From: Cheryl Langdon-Orr [mailto:langdonorr@gmail.com]

Subject: Action item on me from our teleconf yesterday regarding the recent Board Resolutions from Trondheim, reflecting on reports from various WG's including JAS and Rec6 CWG...

As discussed in our brief chat yesterday, the ALAC at its meeting on the 28th discussed several matters and concerns to our community and the At-Large participants in several of the recent WG activities (particularly the WG focussed on VI, JAS and Rec6CWG) arising out of the resolutions published recently from the Board Retreat at Trondheim, Norway see http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-25sep10-en.htm

The ALAC meeting was joined by Regional (RALO) leadership, At-Large Liaisons to ICANN SO's and other AC's and participants to the aforementioned WG's which as you know range from the 'traditional SO / GNSO Chartered WG (VI) through the Joint Chartering Organisation of JAS-WG between GNSO and ALAC to the tripartite or multi SOAC Cross Community WG for Rec6 that was jointly managed under Terms of Reference from GNSO, GAC and ALAC; the ALAC had formally appointed a Liaison from us as a joint CO to both the JAS and Rec6CWG (operating under role definitions and mechanisms from the current near final draft GNSO WG guidelines Section 2.2 page 11 of GNSO Working Group Guidelines - clean - updated 20 May 2010.doc) and both these Liaisons addressed serious concerns raised by their respective WG's since the Board resolutions have been published and the ALAC agreed that "Cheryl and ExCom to follow up on possibility of executive of two chartering organizations (GNSO and ALAC) speaking to Chuck about concerns re Board's reaction to JAS WG. Similar concerns regarding the response to the report from the Rec6CWG, will be raised by Cheryl in a teleconference between the CO's and Co-Chairs of that WG and again follow through on this will be actioned either by the ALAC or in any joint reaction from GNSO, GAC and ALAC that might occur (this will be followed though on either jointly with other issues or separately)." from AI's from ALAC meeting of 28 Sept.
https://st.icann.org/alac/index.cgi?action_items_28_september_2010_en

I am writing to you with this information and the following proposal so that the GAC and GNSO can consider what next steps they might wish to take jointly or severally with that which the ALAC intends to do. As I also mentioned in our call the GNSO Liaison to the Joint JAS-WG is expected to bring this matter forward at the GNSO meeting of the 8th of October and knowledge of ALAC deliberations and AI's on this matter may be of some interest or use to the GNSO Councils deliberations on this JAS specific matter as well as whatever might be raised regarding Rec6CWG.

On behalf of the At-Large Community involved and/or interested in these WG activities conducted since Nairobi and deadlined to feed into the Board Retreat where they were considering the new gTLD program Application Guidelines etc., ALAC will be writing to the Board and Senior staff involved, to requesting some information and materials that we trust will help us (as well as the WG participants and wider ICANN Community) the rational to the resolutions of the Board regarding the Reports provided, as well as some information as to depth and time taken in deliberation of the recommendations from the community (specifically the Consensus ones, but also those with Strong Support) by the Board and for

any information and/or explanation we can be given to assist our understanding in the decisions outlined in those resolutions, we will also be requesting access to and prompt delivery of the Board briefing materials and staff briefings on these substantial reports, (the Board Books) under the previously announced intentions and guidelines for these publications, (since Brussels) noting that at this stage the community has not had access to the Aug meetings materials and if a similar delay was seen with this retreat / meeting we would still be requesting information, explanation and assistance towards our understanding as we go into the Catagena meeting. We have also been requested to write to the ATRT with these concerns and with copy of the requests we make.

There is concern in our community that the briefings and staff advice given to the Board may not have done justice to the degree of information and the specifics of the various recommendations in these reports, nor that sufficient time or debate was allocated to them and we will be seeking assurances and information to disprove or otherwise these fears.

My proposal to GNSO and GAC is that with the knowledge of how our AC is planning to proceed and brief outline on some of the matters we wish to address, would GNSO and/or GAC like to collaborate and proceed in these inquiries and analysis as a joint activity? It is our belief that particularly where we were jointly operating as Chartering Organisations or in Cross Community mode this would be quite advantageous and if GNSO and/or GAC do wish to do so the ALAC and I look forward to the opportunity to continue to build better and more robust models for multi-stakeholderism and bottom up consensus built policy processes in ICANN.

Chuck I trust this missive is timely enough for it to be of some use to the GNSO Council meeting on the 8th and Heather recognizing that the GAC does not have an intersession model that matches the frequency of ALAC and GNSO Council meeting do let me know if there is anything I can do to assist any discussion and deliberations your AC is making on these matters and note also that as ALAC works with all of At-Large and at-large, we would value any individual or partial/subset interactions and interventions from your Members and Constituencies, if you as SO and AC are unable to join us in cross community collaboration on this...

I look forward to your Council and AC reactions to this proposals and towards ALAC and A-Large working with you in any way deemed most suitable and effective on this issue in the near future. Please note that by our mid month ExCom meeting (held in the week of Oct 11 TBC) where we next review our AI's I would like to have your feedback, guidance and suggestions on how you wish to proceed. Naturally as leadership and key representation in the ICANN Community we can I believe work more effectively and successfully in concert and collaboration rather than by divided effort on this and many other matters, and I hope your structures might see it that was as well.

Kindest regards,

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO)
Chair of ALAC 2007- 2010