

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good morning Ladies and Gentlemen, this is awful feedback, that's a whole lot better, should I do testing, testing, testing, testing, testing, testing. I'll start whispering. Good morning ladies and gentlemen, we are unfashionably 4 minutes past the hour, but we are also not quorate in the room yet. Is there anybody on the phone bridge? That sounds like a no. Okay, we shall start with informal work at this point in time, the transcriptions are being done, sorry the translations are being into our normal languages and we have a short amount of Kevin's valuable time.

And I think if we can give you the 'go' signal at your earliest convenience, we will start off with the briefing on the FY11 Budget with someone I trust you all know well and can recognize in the corridors, because that's where you have got to trace him to talk to him sometimes, bit difficult to track him down, he's going to talk budget to so many people in so many places, he is probably heartily sick of this speech by now, but over to you Kevin.

Kevin Wilson: Great, thank you Cheryl. Thank you everyone. My name is Kevin Wilson and just to clarify, this is being recorded and transcribed right?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct.

Kevin Wilson: Okay great. I am the Chief Financial Officer for ICANN and I am pleased and excited, maybe excited is a little stretched, but I am pleased and looking forward to presenting the Operating Planned Budget proposed for a file of in which begins July 1<sup>st</sup>, in a couple of weeks, or less, and goes through June 30<sup>th</sup> 2011. Next slide, can we? Matthias, do I have control? No? You do, okay good. I can see your mouse, I recognize your mouse.

So it would not be right to have an ICANN meeting or sub-meeting to not talk about the process, so let me just start with that to say we've been following a pretty set process, those established about 3 years ago and that follows the bylaws that were established 12 years ago, or so. So essentially what then happens is that the first six months of the year, there is a strategic plan update, an update to the three year strategic plan and that was updated in February of this year, most of you know that that was a simplified, I call it the one pager, so we can have the four focus areas of the strategic plan.

And we've done our best to follow that and the process both follows it chronologically and we've also tried to follow it philosophically and being very simple and straightforward on the four focus areas. So the next step was the framework which we started doing a couple of years ago and that's a document that was posted before Nairobi and then we've had many community calls, meetings and have synthesized that feedback and obviously the At-Large and ALAC have contributed greatly and had several calls and conversations as well. And then per the bylaws, the 17<sup>th</sup> of May, Cheryl did you? No, go ahead? I thought you were waiving at me for something, the tap or the ear pull as the signal.

Okay as per the bylaws the draft FY11 Operating Plan and Budget was posted on the 17<sup>th</sup> May, there were more community calls and meetings and synthesis, more feedback and this last step is the Board Finance Committee Reviewed this and will recommending it to the Board to adopt in tomorrow's Board Meeting. There's also an open forum at 9:30 today and I've had many meetings this week with smalls breakout sessions and some larger breakout sessions to discuss that, so that's the next step. Thank you.

So just to summarize the feedback, there's been a lot, I guess I'd put it that way. And the focus has been, a couple of things from a process (inaudible: 0:10:25.6), the Finance Committee has been really clear to us that not only do we synthesize the feedback, not only do we solicit the feedback and not only do we synthesis the feedback, but that we also provide feedback to the feedback, so that those who can comment know exactly how it impacted, whether we accepted the change, whether we rejected the change or whether we modified it or we assimilated the change. So we've been trying to be as clear as we can on that.

Let me go to the next slide, I'll tell you what the substantive changes and some of the comments, I'll add anecdotally some of the comments that I've heard this week. Probably the most consistent changes we'll want more information and although this budget is 83 pages, that's also feedback after I've been hearing this week, that's a good start, or some people said it's a great start and then others that feedback is we really need is more and more detail, so probably would like some feedback on how much do you tell is appropriate, but we have 83 pages with appendices, charts, tables and the intention is to provide even more of that.

In particular the EAG which shows the expense spending in a certain view called the Expense Area Group which roughly aligns with the way ICANN has organized the community structures so there is actually a slice of the pie for operating expenses for At-Large for example. The next thing is there is a request for a fact based studies to improve the policy development process and in particular the GNSO passed the resolution asking for \$400,000.

And our response was, we decided to increase resources for that so we have something like close to \$500,000 actually for Whois studies and several \$100,000 for ESAC related scaling studies and obviously the new gTLD has significantly more than that on studies to complete the arching issue, over-arching issues. At-Large support, there was a request to provide more incremental staffing, so that's now in the budget, there are some suggestions for fee cost adjustments, yes?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just at that point, just at that point, what you just said, for the record, was incremental staffing; you are still aware we are a full FTE down on our normal?

Kevin Wilson: As of today, yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, so we're getting to normal C and in the budget looking to incremental staffing increase.

Kevin Wilson: Right, I understand that. I understand your point, so really the point of the slide, so just to be clear the point of the slide is, we originally were going to try to use this as more of a shared resources comment, concept when we did the framework, to have more shared resources, and the large outcry was that, from the community that wasn't going to work and so we went back up to that staffing model, so, point well taken.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Are you willing to take questions during, or?

Kevin Wilson: Why don't I go through it real quickly, because we have some questions? So that I make sure I cover at least the time allowed for the first part. I will only like spend five more minutes to complete.

Another question that came up was, was the revenue accurate, and that's been queried, each of the sources of revenue, not the registrants, we didn't check with the registrants, we'll have to figure out a way to do

that, but we have checked with registries, registrars, full cc's and g's, we've checked with the RAR's, are our assumptions correct in that, I think that we made some good progress on that, we could always use more. And then the point that the Finance Committee asked us to provide feedback, there's a whole Appendix C, which is new this year, which provides that feedback to the feedback and we've already received comments and we'd to even to have a better rather than just saying 'yes it was', or to have more description. So my guess that Appendix C will double in size next year, if we follow that trend.

Other things that came up, just in the meetings, there is today, or this week excuse me, are contractual compliance, I heard that in almost every meeting as why are we cutting, drop contractual compliance, or why are we only growing 7%, so the answer to the questions: contractual compliance as an area of ICANN's emphasis, one of the 15 organizational activities, is growing, there is room in the headcount to grow.

And add audit resources another management resources to that, there is also, I believe, that some of the rather expensive Whois studies that were used in contractual compliances assure that was professional service costs, can be reallocated to provide more compliance efforts, so, we believe that the contractual compliance resource, the resources is associated with contractual compliance, are sufficient given the ICANN that we have today, with the current RAA and the current registry agreements that we have now.

Obviously we're starting to plan for, as part of our operational (inaudible 0:15:55.8) exercise to plan for contractual compliance of the new ICANN, with, if the new gTLD registry agreement with the new RAA possibly and also with the vertical integration issues that have been discussed, so each of those would require a re-assessment of what the contractual compliance resources would need to be. So that's a thought there on those, so I wanted to make that clear.

The other one is about the reserve fund that we want to make sure that the reserve fund is properly balanced, it's the right size, it's the right risk posture etc, so it is in the black, it follows the financial market, so it's a tough - I follow it every day on my iPhone put it that way. And it's a tough turbulent market but it's still in the black, its still, you know, more than we've contributed to it, so that's good, it's 45.59 million as of two

days ago, but the finance committee is doing a review of that this summer as part of their investment policy to do an N or a V. Okay next slide. I'll go quickly. I think I covered most of this, about the overall budget; I'm going to the next slide. Thanks Matthias.

This is a little tough to read from here, but this is essentially saying that the overall budget, a key cornerstone of the budget is that we want it to be for fiscal responsibility, not overspent, so the revenue line (inaudible: 0:17:36:0), 65 million is pretty set with the dot.com contracting flat so there's not the growth, the high growth in revenue that we've had in the years past, there's operational activities that come in and we cost those out and we need to still be fiscally responsibility and not overspend the costs for that, so we still have 2 or 2 million dollars contributed to the reserve fund at the mid-year. Next slide.

This is a snapshot of the 15 organizational activities, I can't see it here, my eyes are too bad but you can see it online obviously it's part of the 83 page budget document and essentially that just shows that the large growth areas that we felt that still needed growth out of the internal security efforts policy, including At-Large support that is part of that, and then DNS Sec.

The reduction year over year of the gTLD costs, not that the thought is to stop the gTLD delay, the gTLD program at all, but just that many of its complete, many of over-arching issues are complete and we see, I'm not sure if light at the end of the tunnel is the right analogy to use, but from a budget resource standpoint is that perception is that you will need less to finish that and also the separate new gTLD budget is more developed and more evolved. So, we're able to push off on that separate budget item. Okay? Next slide.

This is one that I really wanted to get your feedback as well, really this is saying that the budget document, the draft budget document is proposed or asked the question and I think it's being circulated as well. Perhaps we should change the planning process somewhat, that maybe the strategic plan doesn't need a full 6 months to update it, it's pretty stable and we could spend less time updating it, however the resource allocation, at least on the broad dials standpoint, that we would like to get involved more, earlier in the process on what are the resources.

And then earlier in the process on what information is needed to make decisions on prioritizations, keeping in mind that the budget really is an exercise in setting activities and prioritizing them, it's as simple as that. The other key aspect of this possible change in process is the SOAEC chair and the supporting organizations Advisory Committee direct involvement, more direct involvement in the budget development process, so we're committed in the September/October timeframe have a meeting with all the SOAC chairs to get their early input on that so by Cartagena we can have a meaningful discussion about broad allocation of resources and making sure that we're landing it correctly and then continue on that. Okay. Next slide.

Think this is the last one, yes. So this is just saying that the new gTLD budget is out for posting, it's more clearly defined, we want to make sure that we have good community support and it's not ready, when I say it's been posted for a community comment, it's not part of this budget. It is proposed as a separate budget amendment and so the two parts of it that are most relevant to the community, well there's actually 3 parts excuse me, there's the first part which is the development which is part of this budget, that's to complete the implementation.

The second part is the deployment which is estimated right now at \$2.6 million and those are the costs that we believe would be required to complete our operational readiness so that there would not be a delay in the launch. So these are the long lead time activities, software, real estate, hiring's that we'd need to have onboard by the time the launch happens, so that we would not be delayed, once the program is approved.

And then the final third of the budget which is the big one, which is all the revenue and all the panel costs and the actual application processing costs. So, I wanted to let you know that's out for community comment, I think that the Board has allocated a sizeable section of the public forum for that, so we'd like to get your feedback on that. Ok, good that completes my prepared remarks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much Kevin, opening up the floor, we already have Alan on the queue, can I have an indication of who else wishes to speak at this point? I see Beau, I see Gareth. Go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: One targeted comment and some general ones, the targeted one, the one that you actually preempted me by discussing it. And that is the issue of

compliance. I will make a general statement of behalf of At-Large and they can tell me I'm wrong, because I haven't cleared it, but if you cut compliance budget, you cut our budget. We feel it's a major part of supporting the users because it's the only path, David says he is currently down two people to do budget constraints, so he doesn't seem to think that he has enough people to satisfy today's world, so anything that can be done to address that, and obviously going forward, the world may become very much more complicated, we hope ICANN will treat it seriously.

Kevin Wilson: May I address that?

Alan Greenberg: Sure.

Kevin Wilson: So I will try to understand what David meant by that but I think some people would say that we're down 100, 200, 500 people, and that some of the quotes, we need an Atomic Energy Commission type model that has 10 to 1 compliance policy people of 10 and implementation and actual auditors of 100's and 100's, so, that's an interesting question.

I am not sure that's the right model for ICANN but the plan is that, and that, my understanding, we can check with David again, is that there are budget resources for there, and there a couple of open positions so maybe that's what he's referring to, so I'll certainly work on filling those and want to make sure that we're doing everything we can to do what we need to do to enforce current contracts.

And I think David might be a little bit shy, doesn't sound like him but I assume that you know that there are 30 registrars, for example, that have been terminated, so there is certainly a lot of effort on the contractual compliance efforts, and following up those that don't pay and those that don't comply with various contract terms.

Alan Greenberg: This wasn't a negative comment about compliance (inaudible: 0:25:57.9). I think the word I used was the ray of sunshine in a very dismal day. But the implication, I think the statement he made, maybe I wasn't listening properly, was they are short headcount because of budget constraints which is different from we're trying to fill them. So anything that can be done in that side, I think, it would be appreciated and the issue of 10 to 1 ratio a la Atomic Energy Commission came from Roberto who works for the European Atomic Energy Commission and that was in response to a

number of discussions by people who are suggesting exceedingly complex and very difficult to enforce rules, which is similar to the Atomic Energy Rules.

I think our general feeling was we don't want to go there, if we can avoid it. The issue is not to build things so complex that we'll never be able to ensure compliance, but we'll see where that one goes. Overall I think we're seeing a lot better understanding and I see a lot more information that we had before and keep doing it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead Beau.

Beau Brendler: I was going to make in essence the same statement that Alan made, but I would just say that in response to the response to Alan is that I don't think anyone has suggested hiring 10 to 1 compliance staff, we are suggesting that the audit positions, two of them, from what we understand, be filled and I think in this room, and I can't certainly necessarily speak for everybody but I think we would prefer to see perhaps, ICANN forgo expensive Gala's if that saves enough money to have people on board who can actually accurately monitor compliance with the RAA.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Point well taken, well made and I hope Will heard we're not criticizing compliance, we want them strengthened and more and more brought up to speed.

Kevin Wilson: Thank you, appreciate that, and just a point or clarification, you know that the Gala doesn't cost ICANN very much and hopefully you're not referring to specifically the Gala but things like that.

Beau Brendler: Well, ok, point taken. Another point that should be made is that ICANN needs to realize that contractual compliance does not just mean collecting money from people who owe it to ICANN, it means enforcing provisions of the contract that affect consumers.

Kevin Wilson: Absolutely, thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead.



Gareth Gruens: Yes a question regarding ALAC support staffing. If I heard correctly, there's another vacancy happening about now and is this going to be filled right away?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Perhaps I can help. There has been a vacancy since Nick moved on. We have not had, we've had a vacancy since Nick (inaudible: 0:28:01.6) moved on, this is not a new vacancy, there is not an axe falling on someone's head this afternoon. It's alright. The point is that we've operated for a significant amount of this financial year, a full person down. And we need to make sure that we're very clear on getting to our basic need that was already established and they were still drowning, not waving, in the work we're doing with them, and extending to meet particularly the regional needs.

Because this is the point, as you know, our life, where we're moving away from it being 15 people in a room, its all of you regional leaders and all of the dozens of ALS's you all have, and that means timezone issues, it means meeting support issues, it means management issues, it means work.

Gareth Gruens: And some of these needs are going to be addressed in the new budget, I assume?

Male: From what I've heard.

Kevin Wilson: Yes.

Male: Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Press the button. Floor is still open, any questions? Go ahead thank you Adam, and then I have Tijani.

Adam Peake: Some quite general questions then. Is Nick's job actually listed on the, Nick's job, not the participation position, the old ALAC position that Heidi took and then, you know, the empty space.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think what you're trying to ask Adam, is Matthias' job listed because Heidi became Nick, Matthias became Heidi and no one became Matthias.

Adam Peake: Exactly, is that job listed because I was just about to go to it and I decided to speak instead.

Kevin Wilson: From a budget resource standpoint, it is, whether on the Human Resources side, I'll have to check.

Adam Peake: I believe it's not, though I haven't actually checked, but I believe it's not. Quick question about tenders generally for studies, which there are quite a lot, how does....

Kevin Wilson: Can you say the word - the what studies?

Adam Peake: Studies generally about Whois and others, and there'll be vertical integration and all kinds of things, how does that process actually get started because the tendering seems to be a little bit, you know, there's a call for tenders but it doesn't seem to be as efficient as it could be, in the sense that, if you think about something like vertical integration, which people are calling for studies on at the moment, you have a city here that does studies on economic modeling, ICANN never seems to reach out to the type of people who do the studies that we need done. I know there's a general tendering that goes out on the ICANN website but that just simply doesn't seem to be the most efficient way.

So, that was just a general comment on studies particularly about travel policy because we haven't mentioned that this morning, that must be a shock to you, but I wondered if its time, have you mentioned it? Well not.... I wonder if it's time to review BCD's effectiveness and operations. They're good, they respond to us and, well they've responded to me, my experience has been good with them, on an individual one-to-one basis but every time they've offered me a ticket, I can get a ticket cheaper, and sometimes it's a third cheaper, so we're not talking about a little bit of money.

When you look at the listing of prices of tickets that are paid, if we're meant to be on the least cost ticket, why are tickets for people from the same Cities, different prices? I mean, I am sure there are good reasons for this, but there is something going on there that I don't think is as efficient as it could be. I know that I could travel on the same money and be happier than the ticket that BCD is giving me and I also know that they're wasting money.

Kevin Wilson: Good, so just to address the procurement. When you say tendering, is that the same, I'm trying to translate English to English, it's like a

requisition or purchasing? Yes? The finance committee and the audit committee directed or provided oversight on the procurement guidelines, some of you know that, I think, that two years ago or so we updated a disbursement guidelines so we had at least clarity on who could disburse, and that's the payment, so I call the contracting cycle. Then the next up was the procurement guidelines which is what I think you're referring to, with a requisition form and all that.

In that, which is posted on the finance section of the website, and in that guidelines it describes what the conditions are for an RFP, for an RFI, request for proposal, request for information, as well as when it's more broadly available, when we provide outreach. Obviously it's for something like a panelist for the new gTLD program, that's a very wide spread panel, you know, and posts things and newspapers and financial institutions for a financial panelist for example. Things like these studies we're talking about, there is sometimes a very very specific and we know there's only a very few people that can do that kind of study so there tends to be a narrower range. There is actually a procurement guidelines we'd like to have feedback on whether you think that's we landed right on the balance on that.

Anyway that was posted. As then far as the travel guidelines, yes we will review that, we had a GNSO travel meeting earlier this week and they echoed the same things that you said so I've already taken notes and taken that on. But if you could put that in writing, on those specific suggestions, we certainly don't have no intention of doing that. There actually is a NFQ that I forced to put in there which is, because I kept on hearing, five or six meetings ago, a little less four meetings ago and last 3 meetings ago, but I guess that its come back up, which is what do you do if you can get a cheaper fare than what's been offered to you.

There's actually a specific process, so the answer is: let us know immediately because chances are, even if you could save \$100 if we can learn about what problem is or help BCD learn what the problem is , if it is actually a problem and there really is a bona fide fare, multiplied by 100 travelers, you can see that's a significant (inaudible: 0:34:32.1) matter, it might seem small to you to save \$100 or say a 30%, that gets my attention immediately, that's a huge number.

Adam Peake: Yes I did put in an exception request to reduce the ticket by \$600 and I was told that 'no I couldn't do that.' And it was the form letter reception

request exceptions, which sounded like I was being rejected for something I was asking for positively, I am asking for more money, Adam slap on the head, no you can't have it and it was a sort of a slap on the head for me. You know the way letters were worded - I don't care, I thought it was ironic.

Kevin Wilson: To be honest, I am a little shocked by that but I will follow up on that and find out what the real background is, I'd like to report to you because, if nothing else, I want to make it really clear, it's in my DNA and I think everybody on my side of the hallway's DNA, anything related to travel, that we do want to save money on that, there's not an intention or purpose for intention, sometimes, just so you know, sometimes its administratively more burdensome to save, I've heard stories, if we spent hours and hours and hours, we could save \$100, you can see that doesn't make sense, but generally I want to hear about that one. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you and just for the record, the saving I made by changing from the BCD ticket was \$3,500. Go ahead Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I have two questions; I'll start with the least important. I would like to react to what Adam was just saying, I had the same problem, several times, I had to have a stopover, an extra stop over, sometimes even using an extra company, in order to come home on Saturday morning instead of Friday night, so every time I can refuse this, and I can tell you every time the ticket costs half the price.

This time I came unto a direct flight and 2.5 hours with a different company, with a stopover and ticket is twice as expensive because I cannot come back home on Saturday morning as requested by ICANN. It doesn't really matter to me, but what really matters is that we made proposals for budget for our work and the proposals we've made where in the interests of ICANN in order to create more visibility.

Unfortunately they are not reflected in your proposals, for example, last year we came up with some activities, and you said they were not part of the budget, we said 'Okay, we'll put them onto next fiscal year', and you said again it's not in your budget, so please explain to me when a proposal is not accepted, why don't you give me a reason for this, and if what we proposed was not eligible, I think there is no hope for us to carry on working, we cannot carry out any activities because come and attend meetings and come home to me, is useless.

However, the projects we came up with, were very real projects and they would have involved African ALS's because so far the (inaudible: 0:38:15.6) of African nations is pretty low because of the reason we gave the other day, we also came up with proposals to improve the situation, we need some budget and we don't have it. We also gave ICANN the possibility to get real visibility within the internet ecosystem, such as the IGF and the World Summit on Information, for the World Summit it was too late but for IGF there was still time and I can't see it here. We suggested to create a workshop on behalf of ICANN, it was accepted, it is very valuable but with what I see here, we won't be able to do it.

Kevin Wilson: I really appreciate that Tijani, on that comment. So let me just address the travel first. So we said, it was about a year ago, wasn't it? We set out our goal to become Silver standard by a certain meeting and then a Gold standard by a certain meeting so it's clear to me, at least if I'm hearing from the couple of comments, that we haven't reached that level. So I've asked and I heard that from GNSO travel support team as well, that we're still distracted, I think that my biggest concern is you're distracted to doing the policy of ICANN by talking about personal travel.

So if I could grab a couple of you that are particularly passionate and knowledgeable about your situation, and take good notes and talk about how I can go back and address this specific situation. So I'm not just coming back with a general comment on people who are unhappy, rather specific examples, which would really be helpful if I could beg upon you to give specific on the suggestions, either in writing or meet with me afterwards? And then I want to address the other one as well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Do you want me to make space when we have a meeting with you on Friday in the ExCom, for that purpose?

Kevin Wilson: I would love that, I don't know if it's the same people?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Because many people will still be there, so I am happy and I am taking two vice chairs who will agree with me, this is an issue, let's give it some agenda time on Friday.

Kevin Wilson: I don't want to take away from the important work of ICANN, but if something is distracting you, we need to address that.

---

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And if I can, its 1600 start for that ExCom meeting, so it's an open ExCom meeting, this is going to be a very important conversation and thank you very much to make yourself available for part of that, because it does distract us, and that has to stop.

Kevin Wilson: Just to be precise, I am available but you have allocated a part of it for me right?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Kevin Wilson: Ok I didn't want people to think that I am only available for part of this and then your point about the budget, so what I think I heard you say is that you're believing that there's specific proposals and you're working very hard and making proposals and fine tuning the budget process and that we're not accepting that, and the synthesis process so will not be effective so therefore it's a little bit demoralizing or?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You can be stronger than that.

Kevin Wilson: A feeling of frustration, so the answer is that we need to get better on fine tuning that and why we did that, each comment, if you looked at appendix C, each comment is specifically addressed. It was clear from some of the other comments in other meetings I had, that's good, we need to be now more specific, maybe add a few more sentences on what that is, so once again, I would like to know your thoughts on, if I could, either offline on which comments you're making, and maybe we misunderstood it or maybe we thought that was a bigger resource than the value provided or there might have been some synthesis that actually happened that if you knew what the reasons were, you'd understand.

I kind of skipped over that slide, because you're such a sophisticated audience and for most of you you've seen this budget many times, but as you know, we're now at the place, like most organizations, where revenues are this and a certain level for those that might be on the call, I'm putting my hand at a certain height and the expenses are right up next to it so when we make a suggestion for another activity, and they're all good activities, people aren't making suggestions for frivolous expenses and things like that, so they're all good activities where the real tough thing of what items we have to take out, it's a zero sum game, it's a very challenging environment.

Its common and all your CFO's for any organization you belong have the same challenge so we need your help in making sure that those get articulated and correctly surfaced as well as identify what we should remove from the budget to accommodate for that, it's not just we're saying 'no' for no reason. So, ok, thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: [Inaudible: 0:43:23.3], then Alan and - but Kevin has to go, to Silvia so we're 15 minutes over, if Tijani just wants a tiny bit of extra -

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes I just wanted to say that we actually made some very very precise proposals; I was just saying that we had made very precise, very accurate proposals, they were very detailed. On top of this, the budget we requested was extremely low, it wasn't much and I think that in terms of travel savings we could make, we would have no problem in covering this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Just a quick comment on travel. I need to compliment you that you actually implemented this time one of our very specific request that is allow us to stay for the whole meeting and not tell us we have to leave a day before it ends. We thank you. We still have a similar problem on arrival, on occasion, but it's nice to see some change that we thought was completely rational and in fact defensible, that ICANN shouldn't waste money travelling, moving people half way around the world and then make them leave before it ends, and we find that encouraging and lets work on the rest of the list now.

Kevin Wilson: Sorry Alan to jump in, I have to make this point that I think a very important one, the travel guidelines are a community guidelines that are posted for community comment, feedback so from my standpoint you are the community is developing the guidelines and we implement it, staff obviously has a big role in synthesizing that comment so to the extent I appreciate the thank you to me, or to Steve, but it really is the synthesis of a comment and likewise the specific suggestions that are coming out, we need to have that big part of the travel guidelines, and staffs role is to implement that, not to, it's not you coming to father ICANN or mother ICANN to ask for permission, its we're implementing your guidelines and we're trying to do that as efficiently as possible. Thank you.

---

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Remembering of course, the ‘you’ here is not ‘us’, we are a sub-set of the ICANN community, its community ICANN capital letters ‘Y’. Go ahead Silvia.

Silvia/Translator: I would like to say that we know that the participation, can you hear me? Can you hear the English translation? Yes, as I was saying, we all know that taking part in this meeting is very important, and the whole way also setup a financial committee where each one of the delegates presented the activities, they find important for the following fiscal year, up until 2013. And we are very concerned because it’s been included in the budget only one meeting, one General Assembly in each of the regions and particularly, in my region, Latin America and the Caribbean, in this committee that we setup we presented all the activities that we thought were more important.

And I included the Cartagena general assembly, we understand that there are financial problems and my question is as follows, we generally make suggestions and unfortunately we have no answer, and what we propose is never done and we want to know why, so the idea of taking into account that we are meeting shortly in Cartagena, if we don’t have a budget in order to make all the participants take part in that meeting, are you going to approve only one General Assembly until 2013.

I would like to ask that this General Assembly has the support of ICANN and if its not possible please help us or work with us in order to find a financing funding in order to make participate all the delegates. But we need an answer; we need to know if we can do something because in our region, we are planning to do lots of things in this General Assembly and we really need all the delegates, this is what I’m asking for.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Silvia. Just what I’m trying to do is get Heidi to sit with - we’ve got Kevin convinced that this is a worthy exercise for us to pursue tomorrow, so on Friday in the ExCom, what the floor, the agenda, and let’s just deal with this. I’ve asked her to see whether we can get Mandy Carver - Global Partnerships, and Barbara – Communications, in the room at the same time, because part of this is the hot potato problem, whose space does it belong to, where should it fit in, who should be talking about what, if we can actually get people in the room to understand, because we did put in the regional meeting as a request, we’ve put it in [inaudible: 0:49:18.7] in every budget.



---

But you can feel that we need to work more on this and I know we're very tight on your time and I need to note to the meeting that I have to leave for a 9 o'clock meeting in time for that meeting, and we have some quorum based work we have to do before that, so I have Beau, go ahead.

Beau Brendler: Mine is very brief, there is a mention made of a policy that the mention made of a change in policy the last people to stay until Friday, I was told I had to leave Thursday, so for me that hasn't been changed.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: This is part of the, we're not got a shared understanding and I think we can just sort this out.

Kevin Wilson: Right and I can meet offline, obviously informally on these issues and I'd like to know specifics and I'd like to make it, just for the record, that was Silvia's comment and not mine, about the comments section in the chartroom. I appreciate Silvia's comments.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: [Analyse], very briefly.

[Analyse]: Yes, there's confusion and I've asked a couple of people, it says on Friday, the ALAC Executive Committee and that's what you're talking about. Who goes to that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well the ALAC Executive meets twice a month regardless, at any of these meetings we meet, and as anyone can join at any time anyway, we encourage you to come to that meeting and this is the type of business conversation we have with the leaders and executive that we can get access to at the end of the meeting, so for example, in the Nairobi meeting, the room was full, whilst its technically a meeting of the executive with senior staff, the room is full, absolutely, we do everything open unless there is a reason to close it. Very briefly.

[Analyse]: And one other thing, the public comment for the travel page and other ALAC things, if somebody at some point in their own time can give me a little tutorial, I haven't been able to find documents for this....

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No problem. Christopher, go ahead.

Christopher Wilkinson: Thank you Chair, some of us came here at 8 o'clock to discuss the proposed amendments to the bylaws, it's now a quarter to nine and we have another meeting at 9 o'clock.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Actually the 8 o'clock session was staff briefing on the FY11 budget, we started at 10 past 8 and we have run overtime because of the enthusiasm in the room, we're about to go into that piece which is yes, I admit, incredibly delayed, but we neither off topic or in an incorrect order.

Kevin Wilson: Thank you all, I'll take the hook to go on and happy to take more comments offline and appreciate your feedback, I really do appreciate that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And for the record, thank you very much Kevin, and we look forward to our continued conversation on the morrow. So it looks like you'll have the usual suspects in a specific example of what we're going to be talking about. I am now going to move that we do, shift the order for a few moments. And that is to go into ALAC business, the reason we have to go into ALAC business is we have to have a quorum to do ALAC business and some of us will be leaving, including those who don't constitute quorum. So is it the will of the At-Large Advisory Committee that we formally start our meeting now? Anyone against that?

We are now in an ALAC meeting.

We have several pieces of business that the ALAC, with 15 members, 8 or 9 of which are around this table, need to deal with. One of them is the proposal to form a consumer interest work group, this is Evan's proposal. It has been discussed. This is a formalization of the proposal for the consumer interest work group. Does anyone wish to speak to that matter? We're going to be putting that motion. The motion is to form a consumer interest work group, which is a work group of the At-Large advisory committee; does anyone wish to have their name recorded against that? Does anyone wish to abstain? That is unanimously carried, thank you ladies and gentlemen. Alan, tossing over to you for the AOC one.

Alan Greenberg: All right, as you're aware we meet in the next month or so, to select our representatives, two for the securities stability, there will be one for the Whois, representatives for the - sorry, we need to decide who to endorse for those two review committees, we're accepting applications in now, although I haven't seen any yet. We need a procedure to do that, I have proposed, since we will not have a face to face meeting, an opportunity for a face to face meeting like we did in Nairobi, and getting large groups

of people together in this group outside of the long scheduled day like meetings is exceedingly difficult, I have proposed that we use the same methodology we used for the ABSDT and that we have recently decided to use for something else which I can't remember, and that is take the ExCom and one other person per region, that gives each region some redundancies so if one person can't make a call, there is another one.

To do the initial selection, make a recommendation to the ALAC for a formal vote. This cannot be done on public lists and such, we're going to be talking about individuals, we can't even do it on the internal lists because one of those individuals might be on ALAC a week later or a month later, and have access to all the archives and such, so it's got to be done somewhat discreetly, but I think it's a very important issue as we've proven this time when we selected a good person for our review committee, there are significant benefits.

Thank you, Cheryl that was a compliment. And I think we need to do it again, and specially for Whois, a subject which is very controversial, where different people in Whois have very different positions and we only have one slot. It was rather disappointing that the GNSO was increased from one to four slots, under appeal and we were not, but we're stuck with it right now, as it would appear.

So my suggestion is that each region contribute one more person, a person who is, we, they believe has the capabilities to assess candidates for the review committees and will actually make their time available to do it and that we use that methodology, and I so move that we have a second.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We note Adam's (or Alan? 0:56:33.3) second and is there any point for discussion? Any call for discussion? No? We're going to put the motion. Does anyone wish to have their name recorded against this proposal? I see none. Anyone wish to abstain? I see none, therefore it is passed and a point of order to the records, CLO did not present a motion to create a work group for the consumer constituency. It is consumer interest. So Okay!

Excellent we have another piece of business, we have the work of the African AFRICAAN and AFRALO joint work group, which has prepared a statement that you have in front of you, it is the first of what I hope will be a number of statements coming in to us for consideration for

endorsement. This is a well thought out, well debated and well considered document, they are requesting that the ALAC formalize this as part of our interests and that I appended as work done in the reporting that I do on our work to go to the Board at tomorrow's meeting.

I would like to propose from my point of view that this is exactly the sort of example that we should be putting forward where our region and interested parties beyond our regional structures, have got together, created something to have input directly into a work group process at the right time. It's a perfect precedent and its one I would like the ALAC to seriously consider having appended as part of a formal ALAC report, it is language which has gone through a vast amount of editing, it is politically careful, it has the support of the whole region and if there is any other region which wishes to speak against it, do so now. Go ahead.

Male: I do not wish to speak against the document, I am just late. I would just like to see that the ALAC support of that document reflects the fact that although this document was written by Africans, about their situation, it also could apply to other countries in other regions.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And if that's an amendment, so we give this as an example and the global value of what is said, I think I can make sure that gets in to our reports specifically. So what I'll be saying is, here is the work from Africa, what it is saying is reflective of those communities from all our regions, is that the type of words you want? Excellent, that's now being put as a formal proposal that we adopt this piece of work from one of our regions as part of our reporting from this meeting, with the amendment to say that it is very cross regionally supported, I see Adam, I see James.

Adam Peake: My only concern is that there is a contested sort of dot Africa application and as long as both parties are fully in support of this then I would see no problem going forward, but that would be my only concern is that we may be jumping with a foot in some problematic, and by the way, I can't find a working year thingy.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You can come and have mine, I am going to get Tijani to answer that question, I want to have on the record that when this goes to vote, my vote is yes, I must leave the room, which my vice chairs is going to take over now. Alan, thank you, go ahead. My apologies Chairman of the Board. Use the microphone Christopher, none of us can hear you otherwise.

---

Christopher Wilkinson: I would like to make a short comment on the amendments about the bylaws, as long as you're here as Chair of BCEC.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: In which case we will need to reconvene, because I am already late for a closed, in one minute I am going to be late for a closed meeting with the CEO, and I can't do that. So if you want to talk to the new chair and reconvene at a point in time, I would like to do that, if we had started and kept to schedule we should have been right, and therefore mea culpa, obviously very poor chairing on my part.

Male: Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Go ahead.

Male: Okay, there is no notion of dot Africa, nobody speak about dot Africa in this document. It's a general document about the expectation of the African community from the resolution 20 of the Board only, nothing specific for anything or any application is there.

Christopher Wilkinson: Great.

[Analise]: I noticed that there is no mention in here about the applying for organizations actually being African or from the African countries, so I don't know if that's something that may want to be added, otherwise you could get all kinds of applicants moving to Africa to take advantage of certain...

Male: What she said is there is no... Can you repeat it with the microphone though, sorry.

[Analise]: I was just mentioning that I didn't see language in here, maybe there is further documentation further work but the way its spoken, it doesn't specifically say African applicants, it just says applicants located in that region. So that was the point that I wanted to make, so that we're not encouraging other applicants to move to Africa in order take advantage of certain other rules.

Male: In this document everywhere you see the African community or the African application or the African NGO's and everything is related to African.

Alan Greenberg: James?

James: [Inaudible: 1:04:11.4] I would like to congratulate you again for this very good statement that you produced, I express my support for, as a matter of principle I believe that ICANN should give sufficient support for developing countries that has special (inaudible 1:04:29.8) of on the application for new gTLD. So in general I do not have a problem with this document, I just like to be clear up front however, however, there is one point in the document that gives me a bit of concern which is the support of the new gTLD of a applicant in African to be privatized.

Alan Greenberg: Can you tell us where that section is that bothers you?

James: Page 2, point number one. So I believe that, I understand that this is an African point of view, but I believe that ICANN being equal and fair for all the communities, it should extend privatization equally across the board, rather than a particular community.

Alan Greenberg: Maybe I missed something, was there a proposal that the ALAC adopted this as an ALAC position?

Pardon me?

Alan Greenberg: Endorsement? I would suggest for reasons such as those named by, identified by James, that this document as written, I do not believe should be an ALAC thing, although I would hardly suggest that we support the African region in making this statement on their own behalf, I think if this were to be an ALAC Five Regions Statement, the wording would have to be generalized a little bit, because there are significant disadvantaged areas all over the world, and we wouldn't want to be restricted, so I would suggest we don't have sufficient time to do that here.

James: Alan, it's not a document of ALAC, it's a document of the African ICANN community, since it is an initiative of AFRALO, what is requested here is the endorsement, we need your support, you need the support of the whole At-Large community, it is specific to Africa, I know that for other regions it would not be the same, it would be perhaps different, but it is our expectation, from the resolution 20.

Alan Greenberg: From the discomfort I'm hearing from a number of people, to say the ALAC endorses this as an ALAC statement, I think is too strong, to say we are pleased to forward it as a statement of the AFRALO, and we are looking forward to a generalization or to similar statements from other regions, I think is very reasonable.

I don't think it's reasonable to ask LACRALO to say prioritize Africa above us, it might say that but I'm not sure they will.

Where we were, there was some discomfort among the people from other regions that the ALAC endorses this statement as written given that it says things like prioritize Africa above other things. I suggest we take the opportunity to forward it with our support, I'm not quite sure of the words, and look for opportunities to generalize.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think that the word I did use, if it was accurately recorded was 'append', not endorse this document, append this piece of regional work as an example of what's happened in the region and state that the points that are made in this document, are echoed in the other regions, in other words, picking up what Patrick's words were.

Alan Greenberg: We need to learn to hang on your every word that sounds perfect.

Is there any objection to doing that? That is, forward it, use it as an example, of the kind of thing that we're praying for from every region, and are pleased to use it as a good example.

I see no objections.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Therefore I think it's a sort of very important landmark where we have, you know, a well organized regional proposal come to the ALAC, and the ALAC say 'thank you region' and move it through our conduit rather than anything else. Thank you Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I will add a personal comment, it is absolutely delightful to have people from regions, especially ones that have not participated very much in ICANN processes, to be a part of a cross-ICANN working group to be exceedingly vocal to actually be taking part in the discussions, contributing it and contribution some of the end products, and I am looking specifically at Tijani, I say 'Thank you'. That kind of thing increased our credibility unbelievably.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: In which case Mr. Chairman, is it possible for us to have the endorsement of that process, not the piece of paper, to go through acclamation and that also acts as thanks to the region.

Alan Greenberg: Is there anyone here who either objects or wishes to abstain? Seeing none, I declare it accepted by acclamation.

Alan Greenberg: I would suggest that unless there are any other votes, we desperately need to take today, that we return the floor over .... Yup, and that close up that section and turn the floor over to Christopher.

Christopher Wilkinson: Thank you. Madam Chair, members of ALAC, I speak just as one member of the BCEC, I would just like to draw your attention to the concerns that I have and I think may be shared, that the proposal for amending the bylaws regarding the seating of the future At-Large representative on the Board, these proposals in practice, envisage that the first turn of the Board Member would be for 6 months and that another election would be necessary next year, before the final election for a 3 year term would take place, for somebody to be seated in May of 2011.

I suggest that this is not a particularly soliciticious outcome, it would be difficult to get serious candidates to stand for an election for a 6 month term, and before this proposal is published for public comment, I think it would be appropriate for the committee and ALAC to ask ICANN to reconsider this absurdity and to make a different proposal. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Christopher, absurd is about the least of the terms that I think come to mind when we look for attracting the quality of candidate that we need, to be attracted to a potential of just a 6 month appointment is absolutely farcical. When we were in conversation as we were beginning these bylaws the other day, Christopher you were in the room, there was I think a, not so much a reconsideration, but a discussion that said clearly because the need to seat, seat number 15, which is what we'll be getting, needs to be in synch with the other SO's.

In other words, when the SO's seek their people, that is when our person needs to be seated in cycle, and so this as an inaugural one, which is out of synch with the cycle, needs to somehow be adjusted. But the conversation was 6 months or it could be 18 months. Right? Because there are two opportunities for this, so I think what we should be doing is



---

leveraging for that second option, that we understand we need to get into synch, we understand that we want to have our seat occupied by a selected person in Cartagena, but that that should be a 12 month plus, not a 12 month minus, and that the rationale for that is exactly as Christopher has put forward to us, and I think that argument, even if it's a piece of formal response from the At-Large advisory committee to the Board, can be made post-haste if it's the will of the meeting. Go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I am in an awkward position in that I have declared I would likely submit a candidature candidate, but I am taking off that hat and putting on the one as someone who has spent more years than I care, writing and reading bylaws. Number, there are several points, first of all, Samantha pointed out that this was the same words used for the SO's, I need to do some historical research but I believe in fact that is not accurate. The words are the same but the situation is different, in terms of timing.

Second of all, you mentioned an option, it's not the only option, our explicit requests to the SIC and the Board said, since this is a 3 year term but will be made, will likely to be made in an off period that the term be 2 and a half years or 3 and a half years, that is centering around the 3 that is normal so one and half years is not the only option, there are other options, if they are viscerally opposed to greater than 3 years, then 2 and a half is a good approximation of it.

The other which I don't know if legal would accept it or not, and I think we need to ask. Is what if we had a vote and said 'this is the person we're selecting for the initial 6 months and for the full term', which says that the full term is still restricted to 3 years which is a bylaw tradition, but we not go through the charade of electing someone and starting the process to elect their replacement before they're even seated.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think we need to make the point, you've also got Adam and then Christopher on the speaking list, I do have to now go but what this is, is documentation that will go out for public comment. Right? This is not Board, if the Board says yes to this on Friday to putting those words out, they go out for public comment, and we need to make those public comments, not just an ALAC and a regional reaction, I'd like to think the ALS's, because it's their selecting process, lets swamp them with what they need, which is public comments saying that 6 months is not up. Then we have a process to follow. I do apologize but I did manage to get another 10 minutes out of my schedule.

Alan Greenberg: Can I say one thing as you're leaving the room; the problem is it would be unknown how they're going to respond to these comments during the entire period of the call for applicants, which is rather unfortunate.

Adam Peake: Well it would be very nice if we could actually get this language amended before it went out for, into the public wouldn't it? I was going to say two things that you covered Alan, the first is that historically, yes there were, when we went through the new process of the new bylaws from the evolution reform process that was sitting board members who had their terms readjusted, because of that.

But the difference of course is that they were sitting board members or they were board members who were going through an existing process, so historically it doesn't apply, its if you want to say something silly, its apples and oranges really, so I don't thing historically it makes sense to apply or consider what happened in the past, in this particular case. Now where applying somebody new, they were taking sitting Board members and others.

I would strongly suggest that it has to be 2.5 or 3.5 years, there's enough evidence in all of the discussion about directorships that it takes a great deal of time to get up to speed, a person who sat for 6 months would not even have made an impact and would be a waste of time. And I would probably tend towards 2.5 rather than 3.5 but that's just me because we're doing something new, so let's not stick someone in there for longer when we might be worried about them. Anyway, but that doesn't matter. But no, I'd like to, this is something I think we should try and get fixed before it goes public. That's it.

Christopher Wilkinson: We have an expression in English, I don't know whether it reached the rest of the English speaking world, it goes 'ask a silly question and get a silly answer'. I am totally opposed to publishing that nonsense for public comment. This will be at (inaudible 1:19:06.6) everybody, including the eventual candidates; will see immediately that this is absurd. No, I rather sympathize with Adam's candidacy but as a formal matter, I would invite us to seek the advice of that famous drafting committee that you had before this thing came up.

I don't think synchronization is sacrosanct, it certainly wasn't sacrosanct for many many years in ICANN, I don't see what the, why the staff

should pressurize ALAC to do silly things for the sake of synchronization and finally, I mean 2 and a half, 3 and a half. If someone does insist on the 6 month solution, I would prefer that we just extend the existing liaison relationships for 6 months and have one proper election, synchronized next year.

Alan Greenberg: You're the chairman, may I have the microphone.

Christopher: I've finished speaking; I'm a quarter an hour late for my next meeting. At a previous ALAC meeting I agreed to represent you all in the internet's governance meeting, so I'm not supposed to be here.

Alan Greenberg: At the last meeting I pointed out that I was deeply offended on behalf of At-Large that we were not given the same courtesy that other groups had been given to at least see and comment the bylaws before they got to this stage. We're in a rather hard position. It is conceivably possibly to lobby enough board members that the wording would be changed on (inaudible: 1:20:54.2) at the board meeting.

I am very reluctant to do that, because I don't know if we would be successful, it may get changed in the ways that we ultimately find less even less palatable than what we have right now, I would prefer to see some motion here saying, that we merged the two together and not elect someone for just the single term but for both, which gives it a three and a half year one, they put us in a situation which is just so unpalatable that I don't know what the right reaction is.

Adam Peake: My response would be, let's see what we can get from the board members today, about changing this text before it goes for them tomorrow.

Alan Greenberg: They may not have seen it yet.

Adam Peake: Well that's, well lets show them. I mean, let's go and find the SIC or whoever it is and show them.

Tijani/translator: I think that we need a very powerful motion, a motion of the ALAC to refuse the 6 month; I think that it is absolutely unacceptable to chose a person for 6 months, we should have the solution of 3 years and a half. We have to express the refusal of 6 months and if they go on with the 6

month, ALAC who is going to choose this director, is not going to accept it.

Alan Greenberg: Just a comment for Christopher, the synchronization is important for the ending date but it says nothing about the starting date. We had [Analise] and then Beau.

[Analise]: My suggestion is to break this up into two things. There is the 6 month issue and then there's the 'how long'. It seems like a lot of people don't want the 6 month issue, but if we're going to talk to the board immediately on this, we should have a proposed solution and it sounds that there's different ideas on the length of time, so, it would be interesting to find out if there's more consensus on the 6 month issue and then talk about whether we like the 2 and a half years or 3 and a half years or whatever people want.

Alan Greenberg: I would make a very quick comment, I like black humor, I get through a lot of situations with humor and I find this exceedingly humorous because within At-Large we went through a very painful process to convince the regions that we should not boot the person out after one year and get someone else because that's guaranteeing that we always have the weakest possible person on the board, that they never get any ability to establish themselves, to create dialogues, to become chairs of committees and stuff, so after fighting that very painful battle, we find that legal counsel comes back and says no, no, that 6 months is ok. I find that humorous. Beau?

Beau Brendler: Rudi had his hand up before me, so I'll cede to him but I'll just say, if this has put us in an unpalatable position, lets reject it. Just reject it and damn the timelines.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes I wanted to make a short comment. It's upsetting that we are getting such an important document just a few days before a board decision is going to be take on this. If this the way that ICANN is going to process and to make life difficult to ALAC, we have to clear, say no, we don't accept this because at the next step we have something to do, it will go the same way, I'm afraid that again we will be taken by surprise and we will have to accept things before being able to ask a community obstruct to process such type of actions by ICANN because if you don't have a lawyer in house, this can go in the wrong direction and disturbing our process.

Alan Greenberg: I guess that their answer will be, if we didn't get it out this quickly, it would have been delayed by a month, however I know they have been talking about this for a while and I am somewhat insulted by it. On the other hand refusing it, may well be that the process gets delayed for another god knows how long. Sebastien?

Sebastien Bachollet: First of all I want to reiterate my statement that I don't want and I didn't want to take any participation in that discussion but as it is, be clear, but as it is and it was not, I don't think it's a good thing that it's in front of us as ALAC body, we have set up a specific group to allow the region to be represented and to discuss that issue. My proposal is the following. That its go back and it's a pressured role point of view, it's not a content point of view. I ask the ABSTD to take on board this document and until the ABSTD make a comment on that, it couldn't be published anywhere before that we do our ground job, because if not its jeopardizing the overall process. Thank you very much.

Alan Greenberg: I guess I'm not sure I support that, but I am just worried that I've, we push the issue it will become a year and a half and therefore that will not be changeable which I think would also be an absolutely horrible way to At-Large to start his presence on the Board with a term that is that short. But, Adam?

Adam Peake: I think we've got two options, one is to do is what Sebastien has said, by saying that the ALAC is offended that it didn't have the opportunity to comment on this document in the same way as all the other blah, blah, blah. What we've said, you know, all the others have had the opportunity to comment on documents in the bylaw changes when they perfected their positions. So that's one thing we could take to the board, we could ask them for a two week delay or whatever we wanted before they publish so that we've had time to consider and respond.

That would be one option, the other is simply to re-write that paragraph and give it to them and say that the reason why we're re-writing this to reflect 2.5 years or 3.5 years is because you are going screw the process if you don't. So we either give them some text now, which they can replace that with, and that means that some of us have to sit down and write it, it's not very hard, except I've struggled with it, we can either give them text or we can ask them for a delay. That's what I think we have before us.

Sebastien: You talk about this point, but there are no other points in this document we need to discuss and maybe tweak?

Adam Peake: I believe there are, I could leave those to the normal process. This I think affects our elections and is really important.

Alan Greenberg: Well, at least one of the ones that Sebastien is talking about does also. But [Analise] and then Tijani and then Christopher, unless Christopher has to leave in which case you take precedence.

Christopher Wilkinson: Well obviously this subject was not properly put on this agenda and has not properly been prepared and we've been put in an impossible situation. My proposal did include what Sebastien has suggested that we ought to have the advice of the drafting committee that did all the groundwork for this, I'm not competent to comment on the history of it, I was dropped into the BCEC at the last minute, I can only comment on the lack of comments since reflected by the text in front of me.

If ICANN insists on 6 months, and given the enormous cost and labor involved in particularly for BCEC in determining the appropriate list of candidates, I would say don't rush. Just extend the existing liaison for this nuisance 6 months and do it properly once. I leave that thought with you.

Alan Greenberg: I don't believe that is actually necessary but that's certainly an option. I'm chairing and presenting in a meeting in two minutes, luckily just down the hall or maybe in this room, for all I know.

[Analise]: I'd like to make a comment, since I wasn't pointed; I'm just going to make my comment. I support what Adam is saying is that if we wanted to take an exception with this, I think that we should come to the table with a possible solution, otherwise you are just sort of opening a can of worms that could just take years and another thing is that, that language changed but do we know why it changed, or is there any explanation as to why this came as such a surprise, because maybe they don't even notice it. Maybe it was ...

Alan Greenberg: No, no, what they attempted to do was put in as similar set of rules to what was put in place seven, nine years ago for the supporting organizations (inaudible: 1:31:30.2) board members, but the

environment, the world was different and the timing was different, so they've ended up with something which is not acceptable.

[Analise]: So they don't know the specifics about this weird little 6 month...

Adam Peake: Oh they do, they just invented something new, which they thought was the comparable and analogue to the supporting organizations, the bylaw office supporting organization said that at the next beginning of the cycle, the GNSO for instance, will elect a person. Because we're doing this with the target date of having the person start in between the official dates, the middle year dates that are associated with supporting organizations, they back, they're trying to back fill with a 6 months term. Ok.

[Analise]: And would ALAC be happy to just add the 6 months to the end thing, we've talked about this for a while but we still haven't actually, as a group we don't know what we want.

Alan Greenberg: May I suggest that we reconvene here, how we get the message out, I asked some staff or someone to try to get it, at 1 o'clock, there's a 30 minute window between meetings before the open forum. Between 1 and 1.30 there is an opening, may I suggest we meet back here and try to come to some closure?

Female: Before we have any indication of where that meeting can be, we need to talk with meeting staff please.

We can ask for space, and once we get confirmation where that can be, then we'll let you know. We'll send an email.

Alan Greenberg: So between 1 and 1.30, if necessary we'll run over and miss part of the open forum. Can you try and arrange it and let....

Female: And Alan what is the purpose of this meeting exactly?

Alan Greenberg: To try to decide what, if anything, this group does. To the extent possible any BCEC people who exist here, there are BCEC's any ABSDT people who exist here should definitely try to attend but of course anyone else who wants to. I have to leave.

---

Sebastien: If it's a meeting, it must be a (inaudible 1:34:02.7) ALAC meeting to make decision.

Alan Greenberg: And we only had 9 people at this meeting before Cheryl, so...

Rudi Vansnick: May I make a proposal, can we just to finalize discussions, it's a formal proposal, just vote on the fact that we're going to accept or not accept this document as it stands, otherwise I think we, in an hour or two, we will have other minds, other spirits popping up and we're not going to take a decision and I'm afraid that this is again an action which is taken by ICANN to disturb us and I don't want to get disturbed by this type of activities that are just put on the line at the last moment.

Alan Greenberg: On a plus side we have a marvelous example for the ANT review team.

Male: is that black humor?

Alan Greenberg: That was fact that was a simple statement.

Female: What Rudi....

Male: So what are we going to do?

--End of recorded material--