Geographic Regions Review Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 15 February 2010 at 1300 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Geographic Regions Review Working Group on Monday 15 February 2010 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-geo-regions-20100215.mp3

On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#feb

Present:
David Archbold
Fahd Batayneh
Cheryl Langdon-Orr
Paul Wilson
Carlton Samuels

Staff:
Rob Hoggarth
Bart Boswinkel
Gisella Gruber-White

Absent Apologies:
Janis Karklins
Olga Cavalli
Zahid Jamil

Absent:
Adiel Akplogan

David Archbold: Okay, thank you. Well, officially good morning or good whatever it is for you, ladies and gentlemen. The agenda that Rob circulated starts off with an update on the working group survey. Rob, can you take that one?

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you, Dave. Yes, can I ask Gisella for the record just indicate who is on the call before I do that?

Gisella Gruber-White: Absolutely, good morning, good afternoon to everyone on today's geographic regions call, Monday, the 15th of February. We have David Archbold, Paul Wilson, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Fahd Batayneh. From staff we have Rob Hoggarth, Bart Boswinkel and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. And we have apologies from Olga Cavalli and Janis Karklins. If I could also please remind everyone to say their names when speaking, thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks, Gisella. Yes, Dave, I'll start off with an update on the working group survey. Thank you all for taking the final review of the document a week or so ago, much appreciated. And I appreciate members paying some attention to that, given that we are moving forward on the drafting of the interim report.

The document is in the ICANN translation system. The plan is that when that document does come back, I'll be recoordinating with our partners at BigPulse Surveys and work with them on their distribution models. What we continue to look at and I'm very excited about (essentials) is Cheryl's original idea about giving us the capability to link to the surveys by a number of communications mechanisms, including Twitter - just direct links we post on our Wiki. And then other inventive mechanisms that you all choose to (be able to) code individual supporting organizations or advisory committees.

One of the things that I'll be looking to all of you for guidance on is the timing issue. For example, how long you want the survey to be posted and available. As I've confessed in the past, I have not as a staffer been involved, you know, a broad array of survey instruments, just one or two in my time at ICANN. So your all feedback in terms of how long you think something should be out, what time period we give people to respond. And then ultimately how you all want to analyze and incorporate the results into the report will all be very useful direction and feedback on this effort.

I don't know if anybody has any comments other than, you know, I would note that as soon as I do get the documents back, I will let all of you know that they are available because I'll want to name the individual documents in soft

copy available to all of you for circulation. And then it's just really what this group wants to decide in terms of a plan, again, in terms of circulation, timing and then collecting the results. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Rob, Cheryl here.

Robert Hoggarth: Greetings, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Probably not a question that you can answer with great accuracy but is there a benchmark time as to when you think the documents will be available? (Unintelligible) gathered together, of course. You know, we do have a meeting number 37 where we could make some mileage out of it.

Robert Hoggarth: Definitely. I am hopeful that we will have the documents, certainly most of the translations by the middle of next week. You know, part of the challenge that we're facing is I did get it in almost a week before the Nairobi document deadline. So we're ahead of that wave of the document submission.

But you know, sometimes - and this is something I think the translation team still struggles with some of the languages - the availability of translators at times is not as commodious as other times. And so what I would expect is maybe typical we may end up with four of the languages available and two not. And what I intended to err on the side of caution in the past is not rolling something out until all the languages are available, not only because of the objects but just because of the, you know, the challenge of, you know, just petering things out bit by bit.

So my sense is the best approach may be for all the languages to be done but I will provide you all with an update at the end of this week in terms of what the status of the feedback is.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Robert Hoggarth: But I think...

((Crosstalk))

Robert Hoggarth: Yes, even in that timeframe I think we're still ahead of the beginning of the Nairobi meeting schedule.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent. Again, the absolutely totally selfish, from a large advisory committee point of view, our working languages are English, French and Spanish and our next preference is Portuguese. So we sort of have a hierarchy in order where some number of the ALS priority languages can be quite clearly identified. So you know, we can give you a sliding scale of shuffling which ones to the top if that helps.

Robert Hoggarth: That's great. And I mean - and if you all think it makes sense, I mean, if we have the French and Spanish and those typically come through faster and we want to go ahead and get those circulated...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We could go live with English, French and Spanish. And if we can get Portuguese after that, I'll be delighted and the others can follow.

Robert Hoggarth: Okay. And that's something I'll...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I mean, this is not as a public comment - this is not an ICANN public comments document. So you know, I seem a little bit duplicitous, I suppose. But recognizing the major working languages, I'd like to see it get some penetration and have something feedback-wise by the time we get together in Nairobi.

Robert Hoggarth: I will confess, I did have a blind spot on the Portuguese and I had requested the six UN languages that did not include Portuguese so I will renew my request with translations so they add that to the mix as well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We've got more Latin American and Caribbean at-large structures who speak Portuguese than we do who speak Spanish.

Robert Hoggarth: I will definitely submit that expanded request, thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Sorry about hijacking it there. Of course, you know I'm not at all sorry but it sounds good on the transcript.

David Archbold: Okay, back to the agenda and me, David Archbold. I'm going to propose that we skip the next two items for a moment and try and look at some of the organizational issues and then the remainder of the discussion can go back to the report.

So I'm looking at both the working group timetable and the benchmark changes, if we need them and the Nairobi meeting schedule. I'd like to get these two out of the way a little bit. Can we in fact jump to the Nairobi meeting schedule because in fact, Rob is not going to be there and in fact, neither am I. I'm going to be tied up, as I cannot get away from here because of court proceedings, though I will hopefully be able to remotely participate.

Rob, can you remind us what you have booked so far?

Robert Hoggarth: Yes, anticipating that the working group has met in the past at ICANN meetings and would perhaps like to do so during the Nairobi meeting, I did make sure that we got in a request to the meetings team, alerting them that the working group would be holding a meeting. I tentatively blocked off 4:00 pm on Thursday afternoon just as a placeholder with the anticipation that you all would then speak and then decide whether that might work for you. And if it didn't then I would, you know, change it.

But we're tentatively slated for the afternoon of Thursday in Nairobi at the conference center. Again...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here again. Sorry, Bart...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Am I crazy or is that going to clash then with the recently distributed time for this GNSO, the end...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, it will...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Workgroup 1...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, it will.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. And that date that they've chosen - notice day because I didn't want the day - they've chosen for the Thursday wasn't one of the two choices we were polled on anyway.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, we did say Thursday - sorry - can you hear me?

Robert Hoggarth: Yes...

Bart Boswinkel: Hello?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, Bart, I can hear.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, Thursday at 4:00 pm and just before, just after is - or just before is the delegation working group as well. So that's going to be Thursday afternoon packed with CC meetings, I know.

Robert Hoggarth: And since that time I got in the request, I - in the block schedule that Nick Ashton-Hart circulated just a little bit ago also notes that the forum on DNF abuse has now been scheduled at 4:00 pm on Thursday as well. So it sounds like that time will need to change.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, it - it's going to be like a dog's breakfast again.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Paul, will you be in Nairobi? Paul?

Paul Wilson: Yes, sorry...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: He might be on mute.

Paul Wilson: I'm afraid I won't be in Nairobi, no.

Bart Boswinkel: So it's - and there is - I think eight hours or seven hours' time difference, isn't there, between you and Nairobi?

((Crosstalk))

Paul Wilson: Yes, the meeting won't be so - working so great for me but I'll try dial in if I can.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I was thinking, we have one difficulty that the venue itself will close as far as I know at 6:00 pm.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: So either if we're going to do it, maybe we could do it, say, at one of the venue hotels and see if we can get that in or very early in the morning on Thursday. But that's difficult for Dave and Rob.

Robert Hoggarth: Well, any early day you also have to consider is that the conference center doesn't open until 8:00 am. So if you go very early in the morning, then you're also looking at potentially one of the hotels.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. And we have a problem with dial-in facilities there, don't we?

Robert Hoggarth: Yes. What may be helpful is, you know, I can get out a quick email after this call. We could do just a quick poll to see how many members of the working group will be in Nairobi. That may be a way...

David Archbold: Well, perhaps we...

Robert Hoggarth: To resolve this.

David Archbold: Rob, perhaps we could actually ask online of the people speaking on the conference, how many are going to be in Nairobi. Cheryl, obviously you are.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, to my knowledge (Carlton) also is. (Carlton) will be there and I'm going to be there.

Gisella Gruber-White: (Carlton) is joining shortly - sorry, it's Gisella - we're dialing out to him now.

Fahd Batayneh: Yes, hi everybody, this is Fahd, I won't be in Nairobi with you.

Robert Hoggarth: Fahd, just to clarify that, did you say will not?

Fahd Batayneh: Yes, I will not be at the Nairobi...

Robert Hoggarth: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. It seems to me like the majority of the work group is not going to be at Nairobi and I, to be distinctly honest, might be of a very similar

mind that it has been when we've had discussion amongst the AC and SO chairs, that things that are of particular interest to the GAC, such as DNS abuse, were to be quoting what was identified as unconflicted time. Thursday afternoon was such a block of unconflicted time and it seems to me that some of us are going to be a little eyebrows raised in wondering in why we're getting all of the meetings popping in unconflicted time that are going to compete with the same people.

So I don't know whether you want to do something that's more humane for people who aren't in Nairobi and just have an ordinary telephone hookup from wherever we are in our hotels whenever or wherever.

David Archbold: Yes, yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. And we can use - what we could use is try to, if we have a document or anything else, use Adobe Connect...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: To look at documents.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: This is Cheryl and that works.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

David Archbold: Yes, I think that's going to have to be it - okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

David Archbold: So let's leave that at the moment but it certainly looks as if we can give up the 4:00 pm Thursday slot.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. And I think, Cheryl, your idea of hooking on the phone is a very good one. And then we can do it, you know, whatever time is most convenient for everybody.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, yes, I - we're - most of us will be still going fairly late, even though it won't be...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: In the conference venue. So I'm sure, you know, two or three of us will be gathering around some desk phone somewhere.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We'll gather around someone's iPod.

(Carlton):   Good morning, everybody, sorry to be late. I forgot I had a (unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hi, (Carlton). Just don't forget you've got a meeting in three more hours' time.

(Carlton):   Yes.

David Archbold: Okay, so that looks like all we can say about Nairobi for the moment. Can we go - I'm pulling all over the place - can we go back up one on the agenda and talk about timetable benchmark changes?

If you will recall, we were anticipating publishing the interim report prior to ICANN 37, i.e., in February 2010. And that was already extended from October 2009. Now I don't think we're in a position so to do. We don't seem to have moved that much further along since our last get together in Seoul, which is disappointing but it's - everybody's busy and that's a fact of life.

We were then leaving 45 days for public comment on the interim report, with publishing the final report in time for the June meeting. I'm personally still hopeful that we might get the final report to the June meeting but I don't think we can get the interim report for Nairobi. I would be grateful for comments and thoughts.

(Carlton): I think I agree - this is (Carlton) - I agree with David, it's going to be tight to get those for Nairobi -- that is by the 4th of March. But I think we could get it out very shortly thereafter, the following week. So we should be able to meet the final comment period and just in time for the June meeting at Brussels.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

David Archbold: Anyone else? Rob, do you feel that's workable?

Robert Hoggarth: My immediate reaction to that is that that is a fairly aggressive time table. It would require some significant additional drafting from where you are right now but it is certainly doable. I think the only think that you would be changing - and again, I don't know - my sense is and Dave, I don't know whether you're having conversations with board members. This is not something the board is, you know, focusing and really trying to pressure you all to put something together.

My sense is that your original sort of cycle of work was going to focus on the various international meetings to allow opportunities for dialog informally during the hallway conversations and otherwise and in community meetings. And so I don't think that you should unnecessarily tie yourself to the Brussels meeting. You know, you could even consider a timetable that looks at releasing an interim report intersessionally between Nairobi and Brussels, allowing for some dialog, for further working group discussion just up through - up prior to and through Brussels. And then producing the final report intersessionally between Brussels and the Latin American meeting, where

you can then again have some robust community dialog, if not a final board decision during the Latin American meeting.

I don't know that you have to tie yourselves specifically to rushing something out. I guess it's really a sense, Dave - and your role is the primary drafter to date - whether you think that the expectation of getting something together very quickly after Nairobi is a realistic one.

I'm just trying to be sensitive because I know you guys have all been extremely busy and this has not been the first priority. And so it's just a matter of trying to realistically assess when you think things can get accomplished.

David Archbold: Yes. I understand the realism but I'm also very conscious of the fact despite the fact the board may not be pushing, if you like, I am pushing from the point of view that there was supposedly a review of regions carried out in 2006. It still hasn't happened because it was suspended, if you like, pending this working group.

So ICANN is, if you like, missing two reviews, the 2006 and the 2009 review that it is required to do by its own bylaws. So I must admit, that I'm conscious of that in the background, whether the board is or is not. So I am trying to push it to get it out as early as we reasonably can.

Robert Hoggarth: We will - as staff, we will support whatever timetable you all agree to.

David Archbold: That's an out.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Dave, Cheryl here.

David Archbold: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: There's a huge benefit in this particular type of discussion, first of all, to having got opportunity for results of the survey back before we delve into the

next level of interim reporting. So the opportunity to run something intersessionally comes out in a timely manner after the Nairobi meeting and that can be out for public comment between Nairobi and Brussels makes a great deal of sense to me.

I think having picked up from my community the interest - and remember, we're - ALAC with its regional balance is the most defined geographic region space in ICANN. So we've got most likely change that's going to affect us and there's going to be some very, very significant affects in terms of our ability to function from a budgetary point of view if any increase in regions in your thoughts document, where you say go from five to six, that's what serious dollar difference is on our budget.

So there's a huge amount for us to talk about. And there's the thoughts of conversations that we're better off having with COOs, CFOs and the whole of our community leadership in a room, which means at the Brussels meeting before it goes into the final report.

David Archbold: Yes, well, my thoughts genuinely were just thoughts. It was to give a stimulus, if you like, more than anything else. Nothing's been cast in stone, I promise you. (Unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think, yes, we can compress, you know, we can compress some work between the two next meetings. But I think giving the communities opportunities to make face-to-face discussions is a most productive way forward.

David Archbold: Yes. Any other comment?

Bart Boswinkel: No.

David Archbold: Okay, so - yes, sorry, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: I think we, as this group, if you look more in the - into the interim report, there are - I think the timeframe for moving forward, we have to move to the next meeting. I think that we haven't - this working group hasn't touched upon how it wants to propose restructuring everything else Cheryl just touched upon. And I think it will take one or two more in-depth discussions by this group before we can send out anything to the community.

So that means, say, having the results and having a more in-depth discussion by this group; so you're really talking about, say, sending out the interim report by Brussels because that's only two and a half months after the Nairobi meeting.

David Archbold: It is I suppose, yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Or three months.

David Archbold: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: And given, say - and you need to do it. Otherwise, it will not be, say, a working group document.

David Archbold: Yes, okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We need that out - literally out in the public by the beginning of June.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, so that means...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We...

Bart Boswinkel: So...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, we're talking final draft by the end of May; that's not a huge amount of time.

Bart Boswinkel: No.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: March, April, May.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, so David, just to meet, say, the proposed timeline of having an interim report out by the Brussels meeting.

David Archbold: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: And then you hit the holiday season again.

David Archbold: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: So in the pragmatics of it, I think if we would aim at, say, the Latin American meeting to have a final report out, it will make, you know, everybody's lives more bearable and maybe we have, you know, start to - yes, try to use the face or the phone call in Nairobi as a first in-depth discussion on where we want to head with the interim report.

David Archbold: Yes. Okay, I'll go along with that. Rob, can you make the necessary adjustments to the timetable, please?

(Carlton):   Yes, sir, Dave, this is (Carlton). Can I ask a question?

David Archbold: Yes.

(Carlton):   What is the sense of members of what else we need to have in this document for the interim report? What is the sense?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Some recommendations, change, don't change, make it 17 groups, make it 7, make it 5, take it down to 3, pick a number between 1 and infinity.

(Carlton):   Okay, because to me, that was - I would have - that's good, Cheryl, because, you see, I would have thought that what we would do is to put up (the straw man) and not make recommendations until after we've posted the interim to the public comment.

David Archbold: Yes.

(Carlton):   You see, that was my thinking.

David Archbold: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

(Carlton):   I'm just asking because I would have - to my mind, what probably would work is that we put all of these issues (a straman) and we not make any recommendation, we do not have a recommendation portion until we've put it out for public comment. Is that something we could work with?

((Crosstalk))

David Archbold: Sorry, chairman's privilege, I get next say - sorry, Cheryl. The way we laid it out initially was that the interim report would not come up with any conclusions, (straman) or otherwise. It was to look at...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

David Archbold: Stage, right. So it was to look at the uses of are we meeting the objective or are geographic regions meeting or doing what the various bits of the organization require them to do or are they not. Where are the problems without looking at the solutions? We find the uses, the functions, etcetera. We're now supposed to be looking at is it working.

(Carlton):   Okay.

David Archbold: That's what we're supposed to be doing. And then the last one is supposed to be the solutions. That assumes that it's not working in some areas.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: In the interim, Dave - Dave, in the interim one, you need to identify if there is a need for change. And...

((Crosstalk))

David Archbold: Absolutely, that's what I'm saying. We're identifying whether it is working for the various organizations within ICANN or if it's not. If it is working there's no need for a solution or the solution is status quo.

(Carlton):   As to my mind, as Cheryl says, only the only (SO) that seems to be closely coupled, work as though closely coupled to the idea of geographic regions in ICANN is the ALAC.

((Crosstalk))

(Carlton):   ccNSO, somewhat loosely. If you look at the ccNSO structure, it's probably a little less exacting than ALAC, Cheryl, wouldn't you say?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, this is where the whole thing starts from in the beginning because of the bizarre mismatch of where some countries belong and the way it's carved up. I mean, going back to Dave's original, you know, outline documents that we all started with and, you know, in the ccNSO space (unintelligible) some stuff broken that needs fixing. So then we need to look at all the other parts of ICANN as well.

David Archbold: Yes, yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's my take on it, you know.

David Archbold: Yes, I mean, it actually goes further than that. But I don't want to anticipate what we've put in the report. I mean, what I would be interested in and what I think need is the more detailed feedback that you can give us on ALAC. And is it working for you, is it not working for you? What are your problems? What would the impact be? And that's something I can't do and Bart can't do. It's got to come from you, (Carlton).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We don't have a problem with our geographic diversity and being in five regions because that's how we've been created, we've been reviewed. The reviews themselves indicate no issue with that and in our view and makes us the most genuinely global representative part of ICANN. If you want something that's 100% balanced globally we have a structure that does that.

David Archbold: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If you change the geographic region, all that does...

David Archbold: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Is change the numbers of structures we call (unintelligible).

David Archbold: Right, right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It doesn't have the same impact as it does in the ccNSO. But what it does have is if you increase regions from five to six in costs now per ICANN face-to-face meeting for every regions, you have to allow between - what is it - because we're all sponsored - they're all sponsored people...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: $15,000 extra budget per region, just for the face-to-face meeting.

David Archbold: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So if you make it, you know, if you make it from five to six, then if you're got two ICANN meetings, and extra $30,000 in the budget; if it's three ICANN meetings, it's an extra $45,000. If you make it seven, it's a simple math situation, which is, you know, makes no difference on how effective we are because the large regions have found ways of dealing with their geographic diversity.

So from the Asia Pacific perspective, we have got a balance. We actually have in our memorandum within the region, we have to have geographic balance within our regional leadership. So one of the vice chairs is from Oceania - I'm sorry, the chair happens to be from Oceania so one of the vice chairs is from the Arab states and the other vice chair is from the Pacific Islands.

So we've structured stuff to work with what we've got to work with. But make it 6 or 17, we just - we'll structure it to work with it.

David Archbold: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But we have clear X number of region results in X times Y number of ALAC members. And that just has a fewer math outcome on budget.

David Archbold: Right, okay. For the sake of discussion, I mean, if we act as a group - and this is a hypothetical - come up with a conclusion that the five present regions do not reasonably represent the present diversity of the Internet or whatever the wording is. And therefore the fact that ALAC is following along with those five regions, does that not also mean that ALAC is not following the diversity of the Internet?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No - and I'll give you the exact opposite. We in fact have a disproportionately high voice of the unconnected countries of the world in the

at-large community voice we bring to ICANN, which is exactly how it should be.

David Archbold: Fine - and how does that work?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It works by having the same number of at-large structures coming out of Africa as are in Europe. And there's a whole lot more Internet users in Europe than there is in Africa.

David Archbold: Yes, sure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And our voice, our discussion, our contribution as public into policy development and ICANN process. In other words, doing what we are here for is...

David Archbold: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Perfectly representative of global geography when you slice it into seven or five or three.

(Carlton):   The only glitch on the map where that is concerned though would be, say, we need to consider Asia and places like China, where the growth is coming on strong and we don't have any representative or very little representative from China. That's the only other issue for us. And that's probably...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We've got two at-large structures in mainland China and two in Taiwan.

(Carlton):   Yes. But in terms of the...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And those are - both of those in mainland China are national paid bodies. And dealing with the politics of China and listening to a national paid body is, you know, (unintelligible) way of doing it.

(Carlton):   Yes, that's what...

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Carlton):   That's the point I want to make, that you have some in China...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, where we have a deficit. But then that's the regional issues effects is we need more members, more at-large structures in all affairs.

(Carlton):   Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So I tell the non-comm - finding non-comm members from a fair, thank you very much. That's where I would like to see my nominating committee member out of Asia coming from, in the space I don't have at-large structures, divvying up my ALAC any other way.

So that's what I'm saying, Dave, the regions themselves within the at-large community work with whatever model we're given. We'll find a way to make sure we're globally represented.

David Archbold: Yes, okay. So where do we go from here? Rob, Bart and I did have some discussions end of last week. And one of our thoughts was for the interim report to try and go down through each of the organizations and look at are geographic regions working for them or not. Is that the only criteria that is being used? I mean, I think an example there, I looked at the board.

And although originally the geographic regions were obviously only diversity requirements that was mentioned and it was a pretty tight fit, over time that has changed, particularly after the 2002 revision to the bylaws which brought in the ICANN goals - I'm sorry, I can't remember the right name - you know what I mean. And that expanded the diversity requirements such that geographic diversity was only one of the criteria.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, it (unintelligible) or isn't it.

David Archbold: Yes, indeed. But I noticed that the GNSO has quite clearly brought gender in their criteria.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

David Archbold: So in many respects...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: In many of our regions in the ALAC have gender in their criteria. But we also strive to gender balance as a name but not an overriding principle because we actually prefer to have talent than a particular gender.

David Archbold: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Don't get me started on (unintelligible).

David Archbold: Rob, you - I thought we were going to have a go at looking up some of this at the end of last week, were you not?

Robert Hoggarth: That's correct, Dave. One of my assignments was to go into some of the 25 areas of recommendations or concerns that were expressed in the initial report and just take a crack at maybe two or three of them, to try to find a way to express them, reflect them with a mind toward to that sort of system works, that that's how we would approach the various 25 that you all listed in the original report.

And I'm still experimenting and working on that. The plan was to share that with you, Dave. I'm more than happy to share that with the broader group, just to get some reactions when I complete that over the next day or two.

David Archbold: Okay, okay. I think that will be useful. I feel we've a little bit lost our way on how we're going to present this. And I think the only way to do that is to do

some - have some trial and error, circulate them round and get viewpoints of - from everybody. Because there are quite definitely different ways of presenting this and I know I'm finding - I'll start going one way and then find cross links another way. So I think some trial and error that everybody looks at it, expresses their views would help us and allow us to go on a little bit quicker.

Bart Boswinkel: Cheryl, on that...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Bart Boswinkel: Cheryl, on that note, could you just summarize in bullet points to this group what you think is the impact of changing the numbers of, say, so just purely impact of changing the numbers of regions?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, the most obvious ones from an at-large advisory committee point of view is under our particular structure. We have two regional and one nominating committee appointed to the at-large advisory committee for every geographic region used in ICANN.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So it makes an immediate move from a 3x5 to a 3xX model. And every time you increase 5 plus any amount, the budget ramifications are in that.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. And is that...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And what it does to our global - our role and how we operate because we've got, for example, Asia Pacific, which is such a huge geographic region. The region itself has come up with mechanisms to meet its diversity needs.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, that's what I understand. But it's - so what you just pointed out, say, just the pure mass impact of changing the number of regions, is that somewhere publically available?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Certainly, we can do now because the cost - in fact, I'm only using, you know, very rough figures.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I could give you exact figures and a couple of estimates by working with the CFO. And you know, if we split Asia Pacific, High Pacific into two or three or some other sets...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Of hypothetic models, yes, we can do the math without any problem at all.

Bart Boswinkel: No, I think that is, say, going back to Dave's question. That is again, another view of, say, not, say, what is the ramification of whatever recommendation there is. Maybe not at this stage of the process but later on it's going to be very interesting. So if you recall what we discussed in Seoul is you need to have an impact analysis on what we're doing or what this working group is doing anyway.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

David Archbold: Absolutely.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. But I didn't really want to sort of bring up those somewhat. By bringing them up, they tend to become limiting factors in our free thinking fall discussions. I think it was a little early to, you know, that's why I actually picked a fairly average cost at, you know, X dollars per person on average for an ICANN face-to-face meeting.

As soon as I bring someone in from Alaska and someone in from New Zealand and someone in - from, you know, northern Europe and the meeting happens to be in Los Angeles, I've immediately changed those costs hugely.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I know. But you want some, say, more average or an idea of what the impact of what some of the changes will be.

(Carlton): The idea is you're going to have some (unintelligible) change in the cost.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. So I've used a very, very average outline.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, that's fine, that's fine.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That means an additional $15,000 per - $15,000 US dollars per face-to-face meeting for every additional region.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, okay, that's a fair number. Yes, we can use that, say, it's just to keep in the back of our minds, say, whatever...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure.

Bart Boswinkel: Comes up is, I mean, probably has the same impact as some of the other or for the ccNSO as well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm not saying that's a good thing or a bad thing...

Bart Boswinkel: No, no, no, I'm not - it's to assess what - for this working group to assess what the impact is of some of these recommendations.

Man: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: I think that is probably what has been lacking in the past of some other working groups.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I couldn't agree with you more. The other thing is too, Bart, which is what I'd like to allow as now we've sort of agreed to stretch the timetable, I think it will allow us to explore some of this in the analysis mode...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Between the interim and public feedback of that...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Is final because that's where, you know, some serious hypotheticals has to be put up for people to consider.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I agree. That's more or less what we discussed in Seoul as well.

Man: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Because one of the advantages of cleaving into smaller regions is that, you know, you couldn't say from a, for example, the global partnership's perspective that popping over to Egypt once or twice means you've properly engaged Africa.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, you're talking about the ICANN global partner.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I am.

Bart Boswinkel: No, they don't have that issue.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I know. I was being very hypothetical.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You see what I mean.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

David Archbold: Okay, people, so what have we concluded here, that there are several possible different ways of taking this forward; that we are going to try to put up, if you like, some (straman) for the way we go ahead. Rob, hope to have one attempt at that within the next few days that we could circulate. I will try and do something as well though I can't promise it's going to be the next few days.

And if we circulate those, please, can we have some feedback? I've got to say, feedback after Seoul was a little bit disappointing, people. But perhaps that was because you weren't sure where we were going.

Robert Hoggarth: I will be happy to circulate that to the group, Dave.

David Archbold: Yes, thanks. I think we need to - can we get in another telephone conference before - I suppose the next one's going to be actually at Nairobi, isn't it?

(Carlton):   Yes.

David Archbold: Time being what it is. It's not really practical before that, is it?

(Carlton):   No.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not really.

(Carlton):   It's not going to be very practical.

David Archbold: Yes - no. So we are going to have to try and sort something out, I think,
during Nairobi for a telephone conference somehow somewhere.

(Carlton):   Well, from my perspective, Dave, it's known that we agreed we have
consensus of where we are going with this thing. Probably is we look at the
comments that may - from Cheryl about the last perspective, which is, I think,
is (impatient) of debate, we could then try to generate several perspectives
from the ccNSO side because those are the two critical ones. And hopefully
that then forms the nucleus for the next document to be released.

David Archbold: Yes.

(Carlton):   And then we could do...

David Archbold: I think that's logically so. I mean, I think Cheryl gave us a lot over the phone
just now. What I'd really like are some bullet points of that actually in writing
that we could work with.

(Carlton):   Right.

David Archbold: Can either of you commit to that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, I certainly can't, I've got this small thing called an ALAC I'm running
between now and Nairobi and there's a few things we're doing.

Man: Yes.

Robert Hoggarth: What I will try -- this is Rob.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Perhaps there's a transcript of this meeting.

(Carlton):   Yes.

David Archbold: Yes.

Robert Hoggarth: Yes, that was my suggestion...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes...

Robert Hoggarth: This is Rob. What I'll do is I'll summarize...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm not (unintelligible) secretary.

David Archbold: Yes.

(Carlton):   Yes, Rob, thank you. If Rob could take the transcript and summarize it then
                    we could work it in, into the next document. And then...

David Archbold: Well, I think if we get that bit of the transcript and also let - well, Cheryl, you
                 have a quick glance at it to see do you want to amend it at all or add to it.

(Carlton):   Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, what might be also useful - Dave, what might be also useful is
                     looking at your thoughts. If we...

(Carlton):   Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If we sort of respond to top issues that we could ask each of the ACs and
                     SOs within our camp to respond to. This working group was supposed to be

regionally - sorry, not regionally - supposed to be balanced across the component parts of ICANN for a reason.

David Archbold: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And not all of us who are on the - on this call, I think it would probably be a good opportunity for that little aversion of your thoughts, you know, a couple or, you know, three or five prime questions. Send it out to every AC and SO chair and say get back to us.

David Archbold: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Before the Nairobi call.

(Carlton): Right. See, this is what I was thinking when I said probably we could get an interim report out before because my idea was to use the nucleus of what, just like you said, Cheryl, that David listed some thoughts and I believe that they're leading into the areas where we think there's some concern. We can add the ones which only elaborate on what the ALAC (unintelligible). And we have a few provocative ones about smaller island states and so on.

And we could actually send that directly to the SOs and ACs, and say, you know, let us have your response and so on, we'll get a couple. And once we incorporate those, I think we'd have the basis for a publication. That was the thinking - that's why I thought we could probably certainly get the interim on before Nairobi. We wouldn't be able to get a final, you know, not Nairobi but...

David Archbold: Well, the responses back...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Dave, there's also some other metrics. Some of our regions, Latin American, the Caribbean is one of the first to do it. But it's a model that I'm strongly encouraging all of the regions to do. And that is we've done a

comparison to see where they have nation states where you've got a CC and an at-large structure.

And it's interesting when you look at those metrics to see how many countries have a CC who are or are not members of the ccNSO and how many countries in the same geographic region who do or do not have at-large structures. And there's clear opportunity for both parts of ICANN to perhaps leverage off positions that either one or the other have in various borders or within various borders. And they're the sort of intangibles, let's be honest, that's sort of - that's painting the well, that's not building the car?

David Archbold: Yes, yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, it doesn't matter if you've got 7 or 17 geographic localities, you can - regions, you can still do that.

David Archbold: Yes, you can. And that goes very much into the participation adding that we did highlight earlier - yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Sorry - there are important things to be aware of but they're not deal breakers on a review of regions.

David Archbold: No, I agree, yes. Okay, so picking up on what (Carlton) was saying, perhaps where I should go is trying to white out some of those questions that you think would be a good idea, carry on from my thoughts paper. So perhaps I'll go down that direction and circulate something there for your...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But Dave, if we could ask the AC and SO chairs, you know, to - for not firmly, you know, binding opinion but reactions and responses to, say, five or seven, you know, something slightly more than yes, no or maybe that where it could come back from them that that's not an issue in their view, actually that really does need more thinking about or yes, this is a big issue from our perspective, then we can sort of do some ranking, I guess.

David Archbold: Yes. And certainly whatever reaction we get back will be helpful.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

David Archbold: Okay, all right, I will go down that route, Rob will go down the route that we talked about. Bart, you're going to be the only person at Nairobi, I think - or Gisella, are you going to be there?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, Gisella is not going to be there.

Man: No, I will be there - yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

David Archbold: Okay, it's a bit difficult for us. How are we going to be able to arrange a teleconference? That's basically my question when it comes down to it.

Man: It's probably through Doodle and we'll just set up a telephone conference like we did this one.

David Archbold: Yes, yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Gisella is your answer there, I think you'll find.

Man: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: She has access to all of the...

David Archbold: All the tools.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Meeting schedules for, you know, certainly the GNSO and the ALAC and I assume she can get them from the ccNSO as well.

Man: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: She'll be able to find some kind of, you know, she's in the middle of one of our dinners.

Man: Or meetings.

David Archbold: Okay, so we will look for a teleconference at Nairobi.

Man: Yes. And then...

David Archbold: Has anybody - sorry, go on.

Man: (Unintelligible) if we have documents and everything else, try to use, say...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Adobe...

Man: Maybe Adobe Connect.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, (unintelligible) here.

Man: Yes.

Robert Hoggarth: This is Rob; just to clarify the, you know, the target timeframe, it seemed as if you all were discussing earlier looking at the evening timeframe, is that correct?

Bart Boswinkel: Depends a bit on the time difference with Paul, that's why I asked.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It could either be a morning or evening.

Paul Wilson: If you set up a Doodle, I'll certainly, you know, see what I can do. But...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Paul Wilson: What's the time zone for Nairobi? It's (unintelligible) 2 or 3, is it?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Plus 3.

Paul Wilson: So probably before about, well, mid-afternoon would be better for me but I'll just do what I can do.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

David Archbold: Yes.

Paul Wilson: I haven't...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Mid-afternoon is an early morning for Nairobi, mid-afternoon Australia is early morning.

Paul Wilson: Well, about this time of the morning, isn't it, which is doable...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I did say early.

Paul Wilson: The other alternative is that I encourage (ADL) to attend the meeting instead and me and that would be fine.

David Archbold: Yes.

Paul Wilson: So (unintelligible) too much about our observation, I think we're holding a bit of a watching brief here anyway.

David Archbold: Yes.

Paul Wilson: Yes, it's not that these meetings are impact that much on what we're doing.

David Archbold: Yes. Okay, well, have we any other business before we close the meeting?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: All right.

David Archbold: Okay, there being no other business, thank you all, one and all. We will be circulating things to you before Nairobi and I look forward to our next telephone call.

Man: Yes.

Man: All right, thank you, Dave.

Man: Thank you all.

Woman: Thank you.

Woman: Thanks.

Man: Bye-bye.

Woman: Thanks, Rob, thanks Bart.

Man: Thanks, Rob, good day.

Man: Thanks, bye-bye.

END