

Transcription ALAC Secretariat Wrap Up Session 26 June – Sydney

[mic check]

V: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Just a small piece of housekeeping for those who are on the audio bridge. We'd appreciate if you'd join us in the Adobe Connect Room, so we can pick up any questions you have via the chatroom. I will remind you that we are simultaneously translating into English, French and Spanish here, today. The usual reminders about -- if I haven't said -- "Thank you, Dave. Thank you, [Sida]." Go ahead.

Adam, then, it would be a good idea for you to name yourself, so that they can name you. Because the listening audience hears their voices -- not ours.

V: And if she says it and gets your name wrong, correct her.

V: Absolutely. Because you're correcting a record.

Now, we have a couple of things on the agenda this morning. There's the all-important key-performance indicators for ALAC -- which I'm filibustering here to get Alan's attention. At what point in this morning's agenda would you like to have that inserted?

Alan: At some point after I get my computer powered on. So -- not the first item -- but I may be ready for the second or certainly later.

V: That is, early in the program as is reasonable. Okay.

Another thing is, this morning, we have the report of the chairs to the community, as a result of our activities at this meeting.

It's a glorious 5 minutes -- and not a millisecond more. So quite clearly, I'm only able to do the highlights. I'd like to spend some today in this session establishing what highlights you as a community feel I need to have in the verbal transcript.

I have a single slide that I have sent to be in my presentation. It says, very simply, "ALAC Report to the 35th Meeting, Sydney," date, blah-blah. And it's got a logo of Sydney on the top.

It has three things, then. The URL of our At-Large site -- where we will be putting up an extensive report of the meeting. The URL and the tiny URL of the working document, which shows all of the non-ALAC meetings we attended and who attended them. That's the space where your ongoing reports have been going up to. That's going to be linked.

Like all Wikis, fear not if you just put a few [skag] words in and you want to fill them out later. That's fine. I'm linking that in the permanent record, which will go into the meeting record. So that's the place to link full-up documentations, if you are going to be doing them in the future. Mike?

Mike: Thank you very much. I was concerned about that. I only had time to turn the notes on one session into a full report. And I have notes for a couple of others.

V: We do, in fact, ask an extraordinary amount of people when they join ALAC as a volunteer. But I'm trying to avoid cruelty and punishment. Particularly, I think it's important to realize our aim in doing this hyperlinked system was very much to make it easier.

So even if you just Skyped a couple of things in notes, you could go back and cut-and-paste from those, and then fill it out later. I'm looking forward to perhaps repeating this in Seoul, if in fact, people found it a useful thing.

I think the other thing -- just in looking at the feedback from the reporting of all the non-At-Large meetings that we've all attended...

I don't think if there were a meeting that didn't say, "Closed," that we didn't have someone in the room. I'd like to be told I'm wrong, but I don't think I am. I believe we had a presence -- and a meaningful presence -- in just about every meeting that was going on at this ICANN meeting.

From my perspective, it's all about still selling us as a concept. We're not the unwashed masses that should be assembled outside, wearing placards. But we actually do have meaningful contributions to make -- to debate -- and to develop better policy. That we are a valued part of the community.

Of course, by being seen, we're reinforcing that.

So could I thank each and every one of you that is here still, those that are on airplanes flying back home, and those that are heading to airports to do so. There, I'm very, very keen to note the work of all the regional leaders here, today.

I expect a huge amount from our ALAC. But then, they're used to that. The regional leaders really have gone above-and-beyond the call of duty. I think of particular note, we look at the work that was done ad hoc on the IRT response.

So, a formal vote of thanks to the ALS members that are here and who've worked so hard. To the regional leaders that are here and have worked so hard. And of course, to the hard-working ALAC.

Are there any feedback points and reporting from the meetings you've attended that you would like to ensure goes in as a highlight to our report today? Floor's open.

Stand up.

V: Just remember that in our board meeting yesterday -- we had a very good conversation with Roberto about the consumer protection. I guess one point to that is that we'll follow from here. It's important to highlight that in the report.

V: I'm certainly trusting that someone is capturing all of these points, so that I get them in priority order. Go ahead, Carlos.

Carlos: Yes. Especially, I was interested and I liked very much...

V: [We're all trying to move in].

Carlos: I liked a lot and I think it was very important to stress the meeting we had with the committee of public participation board. I think we could do some inputs where we were heard. God-willing, perhaps we'll be lucky, and some of these things will be seen in actual reality.

V: [inaudible]?

V: Yes. Other issues that I'd like to highlight for this meeting include the presence of the ccTLD here in our meeting. That was a new thing that I believe is very important and useful.

Another point to highlight was our GAC meeting. It was very, very good. With a huge participation from our side, I believe it's important.

The most important issue is really what you said -- the full participation in remote conditions for many people. Even in a region like ours that has the opposite time zone.

V: Excellent.

Any further key issues that you feel are essential that we bring up and highlight? Go ahead, Rudy.

Rudy: You can go first.

V: I just thought it was worthwhile to highlight certainly my extreme satisfaction -- and I presume that of others... Of us going into a joint meeting with NCUC to discuss a statement on the IRT. With people on different sides of the table with extreme different views -- hammering out an agreement or statement that met all of our needs. And I think it met all of our needs well.

That's a promising sign for future cooperation, and I think it needs to be noted.

V: I'd be more than happy to do that. I have Rudy and then I have Adam -- or is it...?

Rudy: I think that we can say we have a new milestone in the cooperation between ccNSO and ALAC. We've been sitting together -- Cheryl -- Chris -- [Disbain -- Tom Sherwood] and myself. We finalized a debate on how we could work together -- closer together.

It seems that from both sides, it's a green light. We'll try to work closer together in the sense that questions brought up from the ALAC will pass through to the ccNSO. And [answers or] questions coming from ccNSO will come from me to the ALAC.

I will try [both] liaisons to find a way to find always answers for the questions we have.

V: If I may -- based on our discussion over lunch yesterday, Rudy... I'd like to make the specific wording sound like a formalization of how the liaisons between the ALAC and the ccNSO will work to [support] our mutual benefit. It think that covers it. Thank you.

Adam's next. Then it's you.

Adam: Have we mentioned the ALAC review yet? And thanking them? And how wonderful we think it is? We look forward to it all being implemented.

V: We perhaps were less than subtle in the shortest possible time, there. Expeditiously, indeed. [Siva], go ahead.

Siva[?]: Yes. About the meeting between ALAC players, liaisons and the ccNSO liaison. The ccNSO and gNSO are two [houses] that debate on IDN issues. It would be nice if that would be something by which I could also be connected to the liaisons of ccNSO and gNSO.

I dropped into a gNSO meeting yesterday afternoon. I was there very briefly. All I did was say that I was from ALAC, and I could not participate much. I would like to have some formal way of going into these two houses, so that I can follow the discussions and be there in person.

V: I just want to clarify. You did say a "formal" way to work with these two houses? Is that right?

V: Yes. A formal way to work with these houses. In the sense of some kind of organization of ALAC -- to attend their meetings. Some kind of a mandate for their liaison to go to their house and attend meetings.

V: I understand.

At an ICANN meeting, the meeting is open and anyone can go anywhere. If the topic is related to your particular mandate -- i.e... IDNs... we would expect you to be there. And how you work with those houses, as part of the liaisons.

We have a clear relationship between the mandated liaisons and the particular liaisons. But I'll let the liaisons respond. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan: With the understanding that when you are speaking, it is clear whether you're speaking on behalf of the ALAC as something having been discussed and it being a formal position -- or your personal position. Which you may add if you think is generally [inaudible].

That doesn't mean that every time you open your mouth you have to say, "This is on my behalf," or, "This is on someone else's." It's just that in a group that you're going to be attending regularly, be it gNSO or ccNSO, or the GAC or whatever... that you'd establish the ground rules ahead of time with the chair. So it's understood when you're speaking on behalf of the advisory committee in a formal sense, and when you're speaking on behalf of yourself. And presumably in a knowledgeable way about things that have had some discussion. Or in the third -- you're speaking for yourself and you know no one agrees with you. Or if you're not sure -- that's fine! That happens all the time! [inaudible]

Audience: [laughter]

V: I already said too much.

V: Sébastien.

Sébastien: Ladies first.

V: No, no -- go ahead.

Sébastien: Thank you. First of all, I am not a writing man, and I apologize. It's very difficult for me to make a report writing in this way.

I was -- for example -- also completely lost with Skype. 600 messages, I didn't read -- because one time I skipped it and then I was lost.

It's a matter of... We need to find... And I understand it's a good tool. I could be very happy to use it, but it was too much this time for me.

I think we need to find a way to have the very important messages carried maybe in some other way -- to be sure that we get it. Not just somewhere in the middle of a thousand messages.

My point is now to answer Cheryl's question. I went to one meeting that I think was useful. It was one where the SIC was all about the [inaudible] of ICANN. It was about all of the new committee evaluates -- to try to coordinate.

There were very few people there, because it was in competition with a meeting here on the public participation. But I think we went through some ideas.

First of all, I have to say that the main topic was about the board members elected by ALAC, and the number of board members... And more important, the use of all the committees. It's now around the ALAC/At-Large board members. It's come out with one... I will not say "decision," but... it's something that will happen.

In two days, there will be a meeting to start a [BAF -- a brother and father] if I understand -- open to the community, to discuss what could be the change in the bylaw. Not to leave that out in any committee. Just to have a really in-depth discussion and feedback from the community. Then I will try to go to this 1.5-hour meeting this afternoon to follow what's happening there.

V: Thank you, Sébastien. Alan?

Alan: I'm not quite sure how we got onto this subject, from what we were discussing before. But I did go to the meeting of discussing the board review. I think I can come out of that saying that there is a significant, important and vocal part of the board that feels it would be ludicrous to reduce the size of the board, at this point.

So I cannot see it happening, but there may be other people with strong voices somewhere else on the board and within the community. The opinions from the public -- although there were not many opinions posted -- were all universally, "Don't do it!"

Several board members at the meeting said we shouldn't do it. And several board members said -- when I started this process N-months ago -- "I thought we should do it. I've now reconsidered."

So I would be very surprised if we ended up with a [inaudible] board. Although they do intend to go ahead and look at what such a board would look like -- to see how well it meets the needs of a community. But the general perception is, the answer is, "Thumbs down." For those not here.

V: Well, just remember that yesterday meetings in the afternoon were very good. Any point of view was very good.

The DNS had views -- with a lot of people talking about different issues related to how to treat this... how they are supported... and what the countries are doing. What the CCs are doing... It was really a very good one. A long one, but a very good one.

Audience: [laughter]

V: That deserves some [inaudible]. To learn a lot about these issues was a very good experience.

V: If I may, I'd like to pair that with the work on the malicious use of new gTLDs and that one, as well?

V: [inaudible]

V: Yes. Adam?

Adam: Yes. Just coming back to Alan's point about the board reduction to 9. The only people that seem to still be in favor of [it are] business -- and they seem very much in favor of reducing it. They haven't given up -- so it might be interesting to see how influential their voice remains in ICANN. And if they can swing it.

On the abuse section, I thought there was something notable. I don't know if we can improve it, but -- Beau speaking with evidence from one of our ALSs -- Knujon, I think, made a quite notable mistake... Had we looked at it, we'd've noted it.

I know that Bill Semich is here, and I know he's a real person that's done real work. Small corrections that we can make of each other... I don't know how we can coordinate these things a little bit better. Because he wasn't speaking as an ALAC member or an ALS. But still, we are friends in the same room.

V: Nick's waving at me.

Nick: Yes. The only thing I'd say there is... I did talk to Beau after that. The fact that Bill Semich put his [inaudible] or not -- to him -- is irrelevant to the point of what is hosted on that ccTLD.

So I suspect if you'd said... Even if he'd shown it to you... He would've said, "I'm sorry. The point is still valid. I will take out any reference to him being here or not being here."

Adam: Yes. It did sound like an abusive joke when he said it. It was the same connection he was making to the Russians, who were alluding to be ephemeral spies who would never be around the place. It was as if Semich -- as far as he was concerned -- was a non-person.

The point where that came over... That's why people were pissed off.

V: Gareth?

Gareth: I found that whole situation to be quite distressing. Well, yes -- especially for you, Cheryl -- being there as chair. But I guess my comment here is, Knujon is an ALS.

I was also [inaudible] in Mexico City, where [Garth] was taken on quite dramatically by some of the other people in one of the meetings. Is Knujon getting accurate information? Is this going to be a comfortable situation for us? Or what's the issue here?

V: Rudy?

Rudy: Well, I've been working with Garth for a couple of months, in order to get Knujon.com and Knujon.EU for Europe. I know the research work they're doing.

I also know that when you point out there is a problem, you're always the bad person. That's what happened yesterday. We have been pinpointing a few situations that we all know exist. We cannot avoid these kinds of situations. But they don't like it when you say it in a public forum.

V: I think I'm going to use similar language to what I used yesterday. I think we so note these discussions formally in these meetings. In the informal chats that many of us had with the industry players and the consumer representation people we had... And let's face it -- consumer representatives need to have a way of building trust, and to be trusted. It is two-way on all of us.

To use my shorthand and metaphorical vernacular, I said, "We all need to learn how to play in the sandpit together, and what the rules of engagement and expectations are."

I think if we just move through that process, I'm not fearful. I'm looking forward to spirited debate, and fear fearless frank challenges. Because that's how things improve. But in many processes -- and I think this comes back, to some extent, to the IRT report, as well... it would be so much more productive if we were at the input point, as opposed to the output and commentary side of things.

If you develop something with people, you've also developed an understanding -- not necessarily an agreement -- but an understanding of each others' points of view.

You can nearly always -- in my experience-- find language which means you are not compromising your core principles or your points, and yet not giving offense to others. On that matter, I would like to propose to this meeting that as an Asia-Pacific representative into

the ALAC, the offense to my CJK group and the CC support that those ALSs get from the countries that were named in that report was concerning to me, as well.

Whilst I would not be asking for any form of retraction -- because "facts is facts..." I am concerned that we will do better working in positive partnership to make change, as oppose to a conflict relationship. And we need to look at how we do that.

Sometimes it's the painful world of diplomacy. Go on, Nick.

Nick: Oh, to follow Cheryl. I just wanted to note -- as I unfortunately have to do so often... that what I've heard is that Knujon's research is good to the extent that he does it. But he's small -- as two people. It's very difficult to do comprehensive research in complex areas with two people.

The irony is, I was told privately that actually some of the more funded research along the same lines would probably -- and has, in the past -- shown that things are actually worse than Knujon has. I think there's probably a real case -- as Cheryl has just said -- for ALAC and At-Large helping to facilitate the different groups that gather the same or related information in talking to one another.

If they could all compare notes, they could probably all make a more compelling case.

V: That's the reason we decided from [inaudible] and ALS to help Knujon, and mirror what they are doing in Europe. I think that would be a good idea, to try to get us all involved.

When we hear somewhere that there is a problem with a ccTLD or a gTLD, we try to get it together in the database of Knujon, in order to have a richer quality of input -- and arguments which we can then bring up individually in our regional context through our RALOs -- in order to get to... maybe like in Europe, to go to [inaudible]. Because ccNSO also has regional members.

I think that could be a first step of integrating, also, the RALOs in the activities approaching the regional ccTLDs.

V: Thank you, Rudy.

Obviously, for the record, the encouragement that the ALAC continuously gives to the regional leads within the RALOs -- to reach out and to interact with their [NIC]s is incredible. So AP-RALO needs to work with AP-[NIC]. [laughter] LACRALO needs to work with... And there is a marriage there. That's the [nexus].

Go ahead, Vanda.

Vanda: Yes. Just to mention that yesterday, we made an agreement with the dot-[BR] to get together with us. The ALS in Brazil is too weak. Just a few people. It's completely unbalanced. With the size of the country, our participation in the ICANN since the beginning, we decided to get together to rebuild the [ISOC] over there, and to have a huge ALAC group inside Brazil.

V: Well, we look forward to getting that application. [laughter] And I think I am able to report formally now to the meeting that the Korean ALS application is now in. So we will -- as I wrote back -- go with as much speed -- but no haste -- through the due-diligence. And hopefully, we'll be able to expedite having at least one.... Because I believe there's a second one in the pipeline... ALS application coming from Korea.

Olivier?

Olivier: Could I report that the UK application will soon be in, as well?

V: I had a sense of déjà vu on that. But thank you. I want it to the record. We'll look forward to that.

Olivier: I have had confirmation from these who decided that it will be done.

Audience: [laughter]

V: Garth -- go ahead.

Garth: Sorry -- I missed who that was?

Audience: [laughter]

Olivier: The UK.

Audience: [laughter]

V: Did I mention learning the rules of engagement? Humor is very useful. Remember the transcription stands. [inaudible] joke.

V: [You're a bus, Garth].

V: So often jokes do not interpret or translate well. We do need to sometimes punctuate when we're not at each other, but we are actually smiling. Because if you look back on the written word, we go, "Whoa! What's happening between [them] and the UK?" Yes. [inaudible]. Go ahead.

V: In the [inaudible] there's usually a sort of raucous laughter.

V: Yes. I think we may have to start instigating this. Clearly we're not only working harder -- we're having way too good a time about it. Heidi -- go ahead.

Heidi: Yes. I wanted to announce, as well, for [NURALO], there's a new ALS application. That is the San Francisco Bay Internet society that has just sent their application in.

V: Excellent.

V: San?

V: San Francisco Bay Internet Society.

V: Oh, excellent?

V: Andrés.

Andrés: I was stuck for... Yes. You're right. [inaudible] Pensando. And...

V: Spanish line...

Andrés: Gracias.

Cheryl menciona la... Great...

V: Okay. It's okay. Can you hear the translation? It's okay?

Andrés: Okay. I have it here. Yes, go head. Adelante.

V: Bueno. I have to say something important. So I'd rather say something important now after all this. Otherwise... No... I was saying that I was thinking about what Cheryl was commenting on a few minutes ago -- regarding the relationship of the five RALOs and the five [REAL]s.

When we spoke some days ago about deepening that relationship between or among ccTLDs and ALAC and the regions and the ALSs... I was imagining the way.

Rudy is a liaison and there's work done in the higher part of the pyramid. The engagement could be more formally carried out.

I don't see exactly this way or this route, especially. I am thinking that perhaps I'm lucky that I have more relationship with [ACNIC] than [ATLD]. This is just by chance.

Anyway, the relationship with the regional registry is with one person that's involved in a process. Sometimes they participate. We haven't been able to form something institutional in ACRALO. But this would have some strength at the moment of doing some interaction.

The [ALS ACNIC] in Latin America, because my vision is from my region... We eventually participate in some instances open by the same registry. We don't go past that. I don't see clearly how that engagement could be deepened between the users. This is what I wanted to say.

V: I'm quite sure it's not without challenges. It's a matter of an exploration. When you've got a relationship through a person, it's often just assumed to be informal. But nevertheless, a successful thing. But [inaudible].

Go ahead, [Mohamed].

Mohamed[?]: I think maybe they're suggesting a solution. Starting to engage [EU]RALO with a ccTLD regional organization in the region could be beneficial. One aspect of that could be research.

Currently some ccTLD regional organizations are planning to do research in terms of ccTLD relations or ccTLD aspects of Internet users in countries. I think that's an area where [the] RALOs could play a major role. Currently we have good relations between AFRALO and [AF]TLD. That part -- the same people maybe are in one way or another linked to that organization.

But this is an area where I think we can try to have a formal relationship, there.

V: Of course, each region -- as it is in a different point of its Internet development -- and, in fact its users of Internet numbers -- will probably have different pressures on those relationships. In Asia-Pacific, of course, we have many of our member ALSs -- which are also running the CC. It's just the way it's been developed.

So the need for a formal, less-formal or informal relationship -- I think -- is up to those groupings. But to encourage a conversation and/or a relationship should definitely be the end-game.

As we look to our agenda... [He's there]? Please. Go ahead.

V: Among the other things that were also already mentioned... The travel support -- the discussion was also very useful, I think. I think a lot of the misunderstanding... I think it was more misunderstandings that have apparently been resolved. It's good to see that.

I know it's a much different situation than in Mexico. There it was a bit of a verbal disagreement between the different constituencies about who was getting more support over [which], and so forth.

I think that what's happened with the [ACRA] report is actually quite good for all constituencies. Including ALAC and At-Large.

V: I wonder if I may be so bold as to encourage you to support me in also giving thanks to the staff that Kevin and Steve have -- I think -- done a superb job with. They've interacted with us. They've also made it -- I think -- one of the smoothest ones I've experienced here. So I might put that into that, as well.

V: Indeed. Yes.

V: Thank you.

Any further points that you're going to get hot-under-the-collar about if they're not actually mentioned in our report?

Good! Alan? Whoa -- they're coming at you from all sides. Heidi? For those of you on the phone bridge, there was both Alan and...

Alan: Hi. I think you were asking me if I were ready to talk about KPI -- which I am, if I can get a plug in to my computer. And Heidi was asking me if we're going to talk about the voting thing. The voting procedure. I think that's Adam's point, at this stage. Because he has the wording.

V: I was going to say -- "Whoever is ready for what order of what's left on the agenda..." While we connect the dongle to the computer, Adam -- do you want to bring the voting to this point, now?

Or do you want to wait 'til [KBI]s? I would like to think we could voting to bed, and then have a conversation with [KPI]s. There seems to be something caught, here.

Adam: If someone could put the text of the e-mail I sent a few days ago onto the screen, then we can see it. It was sent to...

V: Okay. The magic is going to happen. We are going to have the words. On the right-hand screen, I see them. So the interpreters can, in fact, read them. That makes their lives slightly easier.

And might I just thank you all? Perhaps it's a product of it being Day 7 or a 5-day conference for us all. But the speed and pace of the words coming out of your mouths at this hour of the morning might be a great relief to the hard-working and [incredible] interpretation staff.

Adam: Yes. I was just wondering [whom we] present it to. That was my hesitation. It's the one I think that was called the "Working List." The ALAC list, last Sunday. That's where it is.

But it's just a matter of who can get the screen connected.

V: It's a race. A bit like the panel yesterday. It was like doing a quiz show, where people were reaching out to hit the buzzer, to get the question answered first. It was very exciting.

There we go! We've got it up on the screen.

Go ahead, Adam.

Adam: Right.

Alan, Sébastien and I were asked at the last ALAC meeting to produce some language that we could hopefully vote on and pass. I don't know if we wish to do that at this meeting. If we can do, then good-o.

This is the text that we came up with. This is the procedure for how we would carry out votes. While I am thinking about that, there is something that Beau said that we should probably consider.

In addition to this, it would be with the understanding that -- wherever possible -- options would be worded in the positive. I.e... We're not going to have negatives to deal with and get confused over, and so on and so forth. I think it was agreed that -- yes -- this would happen. It's an understanding that all votes would be positively worded, so that we could say, "Yes or no," without any hesitation.

Having noted that, it's not necessary to put it in the proposed text. Do you want me to try to read it? I'm not sure I can see it at this early hour.

V: Yes. I like to see you struggle with it.

Adam: Right. The proposed text is -- and this is the procedure for voting...

As the vote is proceeding, we can see how many people have voted. As the vote is proceeding, we can see who has voted. As the vote is proceeding, we can see a tally of how the votes have been cast. The order of the options should not change as the vote proceeds.

Outsiders who cannot vote can look at all of the above interim results. When the vote has ended, we can see how each person has voted.

V: Go ahead, Alan.

Alan: I'll note that the substantive difference between this and the previous one is, we are not showing online how people have voted. I will note that if someone keeps on looking at it every minute of every day for seven days, when the counts go up, they can figure out how each person voted -- if they care enough. It's not really an attempt to make it secret. It was just felt it was not needed at this point.

V: Adam -- did you want to... Oh -- thank you -- [Howah]?

V: Sorry. But I didn't understand. Can you please explain again how this will be?

V: The objective is for it to be able to be seen. At one moment you can see the tally. Those who voted for an those who voted against. How many voted against, for and abstentions.

Every minute you'll see what happens. You can see how people have been [voting] during the vote. But except for that, this doesn't show. We have to take this into account for it not to be done openly.

But at the end, you will be able to see who voted for what. So the voting is done as we've been doing. You can see how many votes are for one or the other alternative. You don't know who voted for one or the other alternative. At the end, you know the results, and who voted for each proposal.

V: To that original text that we had... We will actually know who has voted throughout the process. Just not how, until the end. Dev?

Dev: Just have a question on the wording. What is the "order of the options should not change?" What does that line mean?

V: Alan?

Alan: The whole issue I brought up because in many cases, when we did a new vote, the parameters were different. Sometimes you could see the results partway through. Sometimes you couldn't. Sometimes you could see who had voted. Sometimes you couldn't.

My whole reason for bringing this up initially was just to get a standard set of parameters, so it didn't change.

In one of the versions where they showed the count for "Yes," and "No," as it went along, the options were reordered. So whoever was winning was on top.

In other words, there was the first and second option before anyone voted. Once someone votes, the options could be changed. That's the kind of form that's used in popularity contests. For online voting -- for who the best singer is, and things like that.

I just wanted to make sure that it was clear we were not using that option.

Dev: If I try to understand, that means that in other words, the parameters of what's being voted on shouldn't be changed. Then the vote is on for one particular option. That option should not change until that vote is carried? I guess I'm not sure.

Alan: Let me try to be clear... If we were doing this vote online, the question would be, "Do you support the new rules?" "Yes or no?"

If -- at some point during the vote -- six people had voted "no," and four had voted, "yes," the options would have been changed to "No," and "Yes," instead of "Yes," and "No."

In other words, the first one is always the one with the biggest count, so far. We're saying this should not be done. [The number]. Either we do a random order on the ballot for every ballot, or they stay the same. Different people shouldn't see different ballots at different times.

V: Adam?

[inaudible] Anyone wish to speak to this matter? Who is putting this motion? Alan? Who is seconding it? A mass of hands. So it looked more like a vote then, than a seconding. I'm fairly confident about the outcome here, ladies and gentlemen.

May I ask for anyone that wishes to abstain from this vote, to make themselves known. I see no one. I believe there is no one online. Is someone looking at that? Let me know if there is.

I now ask for anyone who wishes to have his name recorded against this motion. I see no one. Do I see anyone on line? Apparently not. Therefore, by unanimous support, the motion goes through. Thank you, Adam. Thank you, Alan. Thank you all.

Audience: [applause]

V: You would think simple things would be able to happen simply, but that is never the case. Alan -- go ahead.

Alan: Thank you, Sébastien.

V: Kevin's above you. Thank you, Sebastian.

Alan: I do have one further thing, which I didn't think of at this time. It's not relevant to this motion.

Most other groups in ICANN -- if someone abstains, they have to give a reason. I don't know whether we need this codified in the rules, but I would definitely like to make sure that when someone abstains, they give the reason. Maybe they have a conflict of interest, or maybe they haven't read the documents or whatever. But I think we need to document why.

V: Okay. Go ahead, Garth.

Garth: Yes. I note that there was an issue regarding the acceptance of the recommendations from North America RALO regarding that ALS application where there was an abstention of people voting against.

I know Evan was particularly upset and wondering what was going on. So if there were some explanation for some of that, that would've helped.

V: I always like to hear why someone votes against it, unless it's overwhelmingly rejected by everyone. I'm not sure we can require that -- or maybe we should. I don't know. I was addressing the abstentions.

My feeling, by the way in that ALS vote... in one case, the ALS was recommending exception. In one case, the ALS was recommending rejection.

When people hear two votes of a similar matter, they sort of think if you vote "yes," to both of them, the same result happens. But we were not voting to admit. We were voting to accept the recommendation. I think that inherently is a confusing statement. And one that we may want to work on again.

It's not the first version we have.

V: Indeed.

Again, taking off my chair hat and putting on my AP RALO hat... I would be supportive as a representative of the region of a strong encouragement for the use of the comment box associated with the polling tool, to be used in the point of abstention. Or of voting against.

It is strongly encouraged for abstention. But I would have to argue against making it mandatory. Because there are very good reasons in some regions why you may have to simply not vote. It is those reasons that we cannot make public.

Go ahead, Carlos.

Carlos: Sí. Aparte...

Spanish Channel: Yes. Besides, I think it's some way of pressuring the person who votes -- to ask him why he does it in such and such a way. If we have to explain why we abstain or why we make a negative vote, we also would have to do it for the ones that vote for the motion.

V: Go ahead.

Alan: That's why I did not suggest it for "no." In the past, we've had many cases where people have abstained because they really hadn't thought about it. Or they don't know [the thing]. I think that's a valid reason. But I think it should be clear -- whether it's a conflict of interest or not.

I simply note that -- for instance, in policy votes -- the gNSO requires that abstentions be explained. Pardon me?

V: The board also...

Alan: I was going to say, I think the same is true on the board. I was simply putting it up as a discussion. I wasn't asking to vote on it, at this point. Maybe sometime in the future, we do.

V: I understand the points. I need you to all understand that as we bring the next billion and the billion after that, and another 50 or 60 countries into this system, that may be much easier if it were an opt-in as opposed to an opt-by-definition, "You're already in," with comments.

The same goes when I argued along similar lines on the regional advice being made public or not. There are terms when things for our processes could influence real life outside the ICANN world. That's where our priorities need to lie. Or we won't have volunteers from some of these spaces and places.

Perfect timing for Nick to leave. I actually wanted to ask a question that he's going to need to answer. So come back for a moment.

If we start wording in the affirmative -- and I've got to tell you, I would like to be doing that... So what Beau said in the preamble here.

Is that going to mean that we need to change the wording in how we have established our rules for ALS application votes? Because at the moment, it's almost forcing a double negative. If that's the case, then I would like to have that actually formalized in our meeting in Seoul. But I'm asking Nick, first -- is that the case or not?

Nick: It would substantially change the process. Very briefly, the regions provide regional advice. The way the procedure is designed is that ALAC flows the regional advice unless it votes to overturn it.

So the regional advice becomes the most important part of whether to admit an ALS or not. We can word it in an affirmative way -- which we have started doing by saying, "Yes. I agree to accept the ALS and the regional advice," or, "No. I vote to overturn."

We have worded it in a way that is less confusing. But if you actually changed the underlying concept, it would be changing the process.

Evan: I was going to note that in our first attempt to follow the procedures, we -- in fact -- did have double-negatives. That was really confusing.

We now have eliminated the double-negatives, but it is still confusing. I suspect that we can follow the letter of the law, but not necessarily have "yes," mean "follow the regional advice."

We can try wordsmithing. If that doesn't work, then we may have to change the rules. I suspect we can do it within the rules.

V: It would be nice if we could. But...

Evan: That's an exercise to follow.

V: Let's see how we go. Yes. Go ahead, Garth.

Garth: As long as we maintain what we're doing now, where the regional advice is the first barrier -- and that's the important one.

V: We worked way too long to be making that happen to get [this lot] to change.

I noted, Steve, you are leaving. I did Skype back -- yes, of course, you've got to be somewhere else. That's fine.

But I would just like to bring to this group's attention -- and the regional leaders that might be looking at this transcript -- that you have put out the questions for feedback. Specific itemized to paragraph, for us to get back -- post-haste -- to be able to make a comment on the PDP process for IDNs.

So -- just attention to your recent e-mail... There are just 4 or 5 questions that we're seeing feedback. That means regional leaders need to talk to the ALSs and need to get those answers, and need to feed them back in to us.

Is that pretty much what you would've said? Thank you.

V: Thank you.

V: Excellent.

Now of course, the minute I'm going to [travel across] to Alan for key performance indicators, I'm going to catch you with a mouthful of breakfast. No? Okay. Fine. That's fine. Alan? Key performance indicators.

V: The other thing is, I'm going to highly, highly encourage us all to finish no later than 20 past 8.

Alan: The first question -- Is that sufficiently visible? Or do I need to blow it up more?

I plan to read what is there.

V: I'm fine. Yes. It's okay.

Alan: First of all, my apologies. After the process to try to work on this abysmally-failed out

of Cairo... In Mexico City, it was assigned to me. I must admit, I didn't get around to it until very close to the meeting.

Part of my reason was not delaying it all, but part was, I really felt I wanted to go into this discussion with the small working group.

By the way -- the small working group included me, Cheryl, Carlos, Adam and [Fatimata].

I tried to go through all of the documents we had -- which include our rules-and-procedure, the draft that Nick had done -- which most of us considered overkill... but nonetheless, attempted to identify all the performance issues.

A document that Carlos had put together just after Cairo, I think. And although I didn't list the document, I did look at the little bit of job description I had. Adam pointed out what the URL was -- so I added that, here.

Now as I was reviewing these documents, I started putting together not a list of what we should do, but a list of principles or basic positions that I thought we needed to note as we addressed the problem. I think I had nine of them.

The first one is that purely quantitative measures -- that is, counting how many meetings you attended or how many e-mails you sent -- is not adequate.

People cannot meet those requirements for all sorts of reasons that are completely valid and acceptable. Conversely, you can attend every meeting and make no contribution at all to the process. You can send 17 e-mails a day, and all you do is serve to fill up other peoples' e-mail in-baskets, and not make any real contribution.

However, despite that, the metrics are useful in identifying possible problems. We should continue to create the metrics and refine them, so that they have some meaning -- but not use them as a way to say, "You're out because you didn't attend a number of meetings."

We never have actually used them that way. We've always interpreted them in a rather soft way, and I think we must continue to do that.

The next conclusion was that it's hard to think of an ALAC member who is not a successful, committed person in many aspects of their life. Both professionally and in terms of other volunteer efforts that they work on. You have to ask yourself -- "If someone is not contributing at all, or very little, in the At-Large process and in the ALAC process -- why?"

It's not because they're stupid. It's not because they don't have the ability to contribute. We're looking at some misalignment. Either the issues we talk about here don't interest them, or interests them, but it's just not high-enough on their priority list. I use the term, "Not important enough." [Fatimata] pointed out that, "Not important enough," is not the same as, "Not important." It just doesn't come high enough on your list, compared to your family or the people who are paying you -- or whatever the other issues are -- to simply give you enough time to do it.

When I did this particular process, this was a good example of that. I feel passionately about it. But other things came first, for a while.

Carlos added the concept of, "Do we need to do something to give incentive to ALAC members?" I'm not sure I know what the answer is.

At some level, if you volunteer for this, simply being one of the very few people selected to actually do the work on behalf of your region -- or from the non-com appointees, on behalf of the world -- should be incentive enough. But it's something we can think about.

The next conclusion that I came to was that in addressing performance problems, we must be sensitive to cultural issues. This came out in a number of different ways.

First of all, some professions -- some people -- spend their lives and are trained in confrontation. They have no problem at all with going up to someone and saying, "Things aren't working well. You have to fix it or you're out."

I can think of two professions where that kind of statement is part of their job. It happens in the legal profession. And if you're a reporter, your job is to confront people, and say, "You're messing up." That's how we have...

What does that sign mean?

V: It's the [Clash and move on].

Alan: Oh, okay. Fine. I thought you were telling me to do something. Okay.

V: [Clash and move on].

Alan: But there are cultures and there are individuals that don't handle that well. We can't set up rules that presume everyone will handle it well.

The second one is actually an issue that Cheryl alluded to in our previous discussion. Many of the people on At-Large and in ALAC interact with each other in different forms -- be it IGF or regional activities. Setting up procedures which force people in a public way to confront each other is almost guaranteeing the people will not be completely honest -- if they know they have to meet the same person next week in another venue, and work with them. So I think we have to be sensitive to that.

Carlos had the interesting concept that if indeed people are working with each other in different venues, shouldn't that mean they really try harder to be good at ALAC so they won't be embarrassed?

I think the answer is, "It should." But... It's not 100% clear that it does. Maybe once we start having penalties in one form or another and say that we do not accept very poor behavior... We'll probably always accept partially poor behavior. That may, in fact, drive people to not be put in an embarrassing position and cause them to deliver. But to be honest, I'm not convinced. I'd like to think that was the case, but...

Combining the previous two items. If there's a mismatch between performance and expectations, then we need to address it. But to the extent possible, we need to do this in a way that avoids public embarrassment. I don't think I can say that any clearer.

V: [Works for me].

Alan: The next point is not an intuitively obvious one. But all of this exercise is dependent upon us understanding what good performance is. Not in a metric, but in a qualitative sense. That really comes down to being able to write... I don't like the term, but I'll use it... "A job description."

What are our expectations of ALAC members? In order to expect the nominating committee or RALOs to appoint or elect people who will meet the qualifications and help the ALAC and ICANN, we really need to make it clear. There's just no way that we can curse either of those groups -- the RALOs or the non-com -- for selecting the wrong person, if we haven't made it really clear what we're expecting. Or at least as clear as one can. I think that's going to be one of the challenges, but I think it needs to be one that has to be done very early on.

As I was reading this, I thought it was worth noting that it's not just what we expect people to do on the ALAC, but what kind of responsibilities they have in feeding information back to ALSs and things like that.

I know I've occasionally sent out messages to ALAC, but not At-Large, saying, "We need to do something." I know for a fact that none of the regions passed it on to their own people in their own language. Including my own region. So I think we need to clarify that kind of thing.

I'm getting toward the end.

Next... When there are problems, we need to involve the RALO. We cannot sit in judgment of a RALO-appointed person very easily. The first pass has to involve the RALO -- presumably with the RALO chair or secretariat -- and trying to understand if there are local problems or regional problems.

We currently don't have a set of procedures to remove someone that was appointed by the RALO. I'm not sure I really want to develop such procedures. It really is a local issue.

Now, if you have someone who is either doing nothing or their presence is hurting the ALAC, and the RALO wants to do nothing about it but is willing to accept that, I think we have a situation that we probably can't fix. Other than through education of the people in the RALO.

I'll come to this later, but I think it really is an issue of RALO. Even for the non-com appointed people, if that person is not helping the region, I think the RALO people need to be concerned. They don't have the right to remove, and there are going to be valid times when the non-com appointee disagrees with what the RALO is saying. That's fine. But at least they're active and contributing.

I think I really covered that already -- and 9... Sorry... Looking at 8?

Nick: If there is a problem with a non-com appointee, and that person -- in your view -- needs to be replaced, it is possible for the non-com to replace that person.

Alan: Yes. In fact, this was clarified after I wrote this. Within the first year of a 2-year appointment, the non-com still exists. The non-com collects names of people that are willing

to be appointed partially through the year. So in theory, that can be fixed. It's not clear it would work the second year of a 2-year appointment. The wording is unclear.

I suspect any given nominating committee might or might not. But in the second year of appointment, that person's going to be replaced, anyway.

V: Adam, is your [inaudible] Carlos is in the queue. Is that directly in relationship to the non-com? Do you see just for the response? Go ahead, Adam.

Adam: Yes. The chair of the non-com exists. He/she acts as advisor 'til the following year, and retains the data about the previous years' candidates. They hold that data for one year, and after that there's a confidentiality agreement when it's destroyed, apparently. It doesn't exist in the second year, basically -- so you wouldn't be able to find someone to replace.

V: Carlos.

Carlos: Gracias, Cheryl.

Spanish Channel: Thank you, Cheryl. First of all, when this was first presented was in Paris. My proposal at that moment... I did it in Spanish. Then I asked for the help of the staff. Mateus helped me translate it. There is one aspect that was translated differently to what I first put in position.

But the idea of that proposal -- I hope you read it... The idea behind that proposal is precisely to dissuade or disincite the member of ALAC that is doing much of nothing. That is, to incentive on the other hand, in contrary -- to incent that person to work more actively.

The idea is, there should be an ad hoc meeting to that effect on the part of ALAC every second meeting or every six months, where the performance of all the members of ALAC could be analyzed quickly. If any of them deserve to be told something, to mention to him that he has a low development or low performance, he's given three months until the next meeting to see whether he improves on his preference.

If he didn't improve on his performance, then this ALAC gathers together -- all of them in full - - because that's the idea, when they decide on a member. This person is given the opportunity to defend himself or herself in a special meeting, in a very short meeting. They're asked to prepare a report to defend himself or herself -- why the low performance. Immediately, ALAC will start deliberating and decide if it sends the replacement request or not to RALO or to non-com.

If RALO or non-com ratifies the mandate, that person should continue until the end of his ALAC member status. He or she could be replaced. But the idea behind this is not to reach this instance. The idea of the proposal is precisely to disincite -- or stimulate for this not to happen.

Nobody wants to go through this procedure. Nobody would like to go through this procedure. This is what is behind the idea.

The parameters we should take into account in order to judge our peers in that special meeting are the parameters that everybody knows. They've been mentioned by Alan very

well. Participation, being present at meetings, sending what is talked through in ALAC to the regions. We know this.

Regarding incenting -- as Alan was saying -- incenting is something we did for the first time in this meeting. In this meeting, in Sydney, we did incent. It happened on Wednesday to assign tasks for each of the members of ALAC, or it was on Monday. I don't remember which day it was.

This generates a compromise, therefore. Which meeting are you going to go to? He is going or she is going to which other meeting? Which meeting am I going to? Then to bring back a report. That's the incentive.

The one that doesn't do this, we have this tool to request that person to explain why he or she didn't do it. I keep on insisting on the proposal I elaborated in Paris one year ago. I'd like you to read it. I keep on insisting I'm convinced that this proposal gathers all the conclusions that Alan posed on the table -- which I think are excellent.

Alan: I have a couple of specific comments on what Carlos said. But I'd like to just continue going through the process. I'll note that Carlos' documents in Spanish and English -- with whatever error in translation there is -- are included in the list of documents that are at the beginning of this.

V: I just want to check... Is your point to the previous subject? Before Alan moves on?

V: My point is as a comment to the process that Alan is talking about. Not specifically to Carlos'.

V: Go ahead, Alan.

Alan: Is that a point you want to make now, or wait until the end?

V: Go ahead.

Alan: Because your microphone is still on. So I didn't know.

V: No, Nick is fine.

Alan: Okay. I think we were at roughly Point Number 9, before.

This reiterates what Carlos said. The overall process of this is real not to build an enforcement process, but to get to the stage where we have few problems. The last thing we want to do is to spend time addressing these kinds of problems. And all of the other difficulties that come along with it.

If you agree with most of what I've said before, then a number of conclusions come out of it. First of all, we need to define the job of an ALAC member. We probably need to do liaisons and all the other ones, too. But right now, I've been focusing -- and I think our discussion has been focusing -- on ALAC members. That's not an easy job to do well, but I think that has to be our first priority.

Number 2 -- we need to develop -- I say a "suggested" methodology. Because I think it's going to vary, depending on the individual RALO involved. We need to develop methodology for RALOs to evaluate their ALAC members -- both the ones they appoint and the non-com.

I know some regions have a formal process in place right now. Some have a less-formal process. But I think we need to proactively and consciously make sure that not only the procedure is in place, but that it's followed on a regular basis by the RALOs.

The RALOs are the first ones to lose if they have representatives that are ineffective. Because a number of the regions are already doing this in a very active and somewhat formal way in some cases, we have models. I would like to try to collect those and use them as models for the other regions.

We need to be quite strong in suggesting to the RALOs that we don't have control over their rules-and-procedure. But to suggest to the RALOs that this be done in a very active way.

The next one is, we need to put into place a process under which the ALAC takes action if there is, indeed, a problem. I differ quite a bit from what Carlos is suggesting. I feel -- due to the cultural issues we talked about -- due to the inability of some people to confront their peers -- I do not believe this should be done in a formal meeting of the ALAC.

If we ever get to the stage where the ALAC is formally removing a person -- which I'm not sure we have the right to... But assuming we do... If we ever get to that stage, that would require a formal -- presumably secret -- ballot to do it. Prior to that, having open discussions and asking people to defend themselves in front of their peers, I think is something that will not work.

If either the person does not feel comfortable doing this, or the person that's being asked to confront them does not feel comfortable in public saying... I know Gareth comes to all of our meetings. Forgive me. I'm picking on you... I know Gareth comes to all of our meetings.

V: For the record, this is an example.

Alan: This is definitely an example. [laughter] But I see him smiling, so it's okay.

I might not feel comfortable in saying, "Gareth comes to all of our meetings, but he never says anything. Occasionally, he says, 'The meeting's almost over -- shouldn't we leave?' That's as much as he ever says."

Audience: [laughter]

If any of you know Gareth, you'll know I'm not describing him.

But I might not feel comfortable saying that in a public meeting. When you come around the table to me, I'll mumble something like, "No, Gareth..."

So I don't think we want to have a formal equivalent of a trial or an interview with people asking them to defend themselves.

I think we need to have a conversation with that person in a more private venue, and give them the opportunity to explain themselves. To point out that there is some dissatisfaction. But I would not want to see it as a formal ALAC action at that point.

I would hesitate to say that we need -- at any given time -- somebody on the ALAC who can take the initiative in private. Now whether it's the chair or it should be someone else that's appointed for their good negotiating skills or whatever, I don't know. That's something that needs more discussion.

I think the first line of action... Speed up -- yes. Sorry.

The first line of action is going to be when Gareth is not performing, we go to Evan -- the chair of the RALO -- and say, "How are we going to handle this?" That kind of thing.

It needs more performance. But I would really like to avoid confrontation.

Lastly, I don't think the whole ALAC as a vote should be involved unless there is a position where we actually have to take formal action. At which point, the ALAC will have to be involved in a secret vote.

That's where we are right now. If you generally agree with the principles, I'd like to hear some comments. Then I think we continue... It's up to the chair... Either this committee or perhaps a committee of the whole, to try to refine these and get to a set of principles we can accept.

V: Yes.

I see first Carlos. I'm asking Carlos to go first, because we will lose our translators, now. Make it short.

Spanish Channel: Yes. I agree in what Alan is saying. There could be some sort of arbitration or amicable component conversation previous to the process. But [I insist] the process should exist.

This process should go ahead. Because this amicable arbitration -- we don't have a way to resolve it, otherwise, if it's not formal.

V: I'm going to punctuate and apologize profusely to the interpretation team, who are not translating at all. They're doing a brilliant job of interpreting. They do have to leave. So can you please thank them all in the usual way.

Audience: [applause]

V: You are heroes -- one and all!

Adam?

Or Gareth -- then Adam. I did forget Gareth.

Gareth: The comment was made earlier that it's possible a RALO would refuse to confront a situation like this. That may be, although I doubt it. May I point out that the reason I'm sitting at this table is because of a situation I [inaudible] at [EU]RALO, and was dealt with. This is the result. Thank you.

V: And we're very pleased with the result, might I mention. Adam, go ahead.

Adam: Yes. I think the RALOs should be taking the lead in this. If that's where the responsibility is.

But the most important thing to me is to actually get some kind of job description -- for want of a better word. Particularly as we're going to have three new non-com appointees that are going to be appointed people joining us in November. They will arrive on a description that's different from the one that I am serving under.

In terms of the amount of time, it's quite significant. They're going to be asked to do a minimum of 20 hours a month. That does not include attending the three meetings. [I] was asked to join on the assumption of 18 hours a month -- which I think, reading the description I remember... and I probably wrote it -- included attending the three meetings. That's still about two months of work.

One of the things that a noncom does -- and this is different from you as RALO appointees... it actually asks you to make a formal commitment when you sign your statement of interest -- i.e... your application -- that you commit that time.

So for me, and I'd imagine for many people, that means going to an employer and asking for that time -- which I did. So if I actually then have to go back and ask for more, my employer's not going to be that pleased. Because they've already given that time to ICAAN, in effect.

So I think for the actual job description it's important that we get it consistent -- year-by-year. Yes. Otherwise we will struggle.

V: Vanda?

Vanda: Also, let's remember the coaching. We need to bring in people, and decide who will coach the people that week a little bit during the October meeting. Thank you.

V: Yes.

Alan: I'm not sure I noted, as I was flying by this... Both Fatimata and Carlos mentioned that part of this overall process is us coming up with a list of benefits to the ALSs in the region -- to rationalize why employers should give up some percentage of time.

V: Right.

The time has come for us to move on to other things. But I think this discussion is the first step in what now needs to be an expedited step, and a commitment. I'm therefore going to say, "...of a committee of the whole," [to put comments -- consider]. And we will have this on our agenda for decision at the next ALAC meeting.

Is there any objection to that time course now, which was at the end of the next month?

V: Sorry -- next ALAC meeting in Seoul?

V: No. The next monthly ALAC meeting.

V: Ah -- okay.

V: I don't see the face-to-face meetings as other than an alternate space for our monthly meetings. Okay?

Now if anyone has got a six-month holiday that they're leaving on tomorrow, perhaps you should let us know now. Six months? Okay. How are you at working from the remote world of scuba-diving and enjoying yourself, Sébastien?

Sébastien: No -- my [inaudible] will be at the end of July. I will be in the middle of Australia -- not in scuba-diving. Then it would be difficult for me. I will be in a really remote, remote, remote place then.

But frankly, I am sure you will do a great job. And I will follow the discussion before, when I will be able to do it.

V: I'm sure, Sébastien -- before you get to the middle of Australia... I can't imagine you not logging on and having a look and responding, if you have a problem with any of the comments.

And I must apologize... We are a large country, and we do have third-world Internet standards somewhere. I'm afraid you are going sort of right out about as far as it can get.

Interestingly enough, though... You may have better Internet connectivity there -- at least in the major nodes -- than you would 40 km away from this city. So all is not lost.

The center of Australia, in fact, has been running educational programs over radio, and have now moved to Internet, because of that. Since the very beginning. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan: Given the amount of time it's going to take people to get home to recover from these 20-hour days that some of us have been having... And get a document ready for at least a week before the meeting... I believe the next meeting is too aggressive.

I believe we should have a good substantive thing to report, coming out of -- again... it doesn't work if people don't respond to e-mail and contribute -- or the wiki -- or whatever we use.

I do not think we're ready to vote on this coming meeting. I think we should have a good update, and hopefully the meeting after that. But that remains to be seen, if that's the right one. I'm not recommending we wait 'til Seoul.

V: No -- I basically like to be pushy. But let's then list it for discussion if that is the feeling of the meeting. Is everyone else in agreement with Alan? That that is being overly optimistic and aggressive? That we list it for discussion at our next meeting?

Alan: With a reasonable amount of time allocated.

V: Yes.

Alan: Whenever we get to general topics, I have a very short statement related to this, but on a different subject.

V: Any further discussion on this matter? That matter is closed. General business is open.

Alan: I know we spent an infinite amount of time trying to figure out when our ALAC meeting should be, and tried to coordinate it with the RALO meetings and such. But I really feel that at this point, one meeting a month is insufficient.

I would like to see us go to perhaps one meeting every three weeks -- or something like that. I don't believe we're getting enough discussion -- real discussion -- going on the teleconferences. And I would like to see more. I may be unique.

Vanda: Let's remember, we need to have inter-RALO meetings.

V: Yes. I think the inter-RALO meetings may take that space, and may however also contribute valuably. They may make more value into what's happening in our ALAC discussions. I'm concerned about volunteer burnout, here.

Alan: What is an inter-RALO meeting?

V: You see, this is what happens when you hide in the gNSO representing us. [laughter]

Audience: [laughter]

Alan: Granted. But may I get an answer, anyway?

V: Yes. Certainly. Vanda? Do you want...

Vanda: I have suggested that since Andrés raised a lot of difficulties to [inaudible] some RALOs. We should get more advantages and information and best-practice exchanges.

If we have inter-RALO meetings -- the secretariats together with the chairs -- or even only the chairs... Once a month... To talk about RALO issues, and how they could improve what is going on in their region and blah-blah... It could be very useful for the RALOs. To get more interaction among them. That's the idea.

V: I didn't look up to see who was first. Was it you, [Jesse]? Oh -- Sébastien.

Sébastien: I was first, but she will go first, because I'm sure she will say the same thing.

V: Okay.

V: Actually, this is already an action item for staff to revive the secretariat's wiki -- and to

organize something like monthly conferences between the secretariats, to discuss that kind of issue. So it's already into the action items and into the agenda.

Sébastien: To add -- it was a proposal made by [Dezi] yesterday at the secretariat. The [chair] meeting. I was participating in it, and they made this decision. I think we need -- as ALACs -- to support this decision, and welcome this organization to be set up. Thank you.

V: I certainly think that's going to be a huge powerhouse of productivity. It has to be. There's no choice.

V: Powerhouse of productivity.

V: [laughter] Well -- because one region can look at what another region is doing. We don't always have core focuses on particular topics. But you can, in fact, perhaps form some mutual agreements and get a short version out to your communities, and get it back in a reasonable time. Go ahead.

Sébastien: And I must say that at this meeting, I was very pleased to see a lot of work done by AFRALO, for example. They produced three different papers. It's very, very interesting. And it's important that it's shared among the RALOs. Because it could give some good ideas from each to the others.

V: Ladies and gentlemen -- thank you all -- one and all -- for what I think has been a hugely rewarding -- occasionally exciting -- and often-challenging... sleep-deprived and over-exercised or should I say under-exercised an overly-sedentary experience.

V: And a wonderful country.

V: And I'm glad we got the weather right, eventually.

Is there any final word from staff? Because they're doing things. Yes? No? We're right? She can close?

Sébastien: I just want to be sure that everybody gets the mail that we received from the ICANN constituency travel. It's important for you to know that you need to leave your room at 11 am, and you need to leave the hotel 3 hours before. If you don't have this [message], just ask me or the staff to give it to you, please.

Vanda: And we also got an e-mail from Bertrand. I'm not finding it now, but -- there will be a meeting in the afternoon.

V: Yes.

V: At noon?

V: [inaudible] Level 2. At noon.

V: Okay. We will have some time this morning -- an official verdict on exactly when and exactly where. It will go out on the Skype, because we don't have a window open for this morning.

Vanda: But in the afternoon, we have a meeting.

V: The executives have a meeting -- until 6.00. Yes. We've got staff people lined up.

V: 2. Yes.

V: Okay. Thank you all. Ballroom! Vivek.

V: Thank you, Cheryl, for the biscuits and the vegemite!

Audience: [applause]

[session ends]