Transcription of ALAC and Regional Leadership Working Session 21 June 2009 – Sydney – Part 3

Cheryl: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Those of us in the room, we'll begin the meeting. Those who are not in the room would do wise to join us.

[laughter]

Unlike a lima or a camel, I rarely [skid] -- and if I do, it's usually nails.

[inaudible]

Yes, I could make them eat vegemite. That would be a punishment. Right.

Noting that we're starting a little into a compressed schedule, this afternoon, I'm now very pleased that we started to work on this document this morning. That is, looking at the currently open-and-coming public consultations.

If we could drill down into that document, then… That is the joyful spreadsheet. Thank you. All ready! Let's have a deep and meaningful discussion about this. How realistic it is -- how you as regional leaders will be using it. How the ALAC will be involved in making sure that we have a lead that's bringing back to us -- directly into our deliberations the work that's going on in the work group.

I'm assuming that you've all spent all of your lunch wondering how you're going to engage your At-Large structures in this process. But I'm looking forward to hearing those plans.

If we take them through -- obviously -- some we've missed… This is a question, to staff… Have we invited the ALAC? All of those individuals to be editors on this? If we're doing that, would the ALAC like to be editors or not?

Nick: We haven't, as yet, invited anyone that hasn't requested it, on the basis that the page is actually republished every 5 minutes -- or whenever an edit is performed -- if you go to the Policy Calendar address.

Of course, there's no obstacle to adding people if you wish to be added. Some people have requested to be added.

Cheryl: I guess I'm looking for the feeling of the meeting, as to whether or not we should require certain people. For example, I would've thought the leads from the ALAC into any of these working groups… it might be practically mandatory for them to subscribe. Is that the feeling of the ALAC and indeed the regional leaders? Did the regional leaders themselves want to opt-in or opt-out at their leisure?

Alan: Can you explain to us novices what "being an editor," means in this particular context?

Cheryl: Go ahead, Nick.

Nick: It means you can update the contents of the spreadsheet. What exactly are you…? Is that all you were asking, Alan?

Alan: Okay. So essentially, since we can't change the names of the consultations, we can put dates in them.

Nick: You would be able to change absolutely anything about the contents of this page, if you're an editor.

Alan: But us changing the name of a consultation doesn't change the consultation. So it's rather moot.

Nick: Yes.

Alan: It could be a lot of fun.

Audience: [laughter]

Cheryl: Yes. Not sure it'll get us very far, though. Go ahead, Evan.

Evan: Having been given access, it almost seems like there's going to be very, very little for myself or anyone non-staff to do, in actually changing this.

This is basically saying, "Here's the consultation. Here are the dates." The volunteers really aren't in any position to change anything about that.

So this is sort of a statement of, "This is the landscape. This is what you have to deal with."

In the wiki pages and the social text pages, we're going to be doing our wordsmithing and drafting or whatever. But the actual list of dates or whatever, I'd imagine, isn't going to change very much from the initial stuff that's first put in. Or do I have that wrong.

Cheryl: I recognize Darlene. But just in response to you, Evan -- yes and no. In fact, it's the tweaking of some of those milestone dates that I would see as very important, as a feedback exercise between the regional leads and the lead from the ALAC -- so we can give another three days, because it's needed -- or another month, or whatever.

Go ahead, Darlene.

Darlene: As well as being able to change the chair's or vice-chair's repertoire or ALAC focal point -- that sort of thing… Should people turn around so would don't have to bother you to do it?

Cheryl: I think -- seeing as… Does this system allow rollback on versions?

V: Yes.

Cheryl: Okay. Providing it allows rollback on versions, I have no problem. But if Mickey Mouse and Donald Duck end up running everything, I want to be able to go back and make it

real people. Just in case we have someone putting names that don't exist any more, for example.

If we give edit rights, you do have total edit rights. You can put anything in here. So we'd need to be able to. If you accidentally started sleeping…

If you fell asleep on your keyboard or put a book down on your keyboard and you got a whole lot of Zs, it would be important to get the data back. That's where I was going with that.

Go ahead.

V: [inaudible]

Cheryl: I think there are. If we can move across, then… Evan -- you wanted to say something?

Evan: …using this -- if you go to "tools…" If you go to "Tools," and at the bottom, there's… Okay. Then I'm… All right.

[laughter]

Evan: Sorry. Usually on "tools," it has something of a revision history that allows you to go back and do the backtracking.

I don't have that on mine, because right now, I'm just viewing.

Nick: It's under, "File."

V: Yes.

Evan: Yes. "Revision History."

Cheryl: We certainly don't want something as important as this having incidental deletes or whatever happening to it. But I think it's important that the people who are involved in the working group use it regularly, as a source.

You may wish to have a review of this as part of a standing agenda item at various regional meetings, for example. It might just be a good time to get back then from a RALO meeting, to say, "The 15th of June is absolutely unattainable because…" That way then the dates can be shifted.

Do we have… Is George wishing to say something to us out of the Adobe Room?

Okay. All right. Well, perhaps he left his hand up accidentally. That's already, then.

If we can go down through the ones that we actually need to do policy work on…

As you can tell, we're about to go into "Travel Policy." [laughter]

Just for those on the Adobe and the phone connect… We have Kevin Wilson and Steve [Antonov] joining us. We're now suspending our current agenda and moving to the time slot that's looking at travel policy.

If you could engage your brains -- Latin Americans, I hope you're ready to rock-and-roll. You've got a lot to say about travel policy, Latin America. Ready boys?

I just noticed this… it will be good when Sylvia gets here. It looks very non-gender-balanced in the region.

If we didn't have Vanda -- who's ours -- we'd be very concerned about the gender balance in your region. [laughter]

V: [inaudible]

Cheryl: Yes.

[laughter]

Do you have anything you want to project?

Kevin: Truth. Wisdom.

Audience: [laughter]

Cheryl: There's something achievable.

Kevin: Kindness.

Cheryl: Something achievable.

Nick: Let's be realistic, please.

Kevin: The answer is, "No." May I start? Good.

My name is Kevin Wilson. I think I know many of you. I'm the CFO for ICANN.

To my immediate left is Steve Antonov, who is our Director of Human Resources, and also the head of the administration department -- including travel administration.

As you know, we've been working very closely together. I think many of you probably know we share a wall. Our offices are literally next to each other. We've been working very closely on the travel administration and the travel guidelines.

Generally, I'm the one that's responsible for the impact to the budget and the guidelines. Steve is generally responsible for the travel administration -- getting the support of community members here, and adherence to those travel guidelines.

Steve and I made a concerted effort to work very, very closely together. I don't think there's a decision that either one of us have made independently. It's the Steve-and-Kevin show, or

the Kevin-and-Steve show. I'm really glad that both of us could come here. Between the two of us, we'll continue that process of ensuring that we have a unified front on all matters.

As most of you know, from the comments we received in Mexico City, and the feedback we received on the implementation of the first-ever ICANN travel procedure -- as it was posted last August… We synthesized many, many comments -- many insightful comments. Many from the people in this room, and others in the At-Large group.

We came up with what we believe is a fairly good effort at synthesizing the travel suggestions from the community. We posted that draft of the travel guidelines. I apologize, but I don't remember the exact date, but I think it as at the beginning of June, maybe.

That is scheduled for comment. The comment period of that is scheduled for closing about July 3rd or the beginning of July. I think it's July 5th or 6th, actually.

We're looking forward to getting further comments on that -- to ensure that when we post the final draft guidelines, that that reflects the best wisdom of the community.

I wanted to make a couple other points, and then hand it over to Steve.

Fiscal responsibility is my Number 1 concern. That's in my CFO DNA. As Steve and I joke back-and-forth, I'm the generally the one that says, "No." Though we've flipped that a few times.

Generally, I'm the one that says, "No," and he's the one that says, "Yes." Usually you get an answer somewhere in-between, depending on the situation.

Seriously, the fiscal responsibility is one thing. The desire for ICANN to perform successfully, and the noble mission that we all have to make it perform successfully -- it's really, really important. We realize that travel support is a key portion of that.

This isn't a travel club to go see exotic places in the world. This is a…

V: [inaudible]

Kevin: What's that?

V: Under the sun.

Kevin: Under the sun. That's right. Yes.

But to really bring the people that are making ICANN policy together as we see, here. We wanted to emphasize that.

On Monday afternoon at 6.00, I believe, we are going to have a presentation with Power Point slides of those travel guidelines. So we'd encourage you to come to that and provide your comments, as well as what you're doing, here. But provide comments on the guidelines.

We especially wanted to invite those from At-Large, because it's a really good opportunity to see the interplay between the various community groups that are supported by travel -- or not. To have their feedback on that.

I wanted to leave lots of room open for questions.

Steve -- would you like to share some comments about the travel support?

Steve: Thanks, Kevin.

I really came more to listen than to chat away. What you have to say is actually really important to me.

This travel support function really has been an evolving function for the organization. Just like ICANN itself is a living, breathing organization.

This is one of those areas where -- 3 years ago -- we really weren't moving very many people other than staff to ICANN meetings. Now we find ourselves moving well over 100 stakeholders/constituents.

We're learning along with you, and we want to do this together. So we came to hear you as well as to share with you what we're learning, as we try to make this process work better.

Cheryl: Thank you, Steve. It looks like we're ready to start a dialogue. So let's lead. I know the mandate has come from the At-Large structures for comment. Particularly pertaining to regional meetings, which I'm sure you're not surprised we've been bleating about for some time. But it's still getting some resistance.

Who is going to be spokesperson? Andrés or Carlos? Who wishes to… Andrés? Please go ahead.

Andrés: Gracias, Cheryl.

V: Thank you, Cheryl. On various occasions, we spoke about this vision from ACRALO. In recent times, we had the opportunity of participating in the summit at Mexico.

We have corroborated and understood the real importance of these regional meetings. We haven't issued any comments, apparently, because one of the statements Cheryl elaborated reflects that situation. We share this.

It's been discussed in the region, but this is something that's really important. The regional meetings. The exchange generated and the capacity building generated for people who are in the first initiation stage. It's very important.

Taking into account mainly that in case these meetings are carried out with an ICANN meeting, as it is convenient, regarding places and destinations, the moment a meeting is held in a region, RALO is present and other people are present.

There is an importance in interacting with everybody face-to-face, also -- to see how this works. How the discussion works with all the constituencies. To see really how the spirit of

many questions in translated documents or in a chain of documents is not that easy to understand. This has an added value which is very important.

In my case, I'm only a regional leader. It's not only now. And it's not a question of counting the results we had as a region. It's a moment to see the progress generated, here.

So I don't think other regional leaders can come and show us important results they achieved, but we can say that this is clear. These questions have to be confirmed.

Regional meetings where you can take advantage as much as possible. It's not an inflexible position. But you have to understand that this is what we think. It is very important.

This adds value to community. In my particular case, I had my first meeting two years ago. My first regional meeting. After that meeting, I couldn't go to all the meetings because of my other chores. Remote participation was not a good idea.

But having had a first experience two years ago, I had the possibility of being involved differently with this. So it's very important. This is what I want to say.

To stress the necessity of having -- in all regions -- at least once a year a regional meeting. Coinciding with ICANN meetings, it's even more fantastic. Or having it with a rare or another organization would be good, because it adds value. It's a value-added thing.

To be able to travel and share this space is something fundamental.

Kevin: Great. Thank you very much for that.

I think I understood all or most of that. The regional or the general assemblies are a really critical part of the process for the ICANN work, essentially.

I just wanted to clarify one thing. I'll take ownership for the confusion on that. We'll clarify that in the next draft. Nick shared with Steve and me recently proposed feedback on particularly the definition of the support.

I think the document right now looks like it's saying, "Either the RALOs come to the ICANN meeting or you have general assemblies." But not both.

So without saying, "Gee -- there's room for more," I want to be clear. I have to be fiscally responsible and not say, "Yes," to every travel request. I think that would be fiscally irresponsible.

I know all of us would love to have everybody that possibly could add value to come to the meetings. But it would just cost many, many, many millions of dollars to afford that.

Balancing that fiscal responsibility is very important. But in the final draft, assuming that you do send those suggestions as I saw in an earlier draft you were working on… We'll make the process and the definition of that clearer.

It's not an either/or situation. Steve and Nick will help me with the words. It will be an either one direction or the next direction or some combination. Some artful combination that's fiscally responsible and within budget. But that meets the needs the best you can.

One thing that I think is hopefully becoming clear on the travel guidelines as it is in many ways, too… There's an undertone of belief that many decisions are best made -- most decisions are best made -- at a more decentralized level.

Steven nor I are sitting and deciding who's going to come to the meetings or which meetings they're going to come to, et cetera. It's much more important that that decision is made at a decentralized level, as much as possible -- given the fiscal responsibility and fiduciary responsibility that we do have.

Hopefully that response was clear.

Steve -- do you have any more on that, that I might've missed?

Steve: Really, we're trying to understand what it is that the At-Large community would find useful, in terms of travel support. And then to match that with what we're capable of actually delivering. So that we reach a point that works well for the At-Large community and is within the fiscal restraints that we've got. And also doesn't create problems with some of the other support organizations and advisory committees, as well -- all of whom are seeking support. We need to balance all of those needs against what our capabilities are.

Cheryl: Of course you'll never be able to preach to a more converted group on equity than you'll get in this room, Steve. Let's face it. We are built on absolute equity, full global participation. And indeed, making sure that our regional balance is exactly that. Regionally balanced.

I wasn't unnecessarily picking on them for the agenda balance. They've rectified that. She's just not here, yet. She comes in a little bit later.

But it's not a matter of a constituency or an AC or SO being better or less well treated. It's a matter, I think, of what you were saying. That's bringing it back to some aspect of control and understanding of what can be done working smarter. Cost-effectively, but getting what is difficult to measure if you're just looking at numbers of documents sent in -- or lists.

If you look at the quality as well as the quantity of the participation you're getting from the Internet end-user, which in a post-JPA environment is essentially for ICANN's survival…
Let's be honest, here. All right? We're a good way to make this institution look good. We're a huge advertising possibility. We're very good for PR.

I think many of us are saying that the regions themselves are keen to do this work for you. But they need to perhaps work with you at this early stage of planning, with a more open and perhaps frank dialogue -- which you'll certainly get around this table.

Carlos -- I see you. And then Adam.

Carlos: Well, I'd like to focus on something we've been listening to for quite a while, now. At least in the two last meetings. Kevin Wilson is always in charge of telling us and talking to us, and ratifying always his work as a custodian of fiscal obligations.

It is important. Fiscal obligation is very important. It's his specific function, of course. But I have to say that fiscal responsibility in the organization is not everything.

ALAC is an organization that requires participation, and that participation should improve.

That participation will make ICANN better. Therefore, we have to understand what is ALAC. I think you center and focus on fiscal responsibility for members to be the right ones. But we have to understand and I stress that it's not everything.

There are other gears in the organization that have to work. If those gears -- those machines -- work together, and all of them work properly, then that will make the organization grow as a whole.

Nick: Hi, Kevin. Nice to see you -- having talked a lot.

I wanted to first of all say that as these meetings are recorded, then -- to say on the record again that we're very thankful that you allowed for the early check-ins. I think that was extremely helpful and thoughtful.

Audience: [applause]

Nick: So now we can begin the abuse.

Audience: [laughter]

Nick: I don't know. A couple of things, really. One is in terms of future planning. We know the meeting locations for the next few coming up. Can we start planning our meetings further in advance? That hopefully will reduce costs, enable upgrades and all the nice things that we really want to do.

I suppose that does mean that we have to tell you that we want to hold the meeting on Saturday or Sunday and so on. So we will do our best to make our agendas known to you, I guess. That would be what we're proposing. That would be very helpful. And I think it would probably save some money, in the long run. That's one thing.

The other is this point I keep going on about. That is, responding to the review process -- which comes on later in the year.

I know that you don't know what the review outcome is going to recommend, because none of us do in the end. But it's going to come into the midterm budget.

So if there are ways to take into account what those recommendations are, they do seem to be moving toward this recommendation of more regional participation and more localized participation. I think that goes to Carlos' point and the other points that were made earlier from LACRALO. Keeping an eye on that.

I guess that's going to be the case for all the reviews that are ongoing. Not just the ALAC, but all of these things come in midterm and make a mess of your nicely planned budget. But thanks very much, anyway.

Kevin: Yes. Thank you, Cheryl.

I wanted to address Carlos first, if I could. It's abundantly clear in my whole career -- and certainly at ICANN -- that if the organization lets the bean counter make the decision, you won't have an organization. Right?

Cheryl: You'd have a good [bean pot].

Kevin: It doesn't make sense for an organization to be only fiscally responsible. It's a pillar for the whole organization to be fiscally responsible. It's in our strategic plan to be financially secure and stable and that sort of thing.

But clearly, you're right. The decisions need to be made so that the whole system works. It's a complicated system, and it needs to work. So we really appreciate that.

We spend $1.5 million on community travel support, alone, per year. Whether that's too much or too little, that's open for discussion. But currently that's really important.

The good news, with the good work of Steve and his team -- and Stacy and others… The efficiency…

I know that you probably aren't seeing that. I think our intention was to hit the silver medal for this meeting and the gold medal for Seoul. But the good news is, we're getting more and more efficient. Steve has a wealth of knowledge and background on negotiating rates with airlines. His background, as many of you know… He worked for Qantas for years.

So the goal there is, if we can at least spend money wisely and at least do things efficiently… To be honest, the amount of time that I saw this group discussing travel -- how much conversation is on visas, for example… I would consider that a major improvement in the policymaking process if we could reduce the time for those kinds of conversations down much less. That means that much more time to talk about -- hopefully -- much more substantive issues. I wanted to address that.

The issue on meeting locations… I think with the new CEO and certainly other efforts that staff and the community are discussing… I think that whole area is really, really up for negotiation or up for discussion and strategizing [inaudible].

There are many good ideas out there to make it more effective. I think the regionalization is on that target to discuss. Thank you.

Cheryl: Alan?

Alan: I'm going to shift the subject to something that is -- at some level -- completely unimportant, but not. It's a discussion I will disclose I've had with Steve and Kevin, before. That's on the issue of ICANN Constituency Travel.

I understand, having run customer-service organizations, why you don't want to publish names. Why you want responses to go to a general mailing list that several people can look at, and things don't disappear in the buckets where bits go when they're not read.

But there are a couple of small things that can be done. I started working in this business 40-something years ago, where the only device was a Teletype -- which only had uppercase.

Once we invented lowercase, people started using it. The general term that was used on the Internet is, if you do something in uppercase, it's "shouting."

I really dislike and it bothers me to have people respond shouting, "ICANN CONSTITUENCY TRAVEL."

Audience: [laughter]

May I make a humble suggestion that before you start the next round of travel, introduce who the people are. Don't tell us their e-mail addresses. But at least we'll know what their names are. They are human beings.

Number 2 -- have them do ICANN Constituency Travel in lowercase -- except for the first letters. It's a small thing -- but this is not just me. I've gotten comments from a number of other people that it's really rattling.

Now I've forgotten my "and."

Once you answer that part, then I'll think of the "and."

Steve: Oh -- I get this one. And it's all good news.

We -- by design -- did not disclose who the people were behind that e-mail box, for this meeting and only this meeting. There were a myriad of reasons why we made that decision.

I've asked that team to actually come back to me with a report on what they thought went well, what didn't go well, and what we can do better for the next meeting -- which is Seoul. They have said that the anonymity does not work.

So we will drop the veil of anonymity for the Seoul meeting. You will know whom you are speaking to by name.

We may use a consolidated mailbox, such as the ConstitiencyTravel@ICANN.org. But when you receive a response, you will have a real live person behind it, whom you will know. That's already been addressed. That will be fixed in Seoul.

Using upper- and lower-case letters… I'll have to look at our keyboards. But I think we can accommodate that, as well.

Audience: [laughter]

Kevin: You can keep ICANN all in capital letters.

Steve: Our legal department thanks you profusely for that.

Audience: [laughter]

Kevin: It's actually quite interesting. When you register for these meetings, if you type in, "ICANN" or "ALAC," it will insist on only capitalizing the first letter, and not the rest. So you might also want to learn how to also use capital letters.

But I did think of my third item, though.

V: Kevin, I just wanted to weigh in on that. I think the costs of those decisions are zero. So I will definitely endorse Steve on that.

Audience: [laughter]

Kevin: By the way… As I said before… I understand why you don't want people to respond to individuals. I know as soon as you put someone's name in, someone will figure out their address and respond only to them. Just the day they go on two weeks' vacation. Perhaps people deserve what they get, if they do that.

The other thing is, in the matrices that you put together on who's traveling, you need an extra column to tell them -- in my case, for instance -- "Do I want to be known as 'Mr. Greenberg,' or as 'Alan'?"

I've had some very senior positions in various types of organizations. I'm rarely known as "Mr. Greenberg."

Steve: Thank you, Mr. Greenberg.

Audience: [laughter]

Vanda: Well, it's been a long time on these issues. I can't believe how difficult it is to respond to all the committees at the same time. To have a very clear and well-defined approach to support all the organizations.

I appreciate all the work you have done during this time. It certainly can be better. There's a lot of room to get there.

I have been discussing a little bit with Steve, and I'd like to share with you some ideas on how to better use the ALS to help us out in these programs. To accelerate and facilitate getting help to people. Anyway, we need to start to get more in touch with our community that knows better how things happen in their countries than someone sitting in Los Angeles.

I do believe that we need to make some proposals on that. To help make it easier for us, using our own community. That's just a point to have opened up and to start to discuss. Thank you.

Cheryl: Thank you, Vanda.

If there's a response to that, I think I would assume we could just take that on notice. There's not a lot of reply as I would have expected.

Wanting to get back onto a perfectly timed schedule, I was wondering if anyone else wanted to raise any points before I give the gentlemen their last opportunities. Go ahead, Evan.

Evan: I just wanted to say -- at least this one, I think you did better than silver. As Kieren will attest, I'm not very easy with my compliments.

Audience: [laughter]

Kevin: I have a couple of words. Do you want me to go first?

V: Yes.

Kevin: I wanted just to share a couple of things about what else we've done that you may or may not have noticed.

We spoke to the gNSO travel drafting team yesterday. I think those were the words they used. Most of them seemed surprised at this.

There's a page, if you go onto the ICANN search engine and look for "Travel Support." You'll see the travel support webpage. On there are the guidelines for each of the drafts through the years, as well as the most recent draft. And then when we finalize this in July, we'll post that, as well.

Then below that is the travel summary, which we're trying to standardize on these words. There's a guideline and a travel summary, which would be for each meeting. And as you can imagine, although we worked closely together, I generally own the travel guidelines -- and Steve generally owns the travel summary for each meeting. That would have the specific information for how to book the travel and how to receive per diems and that sort of thing.

Then below that is something called a "Travel Report." That would show the actual travel support by person and by community group -- and indicate the amount of support for each group, and the level of service. I just wanted to highlight that.

I'd invite and encourage feedback on how we can report on that. I know, for example, the Fellows are required to actually do a meeting report before they're given their stipend. Not that I'm encouraging that for the per diem, but that's something that we'd like to have feedback on. Specifically, what kind of travel report we should do?

To emphasize a point that I was trying to make early on -- which is the fiscal responsibility point… This is not a request for travel and then just honored because that person wants it. This is a request for travel that has a substantial benefit to ICANN. We want to continue that message.

When we go into the other groups that aren't getting as much travel support -- or they're critical of the travel support that we do provide, we can provide that ammunition and fuel to explain and justify that. So I wanted to emphasize that.

Then the last thing I wanted to say is just, "Thank you very much." This group, overall -- the comments we received in Mexico City… I think there were 50 pages of comments on the budget and travel support out of 75 from this group, alone. I know you weren't measuring… We were talking about quality. But also, the quantity is significant.

Then I think I was asked, "How many of those comments were actually incorporated into the budget and the travel guidelines?" So we provided some statistics back on that. I don't know if some of you might have read that.

I wanted to thank the group, overall, and I especially wanted to thank the few of you that Steve and I had talked with a lot. Cheryl and Alan and Adam and others, as well -- through e-mails and whatnot. I really want to thank you for the feedback and encourage that more -- to make this a boring topic. After Gold, this should be a boring topic. That's my goal.

Cheryl: Just before Steve, Evan wanted to write a reply or a comment.

Evan: And to a certain extent, it's sort of, "Right back at you."

Having banged my head against a wall talking to a lot of people and organizations within ICANN, this has probably been one of the most receptive responses that I've seen for any of the initiatives that we've done.

We've been used to giving comments that get ignored, and that hasn't been the case, here.

Audience: [laughter]

Evan: So just conversely… Hopefully, when we come across people that actually listen, the quality of what gets said also reflects that.

Kevin: Right. Thank you.

Steve: I don't have much more to add to what Kevin has already said, other than to say that we deeply appreciate the fact that all of the travelers whom ICANN is providing support for are volunteers. We really do respect and admire that. We want this process to be as painless as it possibly can be, because we deeply appreciate the effort that each and every person in this room -- as well as the other organizations -- do for our organization. To help move the work of ICANN and the world of the Internet move forward.

So we appreciate your kind words, but we also appreciate the critique, as well. Because it really does help us get better at doing this well for you. So I really do want to extend my appreciation to all of you.

Cheryl: I think I can say on behalf of us all, we look forward to continuing to work with both of you. Thank you both, gentlemen. We appreciate the time you spent with us today.

Kevin: Thank you.

Audience: [applause]

V: Yes. Just a little…

Perhaps it's a different issue, and won't need to be pointed out like that right now.

But the visas… This is quite a matter for people who live in or have a Latin American or African passport.

I had to use my Italian passport to come here. Jose [Villa] had to use his American passport to come here. The ones who hadn't that possibility -- it was really difficult to justify this situation. Or perhaps we're experiencing problems that make a 50-hour travel -- as Carlos had to deal with and [inaudible] this morning… Or on other issues that were really specifically involved with visas.

We don't want to make this issue [inaudible] our agenda. But also, we have to point out that this is a difficult matter.

If you have an American passport or a European passport, you can go everywhere. I was abroad and I made an online application. The other day I had the approval. But if you don't have that possibility, you have to hire an agency to do that [inaudible] for you.

Then you have to wait 15 or 30 days or travel to do that. That's quite an insult for people who are from other nationalities. That's just a comment. Sorry.

Cheryl: No. Don't be sorry. It's a hugely important comment. It is one that certainly these gentlemen have heard. Particularly from Vanda and some of us in our other conversations.

But it does mean two things. It means coming back to an understanding of the local issues, as well as the issues of the countries that we come from. When you're doing the planning right out there -- 3 or 4 years out -- saying what cities and states you might want to go to… You probably need to look at, "Have you got a few more of the next billion wanting to be represented?" Because you might have chosen really badly.

We may have to look at how things happen from a traditional, "You can travel anywhere, and it's really easy to get to," to just having an embassy nearby being a challenge.

The gentleman from Peru -- Eric is not here right now… But this morning, he had to go to another country to get his visa. These are things that happen outside the bubble, but they have a huge influence when the timings are close to meetings. It's project-management and understanding and planning. So, it's two things.

Alan -- last word from you.

Alan: Just a quick one on visas.

For people in Africa, for instance -- but I'm sure it's not unique… They may easily have to spend a week in another country waiting for a visa which may or may not come. Of course, it's not just the issue of where you come from and where you're going to, but where you have to transit.

If you have to transit through the US, there are many people who just won't make it -- period. And your air-travel people have to be aware of that. I'm sure this time, they are.

But it's a new world for a lot of these travel agents who don't deal with people from developing countries.

Cheryl: In fact, we should consistently -- and I'm going to continually remind everyone involved… We did have one of our ALAC people detained. He was arrested in transit for more than 24 hours. That's not acceptable. Go ahead.

V: [inaudible]

Cheryl: No. Previously. I just don't want to have that happen again.

Evan: I just wanted to ask Steve if he could address the Seoul situation and the travel summary.

Steve: The visa issue clearly has a life of its own. When the travel support team first took on the assignment of trying to get the Sydney meeting organized, we were already a little late in the game. But we did what I would consider to be an acceptable if not fantastic job. Certainly, an acceptable job of trying to understand what the visa requirements were for coming to Australia. What the government would and would not do -- could and could not do to assist us.

I think we certainly did better than maybe in the past, but… Each country where these meetings are held is different.

Having recognized that, the team that is not here -- that is back in Marina del Rey -- is already actually working on the Korean visa issue.

So we've got some basic understanding already for those countries where no visa whatsoever will be required to go to Korea. There are many countries for which no visa will be required. That's the good news.

Then there are those countries where visas will be required, and we are already putting together our gameplan for assisting all of those travelers as early in the process as we can, so that people don't have to go spend a week or two weeks in some other country, waiting to get a visa.

We're working with the Korean government. We're working with other experts -- including people like Korean airlines who have a lot of expertise in transiting people to Korea and back again. So we're trying to get further and further in front of what this visa issue is.

Neither Kevin nor I actually decide where the meetings will be held. So there may be meeting locations that are designated by the board through the process, which makes getting visas very difficult.

All we can do is provide advice to them on what that might mean in terms of bringing folks from around the world to that location. But if they determine that a meeting's going to be held

in City X, we're then left to try to sort out how we most effectively get as many people there with the least amount of pain.

V: Sorry -- you asked me that it was a matter of concern. So now I'm giving some input.

I'm [inaudible] in chat with some members of my region. There are other things that they point out. The conclusion, I take it, is that perhaps the problem is not how to demonstrate that you're coming to an international meeting being the issue. But rather how to go to knock on the window and wait through the whole process. In some countries, it's not an efficient procedure. [So that procedure was killing us].

Perhaps if the different foreign affairs offices of the governments were aware of this situation and could have a special permit or a simplified permit… you don't have to have a special international visa. It's the same situation.

When we succeed to explain what we're coming to do, I'm not going to say, "never," but there's almost never a problem. But when you have to do the procedure in the middle of the procedure, you find many stops. In developing countries, that situation happens really quite often. So that [stops] are the ones who make the situation happen.

Perhaps that's the key issue. To work with the foreign affairs of the governments. I don't know if they're willing to do that or whether this is another matter.

Steve: It really depends on each individual government. I can tell you that without disclosing names or locations. I know for a fact that there were two people attempting to come to the ICANN meeting for whom the Australian government refused to issue a visa. They notified us of that. There was nothing we could do about that.

They said, "We are not issuing visas because of the nationality of the passport that this individual is holding."

But we did get the Australian government to provide assistance in other locations where we were looking for the consulates to expedite processing. They turned some visas around in 3 days that normally would have taken 3 weeks out of that consulate.

So we learned a lot, ourselves, about how we can communicate with these various governments. Some governments will be more responsive. Some will be less responsive. But we will try, every single time.

We've learned that if we don't try, we won't get. We're devoted to the trying. Whether we get every time or not is another matter.

Audience: [laughter]

Kevin: I just wanted to also thank the At-Large staff -- Nick and Mateus and Heidi -- for their tireless efforts in helping this process along.

I know we've made a conscious decision to not have travel administration. You've been directing the comments and questions and the process through us -- which is great. That's

how it was intended to have been done. But they've been behind the scenes in helping us formulate our thoughts on this. So, special thanks to all of you. Thank you.

Audience: [applause]

Cheryl: Moonlighting!

Alan wanted a final word. Go ahead, Alan. This is like the ultimate penultimate and post.

Alan: It's a small comment. Steve just alluded to it.

The issue is not always just, "Can someone from Country A get a visa to Country B?" Evan and I are both from Canada. I'm from Montreal and he's from Toronto. Our process for getting visas for Cairo, Egypt… I think it was Egypt… are completely different.

He needed a picture. I didn't. He had to go in for an interview. I didn't.

Audience: [laughter]

Alan: Sometimes mine will take a week. He gets his instantaneously. That's two cities in Canada. The rules don't necessarily make sense. And often the rules are made locally by the embassy or consulate, and bear little resemblance to what the country back home "thinks" the rules are.

By the way… I think we found four different prices for Canadian visas. Visas from Canada to Egypt.

Cheryl: I don't think that needs to go into the public record, and I'm glad you didn't have the microphone on at the time. Thank you, gentlemen.

Vs: Thank you very much.

Cheryl: Oh, dear. It's always the little things that trip you up. It seemed just such a little while ago when you could look on the ICANN site and it was very definite that they were not going to be involved in visa issues, at all.

I think it perhaps is something that we haven't measured from the summit. But because of the inordinate number of travelers we had for that -- and the diversity that we were bringing of people… I like to feel a little ownership of the engagement we're seeing now from travel support. I love the way you put that through the microphone, Alan. I think that was just gorgeous. We'll get a travel constituency. Just wonderful. It's one of my highlights of the day. Thank you for that.

I'd like to think that we have some ownership for the involvement, now. Looking seriously at expediting and working with governments, and trying to get visas. At least in the prior planning if not the perfect-performance pile. That's an awful lot of Ps for me to say at this end of the day.

Well, look at what's happened to our time. I'm going to suggest that we move immediately into the new gTLDs now, and then go back to other issues not covered. If that is the wish of

the meeting. I think we're more likely to spend time on new gTLDs, and we do have some hard stops we have to go with.

Alan, I know I'm asking you to do something, but you haven't got the slides that you wanted to make the job easier. In new gTLDs, yesterday there was some discussion within the gNSO. Would it be possible for you to bring us up-to-speed unofficially in the absence of the presentations done by [Curt] on some of the new gTLD [letters]?

Alan: I will try.

Miraculously, I do have the slides. But just a few minutes ago -- so I haven't looked at them, yet.

Do you think this cable might work?

Vs: [inaudible]

Alan: I've never plugged a cable into this particular new machine, but we'll see if it works.

V: [inaudible]

Cheryl: For those on the telephone bridge, it's yet another moment in audiovisual juggling, while we get the cable from another laptop to talk to the system.

In a moment…

Alan: And a new laptop!

Cheryl: Ah-hah!

Alan: And both screens have now gone blank!

Vs: [laughter]

Cheryl: We've gone from seeing it in one place to not seeing it at all. That's kind of sad, really. Perhaps we could all huddle around Alan's laptop and…

Alan: No -- my laptop screen is also blank at the moment.

Cheryl: Okay. That's not going to help, then.

Alan: And the control to allow me to change it is not working any more.

Cheryl: Best-laid plans off.

Alan: Let me talk about this.

[laughter]

One more try.

V: [inaudible]

Alan: They took 15 minutes to get to me, so probably not.   They're big.

I have no screen at all right now, so I can't do anything.   Okay.   Let me try to do this from memory.

As you're well aware, the IRT is one of the major issues that has to be discussed.   The IRT has been presented in various local meetings.   I know the ALAC and the At-Large had one.

There was a discussion in gNSO yesterday.   I think there's another one tomorrow or sometime.   Clearly, that's going to be a major issue.

To summarize the comments that one hears -- comments are often prefixed with, "We understand there is an issue regarding trademarks that has to be resolved before new gTLDs can be launched.   I don't like what the IRT did.   I don't like the process."   Then people sort of stop.

How ICANN is going to get over the issue of everyone recognizing there is a problem which must be resolved, but not being able to come to closure on how to resolve it, is not clear to me.   Yet -- clearly -- it has to be resolved.   And some set of recommendations is going to have to be accepted that do address the trademark-holders' needs.

I can't give you any more insight as to how it's going to unfold than that, but clearly, that's a major issue.

Another issue that was not one of the overarching ones, but was clearly one of substance, was one of geographic names.   We appear to be getting closer to closure on that.

The current version of the guidebook or the draft guidebook -- the one that has not been revised yet --   I believe for top-level domains, we'll exclude all the names of countries in the formal list of countries.   3166.   Plus a number of regions -- Asia, Europe and other ones that again are specified in the document.

There are short and long forms.   These are -- again -- official UN terminology.   These are lists that are available.   So we're not talking about a wishy-washy, "We'll make the names up as we go along."   These are all documented lists.

The official name of the language as published -- as shown -- in the six UN official languages…   all of those are proscribed or unusable top-level domains, without the permission of the authority, for that area.

There has also been added in…   All of you know about the 3166-1 two-letter domains.   The ones that are used for ccTLDs right now.   That list also has some three-letter names for each country and territory.

Those three-letter ones have also been added in to the list of those names that cannot be used otherwise.   It's not clear if the GAC requested that or ICANN staff simply thought it was a good thing to do.   We're trying to decide which it is.

But it would take a whole bunch of three-letter domains -- which may correspond to company names and things like that -- and say they can't be used.

The one exception is the Comoros islands. They have COM as their three-letter name. They would not be able to stop dot-com from working. Dot-Com would be grandfathered.

V: [inaudible]

Alan: What about dot-Asia?

V: [inaudible]

Alan: Dot-Asia got permission from many countries within Asia to do that. Now, one of the things, however… For regions like that, the current guideline is going to say something like, "You must have 60% of the countries represented in the region agreeing." It has been pointed out that that threshold may be too large for some areas.

Some areas only have a very small number of countries to begin with. And others may have a large number of countries -- but -- the number of countries that are active on the Internet and have governments that know what the words mean may be smaller than that.

So that's going to require some tweaking and adjustment to make that make a bit more sense.

I think that covers top-level geographic domains. Then we get into second-level domains.

The original request from the GAC basically said, "Any geographic name -- be it a country, a region or a city or a state… whatever…" Oh, I'm sorry -- on top-level domains, capital cities are also excluded. Including any script of it.

So pick a language that there's no one here to insult. If Norwegian for Canberra is "car," you could not have a top-level domain dot-Car. Has everyone got that? So -- city names -- just like the basic country name in any language -- is not allowed to be used.

There are clearly some objections to that. But that's what the current wording says.

Adam?

Adam: "Language" defined as?

Alan: Undefined.

Kevin: So who has the authority to grant that? I'm asking specifically. There've been activities dot-Paris, dot-Berlin and so on. How does this affect those efforts?

Alan: If the authorities over that region agree, then there's no problem.

V: [inaudible]

Kevin: Which could mean federal, state, as well as city? They all have to agree?

Alan: I'm speaking to some slides that I saw yesterday and I can't look at a copy of right now. I don't claim that I have all the details. I'm giving you the summary. We can follow up. Yes, there will be more specified.

Darlene?

Darlene: Define, "Script."

Alan: Same answer I gave to him. It's one of the issues.

Second-level domains… Any country name in -- I believe -- any of the official six languages that are not allowed in top-level domains -- are also not allowed in second-level domains. This has caused a fair amount of discussion, as one may expect.

The classic one, of course, is the dot-food domain could not have Turkey.food. Perhaps more importantly…

Audience: [laughter]

Alan: Perhaps more important… Corporate domains and other domains of specific interest… Dot-travel would be the classic example, if it didn't exist already. It could not have US.travel or France.travel. Actually, it might have US.travel, if USA is the official name.

If you could fine a modification of the name, it would work. But if it's the official name, you'd need the permission of that jurisdiction. Clearly, that is an attempt -- if nothing else -- to stop Thailand.sex

But it would also stop Thailand.Sony. Or any other corporate gTLD that would want to differentiate or segment its top-level domain based on geographic needs. So that clearly is one that's going to be discussed more.

V: Haven't we had this same discussion when we launched dot-info?

Alan: Yes.

V: I remember that.

In the end, we just finalized with only the UN list of 3566. That's the only one that we finalized. Then currently, we need to push in that direction, because it's too much.

Alan: Yes. I'm not sure if the UN list is allowed, either. I don't remember.

Clearly, there's more discussion. It is worth noting, however, that this set of proposals -- which I understand, but not directly -- is reasonably acceptable to the GAC. It's far, far less than what they were demanding originally. So for that, one could be grateful. Exactly how it will unfold, I can't tell you.

If someone could remind me of other gTLD issues that I might know something about, I'll try to talk about it.

Kevin: I recall there being an issue in Chinese script that there are certain things that are two characters that weren't allowed that can be generic names in other scripts.

A: Yes. The issue of one- and two-character names specifically in the pictogram scripts -- Japanese, Korean and Chinese… The current guidebook still says three. It is viewed as ridiculous by most speakers of languages that use those pictograms.

It seems to be understood…

[Han] can take over if she likes.

I think the short answer is, right now we have seen no movement. The statements have been made. I think they are going to be made again by the IDN people. Hopefully we will see something rational come out of it.

There is a fear that I think can be easily addressed. If we were simply to say IDN TLDs could be less than 3 characters, that would open the world to Cyrillic and things like that. But you then have confusingly similar problems.

I suppose if there were Chinese characters -- one of which looked like a "C" and the other looked like an "A" -- and we allowed that to be a top-level domain, it would be confusingly similar to dot-CA -- my Canadian ccTLD.

It would still be confusingly similar visually as an issue. But I think those can be addressed very simply, and I don't know why we haven't fixed that a long time ago. But I'm giving you Alan Greenberg's personal opinion.

I would like to think that by the time this becomes official in the guidebook, that would be resolved.

The timing -- which I can talk about… the expectation is that there will be a third draft before Seoul, and the final real guidebook available in December 2009. That is the current set of projected dates.

Yes?

Nick: [And the application process and the first few minutes of 2010]?   [inaudible]

Alan: There's a 4-month period that was supposed to start when the application guidebook was available. That would extend from sometime in December through sometime in April.

There is talk now of that overlapping. The 4-month publication period does not have to wait for the guidebook, and I don't know what that's going to happen. But that's the kind of timeframe we're talking about. That of course presumes that IP issues are also resolved, on top of the other [inaudible] areas.

2011, '12, '14… Something like that. Yes.

Cheryl: Thank you, Alan. I see [Hong] and then I see Carlos and then I see Evan. Go ahead, [Hong].

Hong: Thanks for Alan's very insightful explanation.

Actually, there is something that is even worse than 3-character requirements. We really hope to see some [rationale] come out of it. That is, the treatment for [virus]. Especially for CJK group.

We heard very sadly from the senior project manager -- Tina Dunn -- that ICANN is not technically ready to handle the [virus] issue in CJK groups, specifically. That means… Oh… well..

A virus means we have the different character to address the same things. As for home -- for simplifying characters -- it's home for traditional characters. It's another home. That means they treat the same home as two streams.

I don't know if it's an economic consideration, which means we have to apply for [dot.Home] twice, and charge twice.

V: [Yes].

Hong: Is there anything that's been taken into account -- any discussion -- on this?

Alan: There is that issue that in various instances the same word may be spelled different ways -- to use the Roman character set terminology. There is also an issue of organizations that want to apply for the same name in multiple scripts.

If you think about it, other than verifying that there is no conflict in the name -- that it doesn't overlap with some other name -- all the rest of the application process and the application processing is the same. We're talking about the same company, the same financial viability, the same ability to do things -- the same backing of the community, if there is a community. At this point, they'd have to apply for 5 different $185,000 domains. And 5-times $75,000 per year afterwards. Even though they are just script variations of the same name.

There is some pressure… I don't know if it will result in anything… To say there really should be a way of doing multiple applications, when they're virtually identical things other than the visual form of the things. That's similar to the variance issues.

They claim the root does not have the ability of handling duplicate things pointed at the same thing. But there are innovative people that can do it one level higher, and already have, in many cases. It's an interesting question. I don't think that one's going to be resolved, either.

Cheryl: Carlos.

Carlos: In relation to the report for IP people, they keep giving more importance to IP. Intellectual property has -- of course -- very important economic weight. For a while, I've been thinking on an idea. This is simply a theory that perhaps should be ripened more.

But I'm saying it here because [Hon], who is a solicitor -- or at least she knows more about this than myself -- she can help me get this idea to fruition.

We defined the users. Our task is to look after the interests of the users. From my point of view, I think ICANN has the solution, or there is a solution to end the conflicts amongst the brands and domain names. How?

In the new gTLDs, when one is authorized a new one, it could be that there would be a grace period that could be small or short. During that time, the holders of the brands or the IP could get this new domain if they were interested in it.

After this short period, the one who registers first after that period of grace should be the owner of this domain. Or the titleholder to this domain.

Taking into account -- or understanding that -- the brands and the domain names have nothing to do… Because "brands" are a commercial representation, and "domains," is a distinctive sign to locate them within a network on the Internet.

If we take into account the economic asymmetry and tradition that companies have on the users… This impact from enterprise is huge. Then if ICANN decides, the first who registers is the titleholder after this period of grace. That can be given to the companies who register domain names -- and we would be eliminating the conflicts, in case of new gTLDs.

With this, we would also be eliminating the impossible that results for the users to fight and litigate or sue companies that are economically stronger. And who have the capacity to pay solicitors -- and have a longer fight to go to international organizations -- and to decide in their favor.

I also thought about the current gTLDs. But I think in this case, it's more complex. We have to accommodate more things. But the new gTLDs … I think it would be a definite solution and a final solution. For ICANN to define that domain names and brands have nothing to do with each other. After the grace period, the companies or the enterprises that don't register, then the owner of that gTLD will be the titleholder. After the grace period.

Cheryl: The silence was the rest of us catching up. There was a lot to take onboard, there. I'd like to see that in words. I don't care what language… but captured up on our IRT space. I think that's something that we're all going to have to look at and analyze. We've got a lot of good legal minds just around this table, and I'm thinking that perhaps just a little bit of ad-hoc work while we're here could further that. To take it from hypothesis to perhaps something that can be brought forward in one of the public forums or public mics. If the group of you agree to it.

I see [Hon] nodding. But I think it's something that we're not going to manage as a meeting of the whole. That's given us a lot of food for thought, certainly. I'm very interested in that concept. It could be quite interesting.

Go ahead, Evan.

Evan: This is something that we have to do, and I think we already have tried to address through the gTLD working group. In fact, it came out of the summit.

That leads to my question of Alan…

Did anything that you heard give you any indication that some of the things that ALAC had responded to from the last draft have actually been incorporated into new policy? Did you get the feeling that it incorporates anything that we added to this?

Alan: The discussions that I've been part of -- and there have just been a few very short ones yesterday -- really focused on the very specific targeted things that I've been talking about. Of course, there is no new guidebook at this point -- so the answer is, "I don't really know."

Evan: So, issues like the independent objector that we had comments on -- and all sorts of other things like that… The cost of domains for community groups and things like that… Did they address any of that?

Alan: They have not been addressed in the discussions we've had, because the discussions were talking about the overarching issues and the IRT. If you ask for a prognosis -- do I think they're going to address the fees at this point, despite…? Those comments have not only been made by At-Large, but were made by a number of other organizations. My expectation is, "No. They probably will not."

Just as they're probably not going to respond to the request from places like Verisign -- which is at the opposite end of the little user. Why should they pay N-times $185,000 for the same domain name? I don't think that came from Verisign, but I'm exaggerating.

So no, those discussions have not been made at this point. There are sessions on new gTLDs throughout the week, and that's a valid place to ask some of those questions.

To be honest, I would not feel picked upon if they didn't listen to ALAC. I think in general, there has been not a lot of movement on a lot of these things. But on the other hand, there's been a lot of small movement on things that we would not to see different, but that what they were proposing just wasn't going to work. I think there's been more focus on that.

But we're talking about the next guideline coming out several months from now. So there's still opportunity.

Evan: So they're going to be more efficient at doing the wrong thing?

Cheryl: Perhaps not. Perhaps it's a matter of pacing it slowly.

Evan: Not the way I would [do it].

Cheryl: You wanted to bring something into that conversation Nick? Please go ahead.

Nick: For my reading enjoyment on my many-hour plane rides, I've been reading the 230-odd page summary of public comments. The responses from the staff -- and in some cases, proposed amendments related to them.

I don't wish to recommend… Again… so that I'm not thrown out the window… that you all read 230 pages of summaries of public comments. But you can look at the different sections and see pretty clearly where it is proposed to make changes, and where they are suggesting no to make changes. Relating to the comments made by everybody.

I can tell you, ALAC's comments are spread liberally throughout. They're accurately reflected throughout the summation.

I know on the fee structures, Alan has said there were many comments from many people related to changing the fees and differential fees. Fees being lower for community-based applications. Fees being different for non-profits and TLDs that are never intended to be anything but small.

There are many people that suggested differential pricing of varying kinds. That isn't proposed to be changed. The reasons why are stated. Whether or not you accept them, the reasons are stated, there.

I would say that that text is quite useful to look through. It's available in six languages now, I believe. Yes. It is now available in six languages.

This wasn't clear to me, so it may not be clear to any of you that there is actually an open public comment process on these texts. Until -- I believe -- the 11th of July. So it is actually possible for comments to be made. Where it is not proposed to do something or whether it is proposed to do something… You all could make comments.

Such as -- "I think you've got it wrong here." Or, 'Yes. This is good." Or whatever you wish. I do suggest you look at it, because I found it quite useful to see where people have said similar things, and where things were proposed to be changed, and why.

Evan: Have you sent the links to those documents around? They ought to go -- I guess -- into the gTLD working group page.

Cheryl: Into the page and into the record. The Adobe record of today's meeting. So people who are not in that working group that want to track it through his conversation can do so.

Yes, Alan -- go ahead.

Alan: If they're open for public comment, then just going through the ICANN homepage would lead you to them pretty quickly.

With regard to differential pricing, I should note that this issue is not a new one. It has been discussed as early as the first meeting I went to in March of 2007. That was the first meeting, because that was a month after I joined ICANN.

The answer has always been -- from senior ICANN staff -- that we understand the need, but the first launch is just too complex to try to address that right now. The opportunities for gaming are very, very large. Although we will be considering this in the future, not for the first round.

That's been the answer pretty steady-state since the beginning. I'm not really expecting it to change in the next few months.

Cheryl: Thank you very much for looking at all those details. I'm a little concerned that we haven't had enough time to look at the upcoming work that will be going on very soon, in the first of two workgroups from the ccNSO. In terms of cc-IDN-PDP process. We might take a placeholder in another agenda a little later, to explore that.

But it's a work group that obviously [Shiva] and myself are involved in. It hasn't started work. But once it starts work -- which will be at the other side of this meeting -- then we'll need input from the community. For the input from the community to come in, we probably need to be looking at briefing our community just about now.

So there seems to be a great deal that we need to think about in terms of IDNs at the cc level. [Shiva] do you have anything in particular you wanted to bring forward on that topic here? Okay. Not [inaudible].

[Zumi] has asked them for a small slot of time to share with us an example of some of what's happening in his cc environment. So [Zumi], if you'd like to…

And I think there is a presentation that we will be sharing, as well. Fantastic. Thank you very much. Go ahead, [Zumi].

Zumi: Thank you, Cheryl.

Yes. To take about just 5 minutes.

I've been busily working on the process of introducing [dot.Mihon] or the newest cc that will be using the IDN in Japan, with government and industry and users.

Could you go to the next page? This, I got this morning from my government folks here in Sydney. About the background… I think it's too complicated. You must all be familiar with it, so I will skip that and go to the next page. Yes.

The right-side chat, which again, you cannot read, is a summary. From November of last year to June of this year -- 7 months' work. It's the first time the ministry of communication in Japan treated any of the domain names like this -- very seriously -- in their ministry level. There is a formal process called the "Telecommunications Council." Or "Infocommunications Council," which will submit the recommendation to the minister.

The ministry asked to organize a panel of experts -- including myself -- headed by Jim Rye. He's sort of the pioneer in Japan for the Internet. This was to evaluate what the process should be to introduce new domain names. E.g… [Dot.Nihon or Dot.Nipon] or anything using or corresponding to the criteria of the IDN and ccTLD.

By the way, we really have to thank [inaudible] working groups of the IDNs and cc guys.

Now, the challenge is about something I made a noise on about a year ago. The new registries or whomever is given this… It could an incumbent running. Dot-JP is called JPRS. It's a for-profit company. They can apply for it.

But I suggested that anybody else that's eligible should also be able to apply. To have some neutral, fair and open process to introduce competition on [an open] level.

It is happening! Several industry associations -- namely Internet Association in Japan -- includes vendors of software and hardware and everything else. And the ISP Association in Japan -- with the Internet Providers Association.

JP includes the oversight body to JPRS -- which used to be running the dot.JP. [inaudible] Service Providers Association -- another sort of ISP associate -- are now starting to form a private sector led council. Together with consumer bodies of two [organizations approached].

And the Large Business Association or industry associations. Those are the geographic names that are under consideration -- in and to [dot-Nihon]. We are asked to give advice in selection.

In the end, it turns out that we're creating something similar to mini-ICANN, domestically. Where hopefully the multi-stakeholder arrangement is in place.

After doing the selection and after new registry is in place, we'll be asked to do the oversight and regulate it. Also, there is a plan or idea to extend that to the existing operation of dot.JP. Where the consistency of the oversight of the two different registries be applied.

That gives opportunity for the end-users -- together with other stakeholders -- to come together in a national process. We realize that there's no real policy work in Japan -- or process -- from national to global, or from cc to generic areas -- until now.

Without that kind of framework, it's very difficult for end users to be involved with ICANN processes. We have been discussing about the participation and participation.

So -- since I left ICANN, I have more time working on the domestic process. Which, in turn, will be connected to the local, regional and global processes. Thank you.

Cheryl: Thank you very much.

Has anyone got some questions for [Zumi]? No?

V: [inaudible]

Cheryl: Yes. Certainly. Go ahead.

V: The background is, there have been frustrations and criticisms over the pricing of the dot.JP and the way they handle the registration. Some of the registrars are not happy with it. That's one background. Also, we don't know how the actual annual profit of this company -- JPRS -- will go. Or how to treat this.

We have about $28 million per year revenue, out of which they have a net profit of $2 million per year. Cumulatively, about $17 million are there. Is this public money? Or private money? We don't really know.

So we're trying not to criticize this process, per se -- but trying to apply more ideal process-and-outcome with [dot.Nihon] -- the new one. So in the long run, we'll have more justice to both registries.

If you have a monopoly with ccTLD in your own country and you're not happy with it, then you'd better discuss that. If you're happy, don't be bothered. Thank you.

Cheryl: Thank you very much, [Zumi].

We now need to go back to looking at things that we might have not had time to do. I do want to just take a small break in the agenda, because I know people will start to fade on me, and think about getting ready and try to escape before we get to the wrap-up.

I'm going to move something that would normally be in the wrap-up session to now -- because I've got the floor and I can.

Tomorrow, we've got some hugely important discussion-and-debate going on. If I could get one of the screens now to go to Syd.ICANN.Org/ACSO… The ACSO meeting.

If we have a look at our digestible topic… Somebody needs to do it. I don't care whom, as long as someone does.

We're running a very similar but compressed and modified joint ACSO meeting tomorrow afternoon. Obviously, I'd like all of you in the audience. And bring as many friends as you possibly can with you.

Yet again, you will have colored pieces of paper. Despite the fact that some people don't like it -- tough. We do.

It will be a more participative space this time. We will have more formal breaks for what is not quite open mic -- but -- questions from microphone.

We've outlined the plan for tomorrow, but I think it's very important for our workgroups to realize that what we're discussing is really institutional improvements. And how policy is going to operate effectively -- or indeed, are we just going to burn out all of our volunteers? We're looking at what the roles are of the ACs and the SOs in policy development. Is the current balance of staff and volunteer activity right, wrong or not?

There are no correct answers. But it is a roundtable discussion on some very important issues. To that end, I as usual am wanting to put a regionally balanced group together. With 5, of course, it makes gender balance impossible -- because one gender is, by definition, going to be one more than the others, when we split 5 in half. Unless of course someone wants to make an admission that perhaps should not go on the public record.

But to this end, I'd like to propose… And the reason I need to do it now… is that there is a briefing breakfast that our delegates will need to go to for this. So that they can get to know each other and what's happening.

I'm going to do it at a slightly… Notice the "I" language, here. Unashamedly selfish -- I know. But this is a chair's session. We work really hard to try to get staff to come to terms with the

fact that as chairs of these ACs and SOs, we are going to work together. We are not -- if at all possible -- going to go near the tables ourselves.

So I'm looking around this table, to see who needs to be representing their region in terms of the diversity of language and culture. And their personal opinion and experience at an ALAC, RALO or ALS level.

Let's face it. We're all at one point or another of those.

Unless they object strongly or someone else objects to them, I would like to propose that we have Adam from the EU perspective. We have [Vivetican] to run the Asia-Pacific perspective. We have Beau from North America. From Africa, [Howah]. And [Howah], please speak French. It will be interpreted.

I'd like to suggest -- and the reason I'd like to suggest Vanda -- for Latin America and the Caribbean is because I'd like her to bring into the conversation. So this is coaching, Vanda -- if you'll take on the role…

You've been in so many places with ICANN. You've been in the GAC. You've been on the board. You've come to us. This is probably the greatest amount that volunteers can be asked.

I'd like them to listen to her perspective of being a volunteer, working in the edges. Perhaps to try to get some of the understanding of exactly how much. When we then have to go out to our communities, it complicates the issues.

Yes.

Vanda: The only issue I have is Tricia just asked me for a meeting at 2.00, at exactly the same.

Cheryl: I understand the importance of the meeting. Tricia -- if we could reschedule Tricia, that would be great. If not, then I guess it would come to either…

See if you can reschedule and come to either José or Carlos. Is José hiding? Seeing as he's not going, "Hello, Cheryl -- yes, I'm hiding," I think José possibly could be the alternative, because he's not here to say, "No." That's part of my new punishment regime. If you're not at the table, you'll get a job.

So if Vanda can't reschedule, we're going to put José in the hot suit. That'll teach him to sneak off.

Those people need to… Vivek -- you need to look at these questions and think about it. You need to discuss and talk.

Yes -- I know you're there. I checked before. You need to discuss and talk amongst yourselves, and get some ideas. You're not going to have a right or wrong answer. We do want debate. But you've seen Patrick work, and he will draw you out. It's not an onerous task.

The breakfast instructions -- if I can fine the breakfast instructions… they'll be somewhere. Where are the breakfast instructions? I'll make sure you get the breakfast instructions. But you'll be having almost a little practice run over breakfast.

So Adam -- you don't object? Game?

V: Sorry, but…

Cheryl: You object. Okay. Go ahead.

V: Yes. I object.

Cheryl: Express your objection. I did call for objections. Go ahead. What?

V: It seems to me that I was [inaudible] the subject was ALAC. That's my objection.

Cheryl: Ah -- okay. I was particularly trying to avoid the leads of the workgroups. But if you feel or if the group feels that it needs to be the leaders of the workgroups, that's fine, too.

The rest of your objection? One second. Patrick -- do you have an opinion?

Patrick: No.

Cheryl: No? Adam -- go back to you?

Adam: I was the lead on the other half of the same subject. So actually…

Cheryl: [Patrick] how do you feel about being the person in the hot seat, then? We'll avoid both leads.

Right. Okay. We're striking Adam, and we're putting Patrick into the situation. Thank you. That's solved.

Democracy in action. You're up for breakfast. Please get to know what you're doing. Excellent.

So we have Patrick, Vivek… Oh -- you didn't object. You did object. Darn!

Evan: Not an objection. When again is the breakfast? Because I have to be at the RAP thing tomorrow morning.

Cheryl: What time?

Evan: 7.30 to 9.

Cheryl: Okay. No. It's going to be a 7.00 start.

Evan: Well, I could be there for half an hour.

Cheryl: Okay. That's not too bad. Yes. That's fine. Okay. I'll let them know of the 7.00 start.

And [Howah] -- you'll… I know it's early. It is breakfast. But it's just one day.

It's an early start for you, and you'll be getting an e-mail from Patrick [Chary], giving you the details. Okay? We'll just make sure that Patrick gets all of those peoples' e-mail address, right now. Thank you very much.

Okay. Back to the almost schedule.

Carlos: Sorry.

Cheryl: Please, Carlos -- go ahead.

Carlos: Where is the breakfast?

Cheryl: Patrick [Chary] will send an e-mail. Soon as Vanda can let us know whether she's available -- which will be very soon -- we'll either tell José his good news or not. [laughter]

Who's that from?

Ah -- see! You should have a microphone. Okay. Terrific. To the record… Vivek is asking me, "What is 'the breakfast'?" I don't know whether you mean the food to be offered or the purpose of the exercise. So I'll cover both.

The breakfast will be a buffet of various sorts. I'm sure you'll find something to eat. But the purpose of it is to go through the expectations of the group. Some of the questions. Some of the areas that each of you may wish to bring out.

Patrick knows you and you know Patrick. It's really just in no way a rehearsal. It's just a sharing and caring exercise. If you want to do that over a glass of water or orange juice, it's just a little bit easier to do it with what we call a little breakfast.

But certainly there will be a full buffet. There usually is a buffet, and people can pick and choose what they wish. But you will get an e-mail about where and when. So as soon as we've sorted out Vanda's possibilities, we'll get José on the list or not. And the rest will be history.

Obviously, you're going to need to come to the main room a little bit before. You'll probably have to get there about 1.45, and that sort of thing. We'll all be there to support you!

I've actually been very pleased with the amount of work we've gone through today. But I am aware that there are going to be some things on the Tuesday schedule that we need to look at Tuesday to see if there are some sections -- topics -- matters that we haven't covered today that we don't have on Tuesday's agenda, and that we might need to put some kind of ad-hoc working group together for.

Let's get to Tuesday.

For those on the remote bridge, again, we're in the joyous challenges of setting up the audiovisuals. Why won't it stay over there?

Our Tuesday meeting agenda. I understand it is there. I'd just like to see it. [laughter] Okay. That's slightly better. Okay. All right, then.

Can't read a word at this time of night. That's very sad. For those of you close enough, or for those who have it on the screen in front of them -- which is not me -- perhaps you'd like to read out loud.

I believe that says RAA… The all-important morning break. No -- that looks like today. I'm getting bored, now. I've done this day. Twilight Zone moment. I've gone back to a loop.

We have a number of briefings on Tuesday. Ah -- she's going for the paperwork. Here we are. Look -- we're getting somewhere. They're coming at me from all angles, now. Dual screens!

Of course you're all going to be at the 7 am breakfast for the ALAC and ALAC Review working group. That's obvious when we're going to take care of most of those times. That's in this room -- so just come back to what you can consider your room for early-morning breakfast.

If we drill down then into our policy issue discussion -- that's where we need to look. Thank you so much. Click into there.

We've got a number of briefings in the morning. We've got our Conflickr Worm briefing starting at 9.00. I think that's probably going to lead us to some of the discussion on the security and stability and resilience documentation. Nick -- can you just do a mental placeholder to mention what you sent in the e-mail to a few of us today about being able to put in some additional comments to that period -- under security? Or I'll find it myself in a minute.

The GAC views on geographic names. Have we secured someone to do that briefing?

Nick: We've asked, but we have yet to hear back. I'll chase it.

Cheryl: Okay. I did have a word to [Betron], and he was quite keen to do so.

Nick: Okay.   He just hasn't replied to me. But if he's replied to you… Then…

Cheryl: Well, we were standing in the corridor and I said, "Are you?" He said, "I'm not sure." Perhaps with a little prompting… Phone him or something. But I think it would be most useful to hear it, rather than get a misinterpretation of what their requirements are, and issues on geographic names, to actually hear it from a representative of the GAC.

The IRT final report and our draft At-Large response, and the ICC -- The Way Forward… That's really a very packed agenda. Is there anything you can see that we have missed? Something that we have not got in either Tuesday's agenda setup, being managed in a workshop or another meeting -- such as the ALAC Review? Have we got a need to put

together now any ad hoc committee, so that we are in a position to respond -- either in a workshop session or to a close-of-comment shortly after this meeting?

I'm not aware of any. But now's the time if someone knows of this. Go ahead. Thank you, Patrick.

Patrick: I would not add anything to that. I just have a question regarding the briefing on the IRT report.

Will this be like the briefing we had on the teleconference the other day? We only have 1.5 hours to cover 4 different subjects. I can remember that we ran very late with the IRT briefing. So I'm just asking if it will be a rehash of what we already heard -- or if this [inaudible].

Cheryl: Certainly I think that 10 minutes is about… They're actually doing briefings to just about everybody on Tuesday. They'll be doing a roadshow. I think we've been politely included in the roadshow. But I'm not expecting a rehash. If it were, that would be sorely disappointing.

Do you have any more information, Nick?

Nick: Yes. They know they only have 20 minutes. I think they're expecting is more by way of questions. If anybody has any questions that they want to ask them.

The assumption being that if you were not on the IRT briefing, that recording is available in three languages. You may wish to review that before Tuesday.

Cheryl: There was a little list traffic and a few things that are worthy of bringing up in that 20 minutes. I'm looking forward to perhaps getting some responses, which we're not likely to get in any other forum. Yes. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan: Given that there are only 20 minutes, I would suggest that we might want to collect the list of speakers ahead of time and allocate some time for them. So that we don't have 1 or 2 people dominating the thing.

Also, to give them some guidance as to the length of time they can spend on the answers. Otherwise, we won't get anywhere at all.

Cheryl: "Well, will the leads who put the draft together…" she says, looking in that direction… "like to do just that?" I tend to encourage whoever is in control of a piece of work to practically chair or co-chair any of these things. I think that collecting and getting a speaker lineup -- and managing that 20 minutes effectively… I'll help, but it can be your show.

The same thing goes of course for covering the ICC. We look forward to working with… Who's doing that briefing, By the way? Who's doing the ICC briefing? Ah -- Maria. Okay. Thank you. That is, again, another 20-minute slot. So they're all basically 20-minute slots.

Now tomorrow after welcome ceremonies and various other things… We do have a very important session, which we can do a little catch-up, if we've dropped the ball on anything

today. That's where we're going to be allocating who goes where. That's hugely important for our planning and our wrapping up at the end of the thing.

Sébastien -- sorry -- what's up? Go ahead, Sébastien.

Sébastien: Yes.

Patrick and Sébastien wish to say that we already have the IRT feedback. Maybe we can spend this 20 minutes to discus what we want to say. But he already did a very important job, and there were exchanges on the list.

During this meeting, we'll have this presentation on the IRT. I guess it's a waste of time. If they want to make a roadshow, okay -- they can do that. But maybe we don't need to be there. It could be another time.

We won't have enough time to discuss the other issues, and this one will already take a lot of time.

Cheryl: Let me make sure I have this perfectly clear.

You're repeating Patrick's intervention? Or that was your intervention, Sébastien?

Sébastien: I elaborate on Patrick's intervention.

Cheryl: Okay. So it was an elaboration. Then there are two things.

In response to Patrick's intervention, it was put on the table that it would be an opportunity to ask specific questions. There was much discussion on our list of things that just weren't looked at or addressed at all.

You're elaborating to say that there's going to be no net gain or benefit to that. So do I take it you're proposing to the group that we do not have the IRT briefing at all, and that we spend that 20 minutes split across the other matters? Or that we have that 20 minutes discussing our own response? I just want to be clear. Which is it, Sébastien?

Sébastien: I open with both of those proposals. Both really could be useful.

I guess splitting it may be better, but I am open to other [ideas].

Cheryl: Go ahead, Patrick.

Patrick: My personal view is that I think we already had a lot of information coming from the IRT working group. Just as I was asking if we're going to have a rehash of what they already said… If this is the case -- and even if it's only 20 minutes… I think it's sort of a waste of time. We would use that time more productively if we discussed amongst ourselves what we want to put in our statement.

Cheryl: So spending the same amount of time looking at our draft response is where you would like to head it.

Patrick: Yes. Spend the time drafting replies rather than asking questions. I think that we have already asked the questions. IRT working group replies are available, and different [inaudible] slideshows, reports and so on.

Cheryl: But you want to work on the draft that we have got in that 20 minutes -- rather than split it across.

I think part of Sébastien's point is that there is so much else to discuss at that time. So if we slot off that full time now to look at that, that's a proposal.

Yes. Go ahead, Evan.

Evan: We may not need all that time. But I think part of the issue that Patrick's trying to make also is that we're hoping to perhaps have something in common with gNSO. We're going to be talking with them, with the possibility of having a joint statement. If we can all make something together that basically really brings attention to the fact that there are lots of basic fundamental problems with this… that may be worth bringing up, here.

Alan: Excuse me. Did you mean gNSO or NCUC?

Evan: I'm sorry. NCUC.

Cheryl: Very different beasts.

Evan: What time is it?

V: [laughter]

Evan: Quarter to 6. Okay. I have an excuse.

Anyway -- there is a possibility of doing some joint communications that may be worth considering. I think I'd agree with you that based on the last briefing we had, some questions were asked. The answers were unacceptable, but I don't think they're going to be more acceptable by asking them a second time.

Cheryl: I was hoping there'd be fresh questions. Go ahead, Carlos.

Carlos: Regarding the last document presented by the ombudsman -- the way to approach public in writing, in relation to other constituencies of ICANN… I'm not going to say what I think about IRT. But I think Patrick's proposal is good for within that 20 minutes of time. I also ratify what Sébastien has said. We don't have to give them time to do a roadshow.

It would be good for us to confirm the report prepared by Patrick, with other things we could add to it -- to make it a well-rounded document.

Cheryl: Not a problem. I'll have more spare time to talk to other people. We'll just let them know that the group's decided that it's pretty well established its draft response. They do not believe there will be any particular benefit in discussing issues any further. It will

spend its valuable time wordsmithing its current response into a final document. Okay? That's what the work group [decided]? Correct?

Solved!

Have we missed anything, then? We've subtracted something. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan: I may have missed it, but… I did suggest at one point, since there is seem chance -- although some people think not a large one -- that the ALAC Review may be approved by the board in the next N-months… And we may have an opportunity to elect a board member… Should we start discussing face-to-face how we would go about this? So we can continue online?

I think initiating this discussion online is going to be much more difficult than face-to-face. Now if there's zero chance it's going to happen before Seoul, then maybe we just delay it. But if there's some chance it might happen within that timeframe, we really need to start discussing it.

Cheryl: I would've thought it would've been the main point of discussion in both the breakfast with the ALAC Review working group, where we could start doing some of that. But isn't the Structural Improvements Committee conversation going to also focus on that? I would hope it was going to.

Alan: The document as we last saw it -- at least the last version I read… and I haven't read the final one… made it quite clear that it should really be an internal At-Large decision. Although obviously, it would have to be ratified by the board or the SIC. That's the way I read it, anyway. That they expect some idea to come from us, and not just be pushed down.

Cheryl: I'm not sure what else we're going to profitably discuss with the SIC, other than a few extra bits. If it's not going to be that topic with that meeting with the SIC. I certainly would have had it on that agenda. It needs to be on that agenda.

Yes. Go ahead.

Nick: It was actually proposed as the entire agenda. To discuss the question of board seats, and the interlocking issues between At-Large appointing both seats -- board recommendations for a smaller board -- non-com recommendations, and all the other issues that surround it. It's not simply a question of whether or not 1 or 2 directors is appointed from At-Large, but there are multiple structural improvements that have been recommended related to the size of the board, and the way it operates.

That is the entire point of the discussion with the SIC. So you might wish to talk about it internally after a discussion with the SIC, really.

I also can't imagine that this would get done before Seoul.

Alan: I wasn't saying when we should discuss it. I think the discussion on how the board seat or seats are selected is somewhat orthogonal to the count or the interaction with the non-com and things like that. It's a completely separate discussion.

But perhaps it would be prudent to wait 'til after that discussion to have it. I'm just questioning whether there's some time in our agenda this week that we could initiate that discussion -- if it's going to be relevant at all.

Adam: Could I just…?

Cheryl: Yes. Go ahead, Adam.

Adam: It would be awkward if we started to have a conversation and then disagreed amongst ourselves immediately, and did that -- rather than had a… So I wonder if it's worth at least having a little discussion before we go and start [inaudible] to the SIC.

Alan: Or make it out of bounds at that meeting that we not discuss that.

Adam: That could be [inaudible]

Alan: I don't want to start an internal debate with the other people present.

Adam: Exactly.

Alan: That may not give a really good feeling to encourage them to give us board seats.

Cheryl: [laughter]

Sorry. It's the concept of trying to make it a sales pitch, rather than identify the complexities, and look at some of the issues.

Yes. Go ahead, Nick.

Nick: I know they are not expecting anything more than an exploratory conversation about the various issues. They certainly wouldn't expect you to come with a completely full proposal. I don't believe they've even talked about it at any length yet, themselves.

The idea is really that this is sort of a brainstorming session and an exploration of the complexities around it. That's all.

Adam: Yes. I was just thinking that -- for example -- if someone suggested all current ALAC members should be [requested] from becoming the board member… That might immediately start an argument amongst ourselves -- rather than a productive conversation. Just to throw in an idea.

But it could be -- depending upon how you word these things… We wouldn't that discussion to go internally with ourselves rather than externally with them, if you see what I mean.

Cheryl: Well what I'm picking up from that -- and that's certainly the way I was thinking of it when the topic came up to have this meeting at all… I was thinking very much it should be at the high level. The identification of principles. The fact that it's essential that the edges of the At-Large structures are involved. This is an absolute open and transparent system that avoids capture at a regional level.

That isn't to be underestimated to look at what could be an inverted [comment]'s good-looking democratic process. That actually disenfranchises those with less connectivity. So it's at that level that I think we were looking at having the conversation.

If we agree amongst ourselves -- and here, remember, I'm talking to the ALAC -- that I would be inviting input from the regional leaders. All right? If we do not degenerate it into a, "…but I think it needs to be one vote per person," blah-blah. That we keep it at the level of, "There are going to be challenges. We're going to have to go out to our communities. We're going to have to do a lot of outreach, and we're going got have to identify how much energy it's worth putting it -- before we know what we might be likely to get at the end." Then I think it's productive.

Is that in agreement? Alan? Do you see it useful at that point or not?

Alan: I guess "useful," is an okay term. I'm still not quite sure that all the parties going into this meeting have the same image of what we're going to be discussing or what's coming out of it. I certainly don't have a clear image of that. And I don't have a high level of confidence that the other parties do, either. That doesn't make for really good use of time.

Cheryl: Ah -- but then we don't get an opportunity to talk to the Structural Improvements Committee other than in this context. So it'd be good to know whether or not they can see that the harmonization of some of these issues is going to be a real effort.

Alan: All the reason we don't. The expression in English -- I'm not sure how it translates… is that we "don't have a food fight in front of them."

Cheryl: That's exactly what I was calling for around this table. That the ALAC will be sticking itself to a particular level of performance and higher-level discussion. Mentioning that I will be inviting the regional leaders in -- but it's not at that point that we discuss the difference between what would be very comfortable for North America, and perhaps not so comfortable for Asia-Pacific.

We have to recognize that we will need to look at how At-Large does this, and establish how that happens later on. But at least -- as Alan was saying -- it gets the conversation happening. While we're all face-to-face. Otherwise, it won't happen equitably and effectively online.

Ladies and gentlemen, would any of you like to step forward and make a comment in terms of wrapping up for today? You hear enough of my dulcet tones in a day. Would someone like to pop their hand up and take -- first of all -- from a… Let's have a RALO leader's perspective on this.

Who can I pick on? Who doesn't look like they're paying attention? Dev -- you're new-kid-in-camp. [Laughter]

This is one of those rare opportunities where we're all together and we're not just the ALAC with RALO leaders watching. This is interactive. It's a care-and-sharing environment. Did we get it right or wrong? What would you like to tell us?

Nick: Pick on the new guy, eh?

Cheryl: Yes. I'm good at picking on people.

Dev: I think the sessions have all been very informative. I think what tends to happen understand the ICANN structures. Like if I have to understand what the AO or SO or different groups are… All of that is a little bit confusing to me, at this point in time. I guess it's trying to understand all of that.

And at the same time, if I were to try to go back to Trinidad, to discuss exactly all of this type of structure -- ALAC and ALAC representation on the board… all that kind of stuff… What people and ALSs… we'd rarely be interested in that kind of stuff.

It comes off as a kind of bureaucracy. I'm not saying that as a bad thing. I understand it's a necessity. You are working with the ICANN as such.

Cheryl: For the good or real, ICANN is a technical body with some very specific requirements. It really is a huge job for the regional leaders to get that interpretation. I don't mean just language, but the knowledge interpretation across. To make it interesting or even engageable with our At-Large structures.

I actually think one of the most important things that happened today from my perspective was the opportunity to look at not only interaction between ourselves and some of the other bodies that have representation to us -- particularly in here today -- the ccNSO… But the theme that ran through that conversation and through a couple of the others was the opportunity for inter- and intra-regional work.

Whilst it's not the ALAC's position to do more than encourage that sort of thing, we would like to be able to facilitate that. Hopefully, some of what we've talked about today will also end up in the discussions of the regional leaders, when they get together.

The whole concept of getting the At-Large structures informed early enough to get regional views established and drafted and into our processes is still a huge challenge. Yet again, we seem to only do really meaningful work as a large group. Small groups are working very hard. Don't get me wrong. There's much good work going on.

But we have this tendency to have to be sitting around a table to get a heap of multiregional productivity going. I think perhaps inter- and intra-regional work intersessionally. Getting the intersessional work going is still going to be a challenge.

So you did want to speak for a moment?

V: It's just to mention an impression of the meeting. I couldn't avoid seeing an increasing participation [remotely]. Yes. We know we have awareness -- outreach -- and there is some feedback from the channels. Despite…

Well, we could have some particular member very involved in the community and he's not here because of some problem. But the new members are listening and paying attention. This is increasing.

In my particular case, the whole storm that my region of RALO had this year, I'm really glad to see so many people from my region in remote channels.

I don't know if it's going to continue or if it will be increasing. I don't know if their input would be to that challenge we have that Cheryl explained to us a minute ago. That's really, really difficult to know.

But this is a matter to point out. In my case, I'm really glad to see that. It's just a step in the whole staircase -- but for me, it's worth it to point this out.

Cheryl: Thank you very much. I think it's hugely important that as relatively new appointees, we hear your voices -- and see how… This meeting is very different to the one that was held previous to the summit. We've changed each time, to try to find a better way.

In many ways, this is a much more formal policy discussion day than we've had with regional leaders -- up until now.

Earlier on, there were literally teambuilding exercises for the ALAC. We were a group of people that didn't know or understand each other very well.

We've moved -- in a few years -- from how to conduct ourselves appropriately between each other, to now wanting to better-facilitate and ensure that the regions are working with the ALSs. That's obviously where the real stuff has to happen.

I'm pretty excited. I think if we stop and look at how far we've come in a very short period of time, with a huge amount of policy comments… Just tally them up before and after summit! It's a pretty impressive list.

I think we often get -- "Ah -- they're not hearing us. We're not getting far…" That's actually not the case. We're more than just water dripping on a rock. We are having some real impact.

And with some of what we've looked at today, we're putting best-practice challenges up to the rest of the community. Yes. Go ahead, Evan.

Evan: I think we're seeing that specifically in the case of what we did in response to the travel policy.

There was a document that got RALO discussion [going] and it got ALS discussion [going]. A number of the RALOs had comments that specifically endorsed it. So you had things that didn't require the physical meeting, and we were able to do something.

That was balanced off by having ICANN staff that was receptive to what we were doing, and it was improvements all along. To me, that's the biggest single indication of progress that I think I've seen since I've come onboard, here.

Cheryl: Well, we're at a fascinating point in time. We're at an important part of an organization-in-transition. Transition of the JPA, transition with a new CEO, transitioning to getting the next billion and billion after that online. And the challenges of the new gTLDs -- including IDNs and ccs.

This is an enormous amount of work. But we're actually -- I think -- more effective than many of us realize. I just think we should all congratulate ourselves. Please -- regional leaders -- take that back to your member ALSs. Without them, we ain't nothin'!

Please, ladies and gentlemen... Remember -- you have a wonderful, thrill-packed and exciting adventure to go across to the Swiss Hotel with the Fellowship. And those that are ISOC chapter members get to come to a room I'm desperately trying to find. Someone… Level 4? Room 2?

We just go down the hall, Level 2 -- Room 4. Have I got that correct? It's Level 2 -- Room 4. I will see many of you not until the opening tomorrow morning. The people that are going to be in the ACSO will be having breakfast. I will be at the Geographic Regions working team meeting from 7am. I will see the rest of you at the opening ceremony.

Thank you all. A big round of applause to the heroic work done by the interpreters! Yay!!!!!!!!!!!

Audience: [applause]

[session ends]