ALAC is almost minimal. It's like it's some kind of [inaudible]. ALAC is regarded as some kind of [Kellogg Cereal].

[laughter]

V: [inaudible] asking [inaudible]

V: Okay. What I'm basically asking is that when some of you are already doing that… Question Number 1 is -- "If you could just highlight how it's being done." When you said "informally."

Second is that then in such a case to see how ALAC could structure something for some level of information through the ccTLD -- or some level of teleconference if someone is interested.

Cheryl: We might look at those in reverse order. The last one's simpler.

What we're doing right here and now -- working with Ron -- working with our liaison into the ccNSO -- and as a group, getting the regional leads to connect is a hugely important point.

The other one, I think… If we could take on-notice… In some ways, it fits with participation. It's not that it's difficult. It's just that I've got to speak in queue.

I think what Patrick was saying… Many of these At-Large structures became At-Large structures, but they've already got a history with the ccTLD in the area. That's, I think, not uncommon. Particularly when you've got an ISOC -- an Internet Society Chapter -- that has then become a…

It might be a matter of meeting different needs in different ways. Yes. Evan and then Mark.

Evan: Right. But as we go forward with outreach, I'm saying…

Adam -- did you want to go first?

Evan: I was just saying, "As we end up doing more outreach, the point behind At-Large is to get more and more people that haven't traditionally been involved in Internet governance. So that's going to dilute further.

But I wanted to answer in two different ways.

In the case of Canada, it was simply that SIRA actually sought out people. In fact, for a couple of meetings, they kept forgetting to invite me. I ended up finding out through Darlene and Alan and others.

But they've actively sought us out -- which was very fortunate.

Perhaps it might be worthwhile suggesting at a future meeting to have… And maybe this can't be done formally in meeting rooms, but there aren't many people involved…

To have -- say -- five meetings where you have each of the regions have all of the At-Large people that are at the meeting together with all of the cc registries that are at the meeting. To bring them together into five different rooms.

Then at least on a regional level, they could discover each other. Part of this is a matter that they don't even know each other exists.

As you said -- ALAC isn't on the radar. Perhaps there's an informal over lunch. Just get everyone together on an informal level.

The Canadian meeting -- which traditionally I think is Thursday nights… It's not formal at all. It's going out to dinner.

It's as much a matter of getting to know you on that level. There's very little formality that I've come across.

Cheryl: Thanks for that, Evan. In fact, I had an immediate moment of, "Let's do a lunch," and actually have the one room with the five regions broken up, and we'd call that our ccNSO and ALAC bilateral," for that particular meeting.

I'm going to get Adam. I very, very naughtily didn't look far enough to my right. Then it's Mohamed and then you, Dev.

Adam: Very much in a similar sort of vein… I think the problem is that we are regionally organized, but we're not nationally organized, as such. Whereas I know Hiro Hotta very well from JPRS, the relationship has nothing to do with an ALS in Japan, which happens to be Izumi Aizu organized ALS. And of course, Izumi Aizu works very closely with Hiro Hotta from JPRS. But not as a national connection from the RALO to the ALS.

So, keeping it at the RALO level is probably going to work. But we're not nationally structured. ALSs are not national entities, necessarily. That is a bit of a disconnect in that sense. We don't have a ccTLD-to-ALS match, so regional probably makes sense.

Also, we do actually have relationships with other regions. I know [inaudible] better than I know any European ccTLD, for example.

Cheryl: [inaudible]?

Mohamed: Yes. Also, if you look to most of our ALSs… They're going through our ISOC chapters. For example, ISOC runs the ccTLD. There's a room where ISOC chapter or ALSs could integrate and provide feedback in terms of ccTLD policy development nationally. But they need to be proactive.

In some countries, the ccTLD reaches out to the Internet users or organizations or the [ALS]s or the ISOC chapters. In other countries, that might not b happening for different reasons.

We need to also get the ALSs engaged on the national level, at least -- or be interested in participating in positive development related to the cc in their countries.

Cheryl: Thank you, Mohamed.

I think one of the things that you just said there… We might need to revisit that when we have our ISOC chapters and ICANN meeting later, as well.

We need to be very careful that we encourage as many non-technically based ISOC-type ALSs in. We've got to get out there and just get communication consumers involved, as well as the purely technical.

I know ICANN is a technical world, but the matters of fast-fluxing abuse of the DNS, and things like post-domain expiry exploitation is something that isn't hitting you at a technical level. It's hitting you as an end-user.

I think we need to make sure that we bring everyone -- representatives-wise -- with as wide a background as possible. The advantage of having a mix, of course, between something like an ISOC chapter and other ALSs. The ISOC chapter with its more technical focus can sometimes put into simple language some of the bizarre and peculiar things we're asked to comment on.

I think we can find roles for the different types of ALSs, and perhaps do a little bit of matching up there, as well. Go ahead, Dev.

Dev: I just wanted to say that maybe the simplest thing for ALS is to actually simply just contact the ccTLD operator. Just do an e-mail interview. It doesn't have to be a meet-in-person type of thing. Just to send them a question and say, "Hey -- could you please answer these questions? We're interested about our ccTLD." That's something that with the [inaudible] computer society should work very well.

Cheryl: A little outreach marketing. Very successful story. Good to hear.

I have Sébastien and then you, Patrick.

Sebastian: Thank you.

Just a few points. The first is that we have a good relationship between ISOC France and the [FNICK]. One of our members is both a member of [FNICK] and it's the case in some other countries.

It's not historical. We were elected as an [FNICK] open to the end users. The personal end users. To buy domain name two or three years ago. We decided to become members, and as a member of [FNICK], we were elected board members.

My second point is, I think it's very important to try to set up those links at the regional level. Even if we are talking about cc, now, I would like to open that to other organizations that are also national representatives -- to speak about GAC. It's also important that we try to set up those links.

I'm sure that it could be a good way to have one set up together, and not just 2 and 2 that could be GAC, ccNSO and At-Large coming together to have discussions at the regional level -- and the national level, if possible. Thank you.

Cheryl: That of course is very much along keeping of where we were headed at the end of our AUDA. The country-code regulator here in Australia. The Internet governance seminar yesterday was talking about getting governments more actively involved.

Of course, that means an automatic link between civil society -- which our ALSs very often or most often representatives of. The ccs and the governments. Yes. I think that's essential.

Is there anyone else that wishes to speak on this topic now? Sorry -- Patrick! How could I forget you darling? Just wave at me. Put your red light on and I'll see you properly.

Patrick: Yes. Thank you, Cheryl.

I just wanted to point out that… Regarding ALS involvement and relations with ccTLDs… There are -- I think -- as many different models as there are ccTLDs. In the sense that some ccTLDs want to reach out formally to their local community. They want representatives from different groups. Be it industry or individual users.

Some are more -- I would say -- government-focused. They do not have a formal process to involve the local groups. Some may have a strict process to determine which group is representative of which part of the community.

So it might be an ALS or it might be another group. It's also because the local organizations have to volunteer to become an ALS. We do not force anyone to become an ALS.

Although ALSs can partner with their local ccTLD, what I mean is that at the end, the way the local community is built and represented within ccTLD is a model that varies -- from one country to another.

I don't think that we would be able to have a model we could, for example, suggest to the cc. If only for the fact that many ccTLDs are not ccNSOs and don't want to be. For political reasons.

Cheryl: I think it definitely comes back to looking at what we can do regionally and within our capabilities, here. Yes. I'm pointing to you, now.

Nick: Okay. Sorry. You never seem to look right. That's all right.

Vs: [inaudible]

Nick: No. It means they're much more attractive over on that side of the table.

Cheryl: [inaudible]

Nick: Sorry, gentlemen down here.

I was going to say that…

One of the common things that -- I think Patrick, you're absolutely right… But one of the common things that the ccTLDs do have is the notion of the local Internet community. So whom do we proactively say that an ALS could become a helpful mechanism for representing

local Internet communities. Each one will define it in a different way, because we can't tell them what a local Internet community is.

But perhaps, as we seek new ALSs, there would be something mutually helpful there that would say, "Well, we're looking for ALSs. You're looking for local Internet community. Could you help us find something that would potentially be an ALS?" Do you see where I'm trying to go with that?

If there's something that we could work out together… Whether the ccNSO liaisons could somehow put that into English and represent that to the ccNSO… There is an opportunity for some mutual benefit. Perhaps we can somehow look to create ALSs that could become supporting local Internet community organizations.

Cheryl: Go ahead, Ron.

Ron: Thank you. I love the idea.

I have to tell you, I will be making a report to the ccNSO on Thursday of this week. Anything that you want brought to that report, please let me have it in writing. I will have to edit it down, I'm sure. But please let me have it in writing before then, so that I can bring it to the meeting.

The ccNSO meeting -- at an ICANN meeting -- does include a lot of ccs that make it to the ICANN meeting.

Our board meetings and teleconferences that I attend all the time… It's just the ccNSO. It's not the ccs. So this is a very important forum. It's a very good opportunity to get your needs and wants and your good ideas -- which I've heard here today -- to the ccs that are attending.

Cheryl: Thank you, Ron. Evan?

Evan: What proportion of the ccTLDs would you say -- at this point -- may not have that much of an interest in their local community? I'll use as an example Montenegro -- from whom we've been getting swag in our bags and things like that.

When I got the material that was in our bag and it said, "Oh. You want to register with dot-me? There isn't any indication on there that that's Montenegro. I'm wondering how much engagement they have with their local community, when it seems that they're trying to sell to a global audience.

[laughter]

Ron: Obviously that's a question that I can't answer. What you've just described, I'm sure, is a marketing operation that's aimed at something way beyond Montenegro. They're using the two-letter code as a way of marketing their sales of domain names.

I believe they should be marketing locally, and I believe they should also be doing something quite different -- which is what we're discussing -- and that is relating to their local community. I don't think the two are mutually exclusive, but I certainly don't think that what you've just described has anything to do with what we're talking about.

Cheryl: Go ahead, Beau.

Beau: Yes. I just wanted to call everybody's attention to this link that I've put up, here. If you haven't read that report, it specifically answers questions that are being discussed now. Including 20.

I was interested to learn that Cuba, in fact…   The Cuban domain is run out of the United States. That might be a really good thing for you to read before your meeting.

Cheryl: Thank you for that. Perhaps for those of you -- for reasons of connectivity or browser choice are not in the Adobe Connect Room -- could someone copy that across into the Skype Chat as well?

We've yet to find the perfect system for remote participation. Different parts of the world are more or less friendly to different tools. Different browsers work better with other things. Some browsers just can't get to Skype at all. So we've got this hybrid system until somebody comes up with a better Babelfish. Thank you, Ron. Go ahead.

Ron: I was just asked for my e-mail address. I'm going to give it to you verbally so that everyone has it. Please contact me. You can get me at Ron -- which is my first name -- @ Sherwood -- which is my last name -- dot -- VI.

Cheryl: V for Victor and I for India.

Nick: Those of you who have the ALAC contact information spreadsheet will find Ron's details in that, too.

Cheryl: And we'll pop it into the Adobe Connect link, won't we?

I know I've just happened to take a slight tangent, but could I just say how productive I feel this interchange has been? I think this is very much about how we are going to be developing ourselves, our ALSs and our policy. How we're going to get fresh -- and really important to not just our own working groups, but also the plethora in the future of working groups that we're going to want real people and real end-user involvement in, coming out of the restructured gNSO.

We really do need to expand our member base for reasons of sanity, as well as survival. I don't think short of cloning that the people we have in the current workgroups could do much more than they do. But more work will come our way.

What we're thinking of here and discussing now is very, very important to get not just one type of At-Large structure, but an At-Large structure in every single country would be quite a benchmark to hit.

Ladies and gentlemen, is there anything else on this topic at this time?

Yes. Please go ahead, Sebastian. Is there anyone else lining for the queue? If not, then, Sébastien, you'll be the last speaker on this.

When he leaves, I'd like to thank Wendy for her contribution and time. Have you got all the links you need to do the post-summit report?

Wendy: Yes.   I have very helpful links from the [inaudible] document.

Cheryl: Excellent. Okay. Thanks very much. Thank you very much, Wendy. We always appreciate when you can sneak in.

Sebastian: Before you leave… it's one of the topics we would like to discuss with the board members on our breakfast -- this post-summit issue. You can bring also that as a topic. We would like to exchange with them.

Cheryl: Yes. Tabletop talk at breakfast would be post-summit. But go ahead. [They haven't] done any homework, because you've briefed them. Thank you very much, Wendy.

Sébastien, I'm sure you…

Sébastien: Just a very small word. I don't recall any liaison from another group coming to us. I think it's a good… I don't know if it's a beginning, but for me, it's the first time I have somebody like you coming as a liaison from another group. I think it's a very good opportunity to exchange with you.

I hope that the other [ASOSE] and so on and so forth will do the same in the future. Thank you very much, to open this door. Very interesting.

Cheryl: Indeed. Thank you.

More importantly, we will give you a vote of thanks. [Ron says all] hands up to our daily conferences. He does keep a finger on what we're doing. If there is a best-practice benchmark on what a liaison is to the ALAC, we're looking at it here and now.

On that glowing, glowing description of you, I'd actually like to thank Ron for his very brave contribution to step up to the table and do the [vetting]. Thank you so much.

Audience: [applause].

Cheryl: Okay. Yes. Go ahead, Evan.

Evan: I wonder if Alan's getting the same reception over there.

Cheryl: Actually, no -- Alan is very much a valued part of the gNSO community. He actually ends up with far too much work because he's such a valued member of the gNSO community. He does so much drafting and ends up in so much wordsmithing that I really wonder how he does it, sometimes.

Evan: I didn't mean that in a bad way.

Cheryl: No, no. Oh, yes. We sent Alan out. We're just appreciating the talent we've seen sent back. [laughter]

Now we do have a little time before lunch. We have exactly 30 minutes. Yes. Sorry. Go ahead. Ron and then Patrick.

Ron: If I may… Rudy attends our meetings. Rudy attends our teleconferences. But we're ccNSO -- not gNSO. I think Rudy is in the same position that I'm in. Essentially, we feel that we're observers. I've been invited to the table here rather than being an observer, and actually asked for opinions -- which I don't even know that I'm qualified to give.

I would very much like to see -- currently -- Rudy participate verbally in our meetings. I think that way at least we -- "We," being the ccNSO -- or rather the "other" members of ccNSO. We'll get a much great insight into ALAC than a simple report from me.

Cheryl: Indeed. Of course it's this blending of cultures. The liaisons are set up at different points in various of our [acnso] developments and histories.

Some of us have come from a much more open base, and some not so open. So how the liaisons have been -- other than the bylaw-mandated liaisons. Those clearly have been put there for very good reasons.

But the non-bylaw-mandated liaisons… We tend to try to encourage people to play by local rules, in other peoples' houses. If you'd like to encourage your house to look at its rules [wrong], that would be greatly appreciated. [laughter] And I'll do more than my best to help you on that.

Okay -- Patrick -- what is it about this lack of red light? I'm like [half-log-dog and a bill]. You need to make the light enough so I can recognize you.

Patrick: One of these days I will be coming at you.

Cheryl: I hope that doesn't happen. I would hate to need to make you angry. I apologize for not noticing you, again.

Patrick: Well, after [inaudible] right now, but I'm the spokesperson of a remote participant in this case. Alejandro wanted to point out with regard to the noon report on ccTLDs that are being run from outside the country. Cuba was mentioned. Indeed, the DNS service for Cuba is run in the US and in Europe. But that does not mean that the policy for the ccTLD is done outside of Cuba, obviously.

There are many ccTLDs that have a name service outside their country. Actually, it's a technical requirement. Even for some countries that do not have sufficient bandwidth -- all of their name services are outside the country. That's all.

Cheryl: And it's in the end-users' best interest that they are exactly where they are. The redundancy resiliency is built into the system. Thank you for reading that into the record. I'd encourage anyone on any of the chats… If you see something in the Adobe Chat that needs to be read into the record, please put your light on and do so. The same for the Skype Chat.

We now still have 25 minutes in a time, which is not all that generous. I'd like to look at exactly where you'd like to head our conversation with the regional leaders right now.

We do have a couple of working groups which by necessity need to be thinking about and feeing into currently open consultation documents. That is something we've got later in the day. But if there's nothing else in your list of things to do in the next 25 minutes, could I perhaps move to discussion of post-JPA environment? Improving institutional competence?

A couple of those topics, I think, would take a larger amount of time. We could get them started now before lunch. Is that something the meeting's happy to do? Yes? Yes? Okay.

In which case, the leads from those particular workgroups need to mentally prepare themselves -- as I'm looking across at Sébastien. [laughter]

When we have so much going on right now… Yes… We are going to have various public workshops. But it's important that patricianly the regional leaders have time to perhaps Skype -- or at least going out to their regional lists and their ALSs and get some real feedback that they may be able to bring to the microphone in the next few days.

JPA. To JPA or not to JPA. That is the question. [How long]?

Sebastian: That's a good question.

Unfortunately, I don't have my crystal ball here. It was left with my two bottles of whiskey -- sorry -- champagne -- in some ugly place where they think that Australian people can't drink any champagne from France. You are not allowed to bring them with you. So I left all of that in [inaudible]. I hope that somebody takes the advantage to drink.

Maybe they will be able to read in the crystal ball for the future.

I guess it's important to discuss here that it's not too much what we feel will happen, but what we would like to happen. We can't know what will happen. It's a little bit tricky.

But what's interesting from my point of view is that if you read -- for example -- what we write in our report… 1 point was about internationalization. That's an important point regarding the future of ICANN. It was to read it in different ways. Really up to now, it was saying that -- for example -- one way to internationalize is to share the different top-executive job. Place of incorporation. Bureaus and some other important duties -- GAC-share and ALAC-share -- amongst the region.

The situation is… We are coming… My point of view is that we are going back with the future decision we don't know about yet. We have not yet the name of the new CEO. But my feeling is that it will fall into the basket of one single country.

That's not what we think was important to do as a way to internationalize the ICANN process as a whole. It's one point.

The second is when we look at internationalization. We really need better and a lot more documents in different languages.

The last raffle of documents we received before departure this time -- 10 days ago -- was great. Because we were [inaudible] before the meeting.

But it's not at all giving us the possibility to really outreach our community, because it was just done in a single language. That's the second point regarding the real internationalization of ICANN.

Then coming back to the GPA… What we feel. Is it time to release? I say we always say, "Yes." But are we ready or is ICANN ready? Are we ready as a member of the ICANN community to be part of this? Will it really be listened to and participated with in that discussion? Or is there still some work to be done? And which types of jobs need to be done?

I see that the post-JPA has three possibilities. One is nothing is done, and there is no new JPA sign or follow-up of the JPAs -- and ICANN is left to live its own life. Or there is a JPA-post point for months or years. I didn't say years.

Or there is another document. But once again, it's not what we feel will happen, but what we would like to happen in the next few months.

I don't know if all of you heard about the possibility. It's not at all official, but there's a possible new CEO. I think it's an important point to know if it's really the one everyone says that it will be. It's somebody that's a US man who was in charge of the Homeland Security before joining ICANN.

From my point of view, it's a strange way to go, for ICANN. I don't speak about the man, at all. I am sure he is a very good man and a brilliant man and the one we need. But as an image, it's for me a big question in this pre-JPA [inaudible] situation.

I will stop here and open the discussion. Obviously I just touched on two or three issues around this [inaudible] subject. But feel free to open other venue on that discussion and to tell us what you think about…

V: Thank you, Sébastien. I guess we have Adam. Before that, just to add some background… At the least [hard], the new CEO left the Security because the Homeland group wanted to put this center of cyber-security under his control. He thought it was too much for them to have this so close. This is a positive point on that. That's the only thing that I could mention about [hard] here.

Anyway, I would like to hear Adam.

Adam: Yes. I was a bit concerned by that. I was very concerned by the recommendation to make jobs and chairs and all the other senior positions within ICANN somehow regionally dependent. I thought sharing amongst the regions was actually quite naïve. Instead of internationalizing, it would actually politicize the organization to an extent that would turn it into any other inter-governmental organization with over-complicated rules. Where rather than looking for the best person, you end up with people who have regionally lobbied for positions and so on.

Actually, one of the reasons I abstained from that vote was because I couldn't support that particular motion. I thought it was just a mistake. I couldn't support that, and I should have said so in the drafting process -- but I missed it. That's really one point.

The other thing about the person who seems to be the new CEO is that if you look deeper into his background, he has a very broad support for a lot of international activities. I think wherever we're going, for something like that, it's someone who's shown support for international work. I don't know who he is, but I can say that the biography I've seen has a mixture of skills. Some of it is international and some is not.

Cheryl: Yes.

Vanda: Just to share with all of you…

I had an opportunity to present some position in the [inaudible] in China. It's what I think about could be more opened up in that seem time -- to give more comfort to the governments. Maybe to have a focus on the GPA general open agreement. Where all the governments could sign up.

Just to give the first step forward, to become really international but not government-dependent. It's very important to think about governments feel about the Internet. Not to give a hand on that. It's very difficult to present themselves to their congress, for instance.

My suggestion would be to have an open letter to any government that wants to sign a focus on security, for instance -- and stability. Just that. They could sign. It probably could give some comfort to the governments around the world. This could be one movement in the direction of the international.

[Once] we could have another American on a board that I hope in the end of this year will be more international than it is right now. Mostly it's European and Americans -- with the CEO that's American or English-dependent in some way. Probably, we need to change a little bit this spirit. Or we're going to have some kind of problems around the world. Considering the continuous influence of American government on that.

That's just to share my position paper I presented internationally on that issue. Specifically, how to go post-JPA.

I do believe that the US government will open up and won't sign another JPA. That's my point. Once they have the CEO, that's enough.

Those are some points to share with you and have you think about or [confessed]. Thank you.

V: My only point about the JPA is that so far, it has remained one of the few "or else" things that have existed for us to wave over ICANN. For instance, we've noticed with issues such as the gTLD process, while ICANN appears to be going in one direction, it was the Department of Commerce that said very clearly that some of the more absurd things that they wanted to do were not acceptable.

Even though we'd been saying that for a long time and got ignored, the DOC stepped in and said, "You can't do that."

Now, they're not totally our friends. It was the DOC that pressed ICANN to create this wonderful entity, the IRT. So it hasn't all been great. However, it has been at least something of a vehicle of last resort for some of the consumer-related things that have been important to us.

Of course, I would love for ICANN to be able to consider that in advance of needing somebody else to wave a stick at them. But it's an unfortunate reality, it seems, that ICANN almost needs this kind of parental oversight as a method of last resort.

Cheryl: I'm not sure… If I may just jump in more as a participant and less as a chair. By speaking, I would like to say very much from an Asia-Pacific perspective… Not necessarily an Australian one.

Form of oversight would be seen by the majority of our countries in our region as an essential part. If it does anything with the important job that ICANN has -- whatever structure and function. As long as the function is the security, stability, naming and numbering. You can add resiliency in there, as well. We'd want to see some form of not necessarily "parental" control… and certainly not just there for the joy of waving big sticks at things. But rather more to have an established multinational, recognized, multi-stakeholder oversight committee of some sort.

Without that, I can be fairly confident to say there would be large parts of the regulation I represent with extremely large numbers of Internet users -- either on or yet to get on the Internet -- who would be, to say the least, uncomfortable if not outright split off and, "do our own thing."

V: Which begs the question… If we're talking one way and the other about accountability… Ultimately, accountable to whom?

Cheryl: You've got -- I think -- fairly great opportunities. ICANN has a few other excellent models. Many of us come from experiences… i.e… ETF et cetera, that has genuine multi-stakeholder interests, and some very bottom-up ways of doing it.

But ICANN does see itself as somewhat of a rare beast in its multi-stakeholder model. It's nowhere near perfect, but it's actually further along than a number of other like… There isn't a terribly perfect fit of an exact-like type of organization. But if you look at other international-level organizations with certain types of responsibility, they're not looking at as getting the edges into…

Red Cross and all these types of organizations are still very much top-down. That's obviously something in our best interests that we want to avoid, if we're not going to stifle innovation and opportunity on the Internet.

V: My only answer to that would be, "Ask me again after we get our voting reps on the board."

Cheryl: Which, of course, is halfway on the way of happening.

Go ahead.

Vanda: Yes. Just to remember that we need to in some way discuss a little bit about the hearing of [Paul] in the Congress. Certainly it's applying to that, probably. We have this debate with the board on that. Yes.

I believe this could be an interesting point to explore.

Cheryl: Vanda -- if I may -- you're proposing that it becomes a topic for discussion. Specifically that becomes a topic for discussion at our board breakfast. Is that what you're proposing?

V: I think that it could be something that they will intend to. So I believe probably we need to have at least some points that we believe are interesting or not or whatever. But I guess it's a point we need to talk about.

Cheryl: You were doing this at me. Yes?

Nick: In that connection… Lest I forget… Of course, there is a meeting with the structural improvements committee of the board, to discuss the issue of election or appointment otherwise by At-Large of board seats. To discuss the various issues that surround that. It relates to various reviews. They have interlocking relationships with one another.

You may also get that at the board breakfast. The board is ultimately going to consider a proposal from the SIC. There may be board members who wish to discuss your thoughts on how At-Large could go about selecting directors that would be an asset to the board.

You may also wish to refer to part of the translation of the commerce committee hearings that were just referenced by Vanda. The chairman of the commerce committee actually brought up the number of directors on the ICANN board who represented the consumer interest, as a question to Paul Twomey. There was an exchange related to that. So you may wish to familiarize yourself with the exchange.

Cheryl: Can we put that link up into the Adobe Room? Thank you. Can someone duplicate that into the Skype chat, then?

Is everyone aware that when we have these breakfasts -- and they're all on our schedule… I really do want to see as many of you as possible on those. Go ahead, Adam.

Adam: I was wondering if we were going to try to have… Oh, I'm sorry… I was just trying to steal it. I was just wondering if we were going to try to have any consistent messages for this board breakfast, or whether we were just going to have random thoughts. That might be confusing for the board.

I don't think we have to all say exactly the same thing. But something that's reasonably consistent would be helpful.

Cheryl: Go ahead, [inaudible]

V: When is the board breakfast? It's not on the schedule.

Nick: It's not on the public schedule because there is free food involved.

[laughter]

There was a feeling that if it were on the public schedule, people other than those that are in this room on ALAC or on the Regional Secretariats might come for breakfast. It's Thursday morning -- from 7 to 8 am, I believe, Mateus. Is that correct?

Cheryl: If you want to also put up the [url].

Nick: We will also send a note to ALAC internal with the coordinates.

Cheryl: And I really would like to see you all there. If you're ALAC or a regional lead, I mean.

Nick: One thing I should note is, there will be a few directors that have to be at a parallel meeting. There will be a few who are not there, but most are expected. Then immediately after is the public forum.

Cheryl: The major topic that we thought -- if we had table topics -- to come back to Adam's point -- is a follow-on from the summit. The only other one that we also felt would be while in the [Guernsey] to discuss the ALAC review.

They're about to get a set of documents that are going to be making recommendations that we'll have to consider. That's what we were just discussing then with exactly how we… Assuming that they do give us voting board members… how they're to be best appointed.

It's going to be a work-in-process. Though at this stage, I don't think we could have a unified voice on the latter. But we certainly could have fairly unified voices on the former -- because we've put those summit statements through as voted on, and authorized statements. Yes, Adam?

Adam: I thought there was one more issue -- which would be the role or the increased participation of consumer organizations within ICANN, and how we could encourage that to happen. To get the board…

Obviously, it's an important issue, because it keeps on coming up. Whether it's in the gNSO representation or ALAC or -- as it now sounds -- from the commerce committee. How does the board propose to do that? And are they willing to put resources into it? If they don't put resources into it, it won't actually happen.

That would be something to ask them about, as opposed to telling them, "Our opinion is 'X'."

Cheryl: I think what will tend to happen -- providing we've got a nice mix of board members and ALAC and RALO leads on each table… It's fairly predictive of what we're going to be saying on most of these things. And in the latter, in terms of how we might be able to look at the appointment and well-balanced non-captureable -- and yet, still-accountable -- appointment of an ALAC/At-Large voting board member. And then a second, hopefully.

That's something that I think everyone recognizes is going to take a lot of work. But we actually start that conversation at that table.

I guess what we want to then decide is… it's not an enormous amount of time, and they are actually enormous subjects. Do we want to have a couple? Maybe one and an alternative question -- randomly assigned to tables. We won't all try to do all things. Is that something you'd prefer to do?

Or do you want to try to… Rather than go there an agenda, "Oh dear -- we've got to stop now because there's one more on our list…" Yes. Go ahead, Sébastien.

Sebastian: I think we need to concentrate to one issue. If not, it will be too short to discuss each issue. Also, maybe we are more concerned or more involved in one issue than the other. It could be also more productive for both ALAC, At-Large and the board to have focused discussion on one table -- on each table. Thank you.

Cheryl: All right. If no one else objects to that, we'll take that onboard. [inaudible] Staff will have of course captured every word we've said in terms of the topics. There'll be clever little pieces of paper put on the tables. I guess as long as we're going to all fight over the tables with our favorite topics, some people just have to have something you may not like best of all.

Go ahead, Adam.

Adam: Or fight for our favorite board members who actually might be… Whatever… They're different people.

V: Is this still being put straight out to radio?

V: Yes.

Adam: They're all lovely people, and it's very nice that they're all board members. I've completely forgotten what I was going to say.

Cheryl: That's possibly a very good thing!

V: [laughter]

V: Very valuable.

Cheryl: When you get a moment, you've got the mic back. Oh, dear.

We're at the hour where luncheon should begin. I just wanted to mention to you that -- yes -- he's thought of it.

Adam: Wow. Good lord. I'm sorry.

We usually have visitors from the board to the formal ALAC meeting. Is that on the agenda this time? Or are they not coming? Are we just down to a breakfast?

Cheryl: We're down to a breakfast.

Adam: Thank you.

Cheryl: After lunch, if you can all be back here… You've got 90 minutes and an enormous amount of opportunity and possibilities. I would really like if you can to be back just a few minutes before 1400 hours -- 2 PM. Kieren McCarthy is our first speaker, and he's undoubtedly going to be wanting to do more interaction -- rather than a presentation, as such.

Looking at public participation and At-Large, this is how we're… particularly through the next week. Not so much at our meetings here. How are our people getting in remote participation? How are we using the chatrooms? What else should we be? Do we want Tweets Tweeked? What is the story? What are the possibilities. And it's the more formal commentary standard boilerplate ICANN participation, as well.

So -- there aren't particular limitations on your conversation. Just take the exploration where you will.

I will be in absentia. I'm not going to be here. Absentia is not another place. Well actually, it is another place.

V: [inaudible]

Cheryl: It's another state. It's another state of mind.

As you know, Alan's commitments to gNSO means that he's usually in their room rather than ours, on days like these. Because we've been more and more involved in the work teams -- the work group work team is the one I represent. This part of our organization. So I will be in the gNSO room from 1 PM to 3 PM.

During that time, I'm going to ask Sébastien if he would be so kind as to do the chairing throughout Kieren's part. If my chance with a rush of blood to the head, the discussion goes a few minutes beyond the 3.00, we'll give Vanda the…

Vanda: I have an OSC meeting.

Cheryl: What time?

Vanda: From 2 to 3.

Cheryl: From 2 to 3. So if you come in at 3, then that can give you a break. I'll turn up when I turn up.

It's important you know that what we're talking about in this work team is exactly how the policy-development processes the charters that your At-Large structural representatives and others in the community that you'll be encouraging… what sets of rules they're going to be playing with.

So I apologize for my absence this afternoon, but having two vice-chairs means that they can share the job.

The other thing I'd just like to mention to you before we finish is that when we come back after afternoon tea -- again -- if we could be quite tight on our return terms. So -- just in case… that return time from the mid-afternoon break really has to be kept quite tight. Every one of the ISOC chapter members has to have a hard stop of these meetings, so we can get ready for our next ones. We cannot let this agenda sit.

Other than that -- sorry about the weather. There is a bit of sunshine out there. Stretch your legs and enjoy Sydney's hospitality. You've all experienced vegemite and the Lamington, so there's a little more joy in your lives. Thank you all so very much. I'll be seeing you a little later this aft. 5 to 2, back here. Good afternoon.

V: Okay. Thank you.

Audience: [applause]

[session ends]