

Transcript 15 January 2010 Strategic Planning 2010-2013

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So we'll move straight into the agenda, which begins with the overview of strategic planning by Theresa. It's all yours.

Theresa Swineheart: Thank you, Cheryl, thank you. And, welcome, everybody, and thank you very much for the chance to do this briefing on the call. Cheryl, your remarks were really perfect, and I think one of the things I might flag is that after the strategic planning process is done, we are (background noise) input received. And from everybody in all the different regions and potentially look at next steps on how to be responsive towards those separate and aside from the strategic plans that with regards to the staff and teams that we have in all the regions. I think we have good opportunities to build on those.

Let me step quickly through the strategic plan itself. Some may have heard this presentation already, but just for the benefit of all -- on the big picture side, we have taken a different approach this year to a strategic planning process than we have in the past and, hence, many of the more detailed aspects of it will be captured in the operational planning processes Kevin will then talk to.

The strategic plan is still open for public comment until the 21st this next week, and I would strong encourage comments to be provided and public input to be provided that it's really essential in regards to (inaudible) on how I can operate well in the public trust on an international level and regional level, which I know is very important to many on this call as well.

The --

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Theresa, just one moment. I thought it was just me but, in fact, a number of people are pinging me saying you're very, very hard to hear. Could you just either adjust where your microphone is or yell at us or whatever works. And while I've stolen the microphone from you, we do have some background noise coming in from participants. Can I please ask people who are not speaking to mute? That is star 6 to mute, and we'll ask you to do star 7 when I recognize you later, and you wish to speak. The other thing is, if you continue to have deep breathing and noise on the line, we will just mute you. Thanks, Theresa, back to you. Please yell at us.

Theresa Swinheart: Okay, can everybody hear me better now?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Much better, thank you.

Theresa Swineheart: Okay, my apologies. The -- so the strategic plan is open for public comment until the 21st, so until next week. Please do comment.

I am going to quickly go through the setup and layout. Obviously, the first page, which I believe is posted on the Adobe. I'm not sure -- Heidi how is this working?

Heidi Ullrich: Matthias is actually controlling this.

Theresa Swineheart: Ah, fantastic. Matthias, if you could actually go to the slide which just show the big picture overview of the entire plan? There you go, perfect, okay. The approach taken this year is to focus very much on four focus areas. And by focus areas -- very high-level focus areas that are strategically a marketplace for the organization. And then try to flesh out under categories there, examples of what would be considered a strategic objective, which you'll see in the second bar going across.

And what we mean by a strategic objective is what do -- what does success look like for that? So on a very high level strategic (inaudible) there yet, what would success for preserving DNS stability and

security look like? What would that actually mean? Not what are the specific work activities, but what would it actually look like in the end? What are we aiming to achieve?

The reason that these words are in brackets is that this category was an addition following the ICANN meeting in Seoul and the feedback we had received and interest to provide some clarity on what an objective might look like in the end. So, again, those words are in brackets, but please feel free to comment, also, on whether those interpretations and representations adequately reflect what your view would be.

The next bar underneath is an example of existing community work under the different four focus areas. And as we know, the community is doing a tremendous amount of work on a wide range of issues. This seeks to capture the high-level examples of this. You will see similar terminology in there as was reflected in last year's operating plan and strategic plan. This is an area that, again, will be fleshed out in the operating planning process in greater detail.

The following category has strategic projects. These, again, are very specific projects that are either new or intended or being proposed that go specifically to the four focus areas. And these will be fleshed out further in the strategic planning process.

And then you have the final bar at the bottom, which is staff work, and this is ongoing and continuing work that exists for the organization to operate and to support the community. And, again, this is an area that will be fleshed out in greater detail in the operating planning process itself. So what we've really done is trying to move a shift of a strategic plan that contained quite a bit of detail to a strategic plan with high-level focus areas and strategic suggestions and strategic projects (inaudible) out with other work reflected more strongly in the operating planning process.

What I'd like to highlight, importantly, is the last star at the bottom -- and, Matthias, I don't know if one can see it on the Adobe Connect, a little further, there you go -- there are five words that go across the bottom. And what we've found in discussions on strategic plan and ICANN's operations, is that we continuously refer to the importance of multi-stakeholder collaborative work, international and transparent, and being accountable. And that these are essentially not only strategic objectives but actually the enablers for ICANN to do its work well.

So these have been put at the bottom as enabling aspects for the organization to do its work successfully, and things that need to be aligned and incorporate into all of ICANN's work. So, hence, it's been moved into a crossbar, so it's a matrix going across four for contributing to ICANN's ability to focus on strategic areas and deliver to the community in a healthy way.

The following slide fleshed out further examples of what the four focus areas would look like and, again, focusing in, then, on language with regards to strategic objectives and strategic projects.

The final plan will calculate some high-level areas of the staff works, but the primary focuses that will be moved into the operating plan because that's very much ongoing work the community does in order to support these other variants.

What is important for feedback is very much have we gotten the four areas of focus right? Are we looking at the right buckets? Do the strategic objectives look like they are in the right direction? All the strategic project ones that fulfill the needs of the community? And is anything missing? And by "is anything missing or anything needed or should anything be strengthened" that the feedback is provided also to specifics within what is ICANN's scope and mandate.

So on one call we had a discussion, for example, about the importance of (inaudible) divide and ensuring that everybody globally has the opportunity to participate and engage. So an example of how to strengthen feedback in that area would be, you know, ensuring continuation on training for CTTLDs

and increasing mechanisms for participation. Aspects that would help contribute support bridging issues that the community efforts feel need to be addressed and if there is any new ideas, obviously, to raise those as well.

Cheryl, that's the high-level overview. I'm happy to take any questions, or we could move on to Kevin's and then have questions.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'll just call for questions now. Anyone in the Adobe Room wish to raise their hand, and anyone who isn't in the Adobe Room and is on the telephone bridge, make a hello please now. I speak to your noise, and I'll recognize you. I see nobody in the Adobe Room, although it is difficult while squares are moving around in front of me, particularly in the -- luckily the Adobe system would put people who raise their hand high, although I'm probably not going to miss them. Anyone on the call who is in the Adobe Room want to ask any questions of Theresa? You've made yourselves perfectly and absolutely clear, Theresa. What more could we ask of a presentation?

Kevin Wilson: Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, go ahead.

Kevin Wilson: Cheryl, this is Kevin Wilson. I have a question for Theresa.

Theresa Swineheart: Kevin.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Why don't you raise your hand, then, sir. All right, I'll recognize you just this once.

Kevin Wilson: I'm driving. This is my method of (inaudible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Probably and, let's face it, I wouldn't be able to see with your driving with one hand raised.

Kevin Wilson: So, Theresa, I know you've made this call a number of times, and I'm just curious -- Matt and others on the call would like to know how is the new strategic plan approached and the presentation, which we obviously were (inaudible) to internally. But I'm wondering how the receptivity has been, or have there been suggestions of things that are missing, or -- I haven't read the comments that have been posted already, but I'm just curious if you'd like to address that (inaudible) feedback.

Theresa Swineheart: Absolutely. So far, the response that we got both in Seoul and subsequent on briefing calls has been very positive. So it's very helpful to capture on one page a bigger picture, strategic and long-term approach for the organization. It's easy to see how that's connected, and that, so far, the feedback has been very positive in this realm.

We have received comments on nuances and terminology. So, for example, you know, the last square contributes to shaping a healthy Internet ecosystem, you know, what does that mean? We all know in our heads what it might mean, but what do we all see happening in that space and what would be the pragmatic approach? So we've received some very good feedback on how to terms and things a little bit differently, but I would say the response, to date, has been very positive -- and then some suggestions on language. I haven't had an opportunity to review all the comments yet that have come in, and I would expect quite a few for next week.

We had run a survey to highlight different areas that will be one form of input to it. And those responses were quite varied, you know, that IDNs is important; that ICANN, engaging with other international forums is important; regional outreach is important; participation, security, and stability is essential. And so we are gauging that input, obviously, then, to balance it as one form of input.

But to answer your question -- so far so good, which is very pleasing to see.

Kevin Wilson: Great, thank you.

Theresa Swineheart: Mm-hmm.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Theresa. I'm wondering if I might be so bold as to ask a question as well -- and I'm probably putting on my APRALO hat, but I'm unsure whether that's the case. I wondered, with the new format that we've seen in both strategic and operational planning process as it's being evolved over the last couple of years, in comparing your current experience with the timing and I might use the word "quality" in advisedly -- acuteness and directness of the input you're getting -- are we seeing greater community contribution with this new system?

Theresa Swineheart: It's just real hard for me to gauge because it's a very different kind of approach. And some of it will be part of what's captured in the operational planning. I think we have received greater contributions on conciseness of the focus areas. I think that the clarity of really just looking at four focused areas and then projects in areas and enabler success has provided an opportunity for a focused assessment in people's discussions around what is the strategic plan. Less focus is on specific project areas and work items that need to be completed but rather are these the right directions for the organization and does one agree.

And feedback I have gotten, as well, from new participants and actually people who have -- stakeholders that have participated for quite some time -- is that this approach has provided clarity to what ICANN is doing. So for a new participant it becomes easier to understand what ICANN does but also where it's headed. So we're seeing a different kind of feedback.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, well, I must say I was sort of comparing not only from the changes that I am seeing within the At-Large community, which might be for multitudes of reasons, which I was wondering if it might have been able to be teased out from the rest of the ICANN community but also comparing -- having been involved previously, rather more from the CCTLD perspective, you know, I've been coming to every ICANN meeting face-to-face since Wellington and remotely since before that. So I sort of felt that this was engaging community more, and I wondered if that was just my hopeful bias or whether there were some measurables. I think it's interesting to, perhaps, keep an eye on that as well.

I recognize you, Evan, you have the microphone.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi. I wanted -- hi, there, Theresa, thanks for being here and also for coming to the North American and some of the other regional things. You've been a real trooper at sort of bringing the word out on this.

I wanted to ask specifically about the term "outreach." I've heard -- it was used by Rod at the introduction, so I've heard you mention it both at the North American meeting, and it's come up here as a matter of conversation. The word "outreach" never shows up in that document.

Under the slide where you've got the four silos, and you've got the term "increasing participation."

Theresa Swineheart: Mm-hmm.

Evan Leibovitch: That, to me, is far too vague because it doesn't really say what kind of participation. Obviously, you want to engage volunteers within ICANN better. I'm going to make a suggestion that you really do need to have something specifically that mentions outreach that basically says, "We're not just going to be engaged with volunteers we already have in participating conferences. We want to reach out and try and grab the grassroots, grab the public at large. That is a priority to try and go out and the community."

And I say that in the context, especially within At-Large, that most of the regions have some kind of

engagement plan related to outreach. And so I'd really like to ask you opinion, and I'd really like to ask, if possible, that the next time you show this slide, that under community work in the silo of contribute to shaping a healthy Internet ecosystem that you have something that actually uses the word "outreach." It's been used so much in conversation, I think it ought to be exclusive in the document.

Theresa Swineheart: I think that's a great suggestion, and I hear what you're saying -- that we implicitly see it in different things, but explicitly calling it out is an important aspect -- to have it built into the different areas of work, whether community or staff or some project. Thank you.

Would it be possible to -- this would be -- I have taken a note on that, but what would be very helpful is in the comments that are being provided to the strategic plan to also put that in there, because those are publicly posted, and that makes it available also to the global community at large.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I suspect every regional leader who has hold of the pen for the regional ones has already written it down, and I can assure you, we will capture it for the ALAC one.

Theresa Swineheart: Fabulous. I've taken note of it, but I always like to see (inaudible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can you actually imagine the term "outreach" not being something we are passionate about. I mean really.

Theresa Swineheart: No. I am equally as passionate as you are (inaudible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, yes, which comes back to this whole, you know, working in partnership together story. But, Kevin, in terms of -- as the agenda, we should actually be moving to you next. I'm a little concerned if you're driving vehicles. Are you in a position to -- ?

Kevin Wilson: Absolutely, I'm hands free. If you can hear me, fine, then I'm good. My hands are not on the telephone device. They are on the steering wheel.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: As long as you keep some of your mind on the road, I guess I'll feel vaguely okay encouraging you to take the microphone then.

Kevin Wilson: I probably shouldn't have announced it, but I'm pretty comfortable with it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Kevin Wilson: So I think the segue from Evan's point about outreach is pretty good to lead into the operating plan and budget discussion. So -- what are the concrete resources.

And that's, once again, like Theresa said, I appreciate you inviting us to join the call and specifically appreciate you appreciating the connection between the operating plan and budget development process into the strategic plan. And, as Theresa mentioned, with the -- I'm not sure if she used the word "simplification," but the simpler, easier-to-digest presentation of the strategic plan, we also want to have that as part of the operating plan and budget. So the connection we (inaudible) is really important.

So -- just to follow -- I think, Heidi, you put some slides up for me on the Adobe Connect, right?

Heidi Ullrich: Yes. The key points are showing now.

Kevin Wilson: Okay, great. Just to cover my main points I want to cover is that every time I stand up, I need to send the message that ICANN is strong, and we have over \$45 million in the reserve fund, the rainy day reserve fund. That's now in the black after (inaudible) last year and as of October, we're going into the black and continue to be managing our budget. And our ops budgeted revenue is close to what the plan was, and our budget and expenses are touching up against the -- our actual expenses are touching up against the budget expenses. And so I just want to make everybody aware that we aren't experiencing budget pressures like most organizations in the world, and so we're -- the days of yore, in which ICANN didn't have the bandwidth to spend enough to achieve its operating plan are no longer.

We've actually gone to maturity so we can actually know how to spend our funds for the operating plan.

So really the question now is not how can we work more hours in the day to get simple work done, it's we need to be involved and (inaudible) more and more sophisticated role given that revenues are flat in the next year; that we develop a plan that reflects that (inaudible) for the community, and we need discipline. I don't want to say "zero some (ph) game," but it's very important that as new initiatives are considered and evaluated, and we consider increasing some of those -- one of those four buckets that is the strategic plan now, that we also think about, well, where are we going to save money in other areas? We can't just (inaudible) and do that. But that's sort of an over-arching point that I want to make.

The other one is, as soon as officially it's in the strategic plan, it toasted, which we expected to happen in early February after the public comment series closes, then the operating plan and budget process officially opens. Internally, for staff purposes, and I think there are many on the call as well, have already started to do the budget development process. So we're in that process, and I'm trying to identify and read what the community wants -- the priorities and that sort of thing.

So as far as timeline, before Nairobi, I think (inaudible) is the deadline, our internal deadline, and we plan to post a framework for the FYL (ph) of this operating plan and budget, and then we would hopefully set up some calls before Nairobi. And then, obviously, at Nairobi, we'll present that framework. And, you know, encourage comments and feedback and make sure we're getting as much community feedback as we possibly can.

And then after Nairobi, continue that process. Get feedback into the framework and then on the (inaudible) made for our by-laws, 45 days before fiscal year-end, we post the draft operating plan and budgets for fiscal year '11. And then there's more community feedback, and then (inaudible) presumably the board would just leave a final budget operating plan for them to approve.

So as far as the process, that's the general process that I wanted to make sure -- I think the old ICANNers will already know that by heart, but whether you might be new to the (inaudible) that's generally the way -- how to plug in. So there will be -- as in the past, there will be an online comment period. We'll have set up as many conference calls as are required, and just make sure we get that feedback, and we get the right balance on the item.

And, like I said at the beginning, the hope is that we get more and more -- I think the At-Large community, in general, sets the gold standard for quantity and quality of comments last year. And I actually had to hire a consultant to help me synthesize the 50-plus pages of comments made to make sure that we captured how and where and what impact it did have on the final adopted budget.

So encourage that, encourage the -- continue, as Theresa mentioned, encourage the continued feedback on the resource allocation. There is one thing to say the strategic plan should have outreach, which is important, obviously. And say, well, what are the actual resources? How would you send it, how would you manage it, that sort of thing? So we encourage that feedback, which is an opportunity for the At-Large and others in the global (inaudible) to provide feedback. There's about 10. So it's an "our" plan not a "we" plan. Okay?

I think that's -- if there's any questions, that's pretty much what I wanted to share with the group, and (inaudible) most importantly I'd like to listen to comments, suggestions, and possibly answer questions.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, Kevin, and, most importantly, I was delighted not to hear a screeching of breaks or beeping of horns while you did that presentation.

Kevin Wilson: Okay, thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, Evan, I know that your hand is up. It could be still up.

Evan Leibovitch: It was dropped and raised again.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Ah, okay, so the floor is yours. You obviously have a question for Kevin.

Evan Leibovitch: Actually, Kevin, I've got two things. One is just a quick counter-question to what you just raised. When you mention that you want to get something more detailed than just saying we want outreach, the strategic plan document has always been a kind of high-level thing. What level of detail are you asking for at this point in the consultation? I know, in our region, we've come out with very specific plans and ideas and haven't even known how to put them forward. So could you give an idea with the kind of -- what level of feedback are you wanting? What level of detail are you asking for in terms of, "Okay, it's not enough just to say outreach, how do we want to work together with ICANN to make that happen?" What level of detail are you asking for?

Kevin Wilson: I think that's a really good question, and I'd like -- I'll make a first stab and then I'd like Theresa to answer. Hopefully, she can answer more specifically. But for the feedback to the strategic plan, I would think it would be (inaudible) to be trite about it, but be very strategic. So -- focus on what ICANN should be doing overall, how it should be changing from a strategic focus on outreach, as an example, (inaudible) example.

When the frame for the operating plan and budget for fiscal year '11 only comes up in a few weeks, that's your opportunity to be much more specific to how you allocate the resources, how, you know, and possibly how we manage those resources as well (inaudible). Does that help answer the question?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, but that was just a follow-up to what you'd said. I have an original question.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Evan, just let me see if Theresa wants to jump in then. Just hold your thought. Theresa, comments from you?

Theresa Swineheart: No, I think Kevin summarized it well. It's strategically what objectives for outreach, so taking that from a high-level strategic approach and then in the operating examples of specific areas of focus.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So stick to the helicopter or 40,000-foot view at this (inaudible).

Theresa Swineheart: Yes. An example is Cheryl's observations at the beginning. You know, strategically, it's very important that we strengthen the outreach, and we engage further with the participants in all the regions and with the communities and define that as broadly. And the operating part, an example could be specific initiatives between the regions and other stakeholders. You know, this is community to others. So it's taking a helicopter and then going in the operating down to examples of specific work areas.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks very much. Next point?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Kevin, I want to ask about that slide that was put up a few moments ago that said that revenue expectations were going to be flat. Given the plan to add new gTLDs; given the fact that each new gTLD has, at minimum, 100 and, what, 60 or \$180,000 coming in for the applications fee; given the fact there's going to be, you know, regular maintenance fees paid; and given that each of these new gTLDs is going to be generating perhaps significant sales of new second-level domains, is it really realistic to say that revenue is going to be flat given this potential bonanza that's going to happen?

Kevin Wilson: The short answer is you're right. No, it's not reasonable to assume it's flat based on those. So let me explain that a little bit more.

In the past, in particular, the dot-com fixed price agreement out of very specified step-up -- so it went from \$12 million to \$18 million in fiscal year '10, for example. So that was a \$6 million increase by

contract. Also in the past, there has been significant -- a couple of years there was over 20% or 30% growth in the domain names, so the per-transaction year domain name growth also had ICANN's revenue growth. In fact, it was only, I think, a year and a half ago when we got better at -- our budget was consistently below what our actual revenue was. I think it was only a year and a half ago we started getting better at that so that we -- our actual revenues were to budgets.

So given the perceived absence of both of those, I think we still have a budgeted 2% or 3% growth in domain name volume. So it's not flat, or it would be -- I probably should have corrected that slide to say "flatter" on that. There was also discussion about other revenue sources, whether, you know, CCTLD revenue or whatnot.

And then as far as a separate gTLD -- the new gTLD program, the assumption that I have right now is that we don't have a date for that. Therefore, as we've done in the last two budget cycles, we will describe a separate new gTLD budget so that 90 days before the actual launch of a new gTLD program, then we would include -- we would go to the board and ask for a separate budget to handle that extra revenue and the associated operating costs.

Hopefully, that makes sense. So it's not that we're assuming it's not there, it's assuming that -- it's say whether we develop our operating plan, we don't know what date it will happen, so we can't build into our assumptions to suspend those funds until we are more certain what the dates are.

Does that make sense, Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: It makes absolute sense. I would just perhaps suggest that maybe you had a little asterisk on the slide that suggested that something might be coming down.

Kevin Wilson: Yeah, I think it's a good point. And that will certainly be clear in the framework and the draft operating plan. And, Heidi, since I can't take notes, can you make sure you take a note of that for me -- or (inaudible)?

Heidi Ullrich: Yes, I've done that.

Kevin Wilson: Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm delighted that you're not trying to take notes as well as do a presentation, Kevin. That, again, is making me feel so much better.

Kevin Wilson: Yeah, I'm too busy making my breakfast, so --

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Sebastien, you have the floor.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes, thank you, Cheryl. I would like to come back to the first point of Evan and say that we wanted to be sure that we put the right information, the right request, at the right level. Because since the formation of the RALO, we always fail, and I insist we always fail to be able to give the input we wanted to have budget set up for activities at the RALO level. And the answer was "It's too late," or "It's not at the right level," or "It's too detailed," or it's too something. And my request is that we need the staff to guide us to be sure that we will be able to give our needs at the right level.

I would like to take this opportunity to say one thing you need to keep in mind is that RALO -- RALOS -- the five RALOs are the ones were set up by MOU between the ALSs in each region and ICANN. Then they are contracted party. And since the election, there is no -- since now, too -- now since the summit, there is no commitment to really help the RALO at the right level. And it's why we came with -- in some region with some idea about outreach and about general assembly at the regional level. But we really need to keep that in mind to be able to do it.

I really think that the -- at the RALO level, we need one meeting -- I will not say per year, but it could be each two-year at the level of one plan. But we need to find a way to have that included in the budget,

because I know that my colleagues from Africa are struggling for the Nairobi meeting, and I am sure that we will have the same trouble with the Brussels meeting because as we are in the same fiscal year, we can't move anything on that.

And my second aside point is that a lot of feedback came about summit in Mexico in 2009, and I would like that we put somewhere in the strategy planning that this type of meeting must be done again. I am not saying that we need to do that next year. I am just saying that we need to schedule that to include it in the budget well in advance to allow this type of exchange to be done. We need regionally (inaudible) and we need worldwide (inaudible), and at the EURALO level, we put somewhere on that. I hope that it could be shared by our colleagues from the other regions and by ICANN, in general. Thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Sebastien, and I'm unsure whether to throw to Theresa first or Kevin first. I might let them struggle and just jump in and say who gets the first word in response to that. But I think, in terms of -- and, Kevin, whilst you won't be looking at the Adobe Room, it was green ticks and little clapping hands coming up as well as chatter from just about all the regional leaders while Sebastien was speaking. I guess you won't be surprised that they feel that that's a very important issue.

But what they also need to do, I think, is have guidance, as Sebastien outlined from staff. But, I mean, staff at yours and Theresa's level about the long-term, medium, short-term, and contingency planning options and opportunities and how they learn to work within those particular constraints, which you all have to work in.

So who wants to respond first -- Theresa or Kevin?

Kevin Wilson: I'd be happy to, unless, Theresa, do you want to jump in?

Theresa Swineheart: No, give it a shot, Kevin.

Kevin Wilson: Well, yeah, there was a lot there, and I'd love to see when the claps happened, because Sebastien had, you know, a very meaty response -- meaty question -- or comment. But to address the issue on the "too" comment about not having enough -- not being too detailed or too general or too high-level or too specific, just really -- I would just really, really encourage the feedback as one who read and re-read the 50 pages of comments that the At-Large community and others provided to the last year's operating plan and budget.

I would just encourage you to continue doing that. I sense that the dam broke. You know, there was -- before there were trickles of comments coming in, when the message went out that we are interested in having this be a "we" budget not an "our" budget. We, our, ICANN, you know, made a community budget not just a staff budget or a board budget or a, you know, another SO or AC budget. It's really a collective budget. So once we said -- I think that one -- as that message has evolved, the volume of comments came in, so now we have -- the dam broke and a huge amount of information came in on the feedback, which was good. So I want to take away the two comments -- Sebastien and others -- to say there really was a lot of input at that, and a lot of feedback that did shape. And I hope you got that message -- that that was very well received and did have a great influence on it.

Now I think the trick is -- I think we're in the stage of evolution where it helps to have focus or channel -- to take the water scenario a little more deeply -- to channel that so it's not just a flood of information. So that a comment about someone's specific travel support and another comment about a very strategic issue on outreach, aren't just mixed in together -- that you have a very focused channel to address that. Obviously, the strategic plan comments would be very strategic; the operating plan comments would be much more operational and resource-oriented. So if you could do that, that would be helpful.

It also helps us to prioritize it. So we make judgments based on the comments we receive and the

feedback we receive on how important is it to have a RALO versus, you know, an ALAC meeting. And we've had some discussions about that, but it even helps more if you get that very focused and collective and, as Theresa mentioned earlier, if you get that out so people can see all that in the public comments so everyone can see that that really helps us in shaping that and as we allocate those resources.

That's a general comment. And then as far as the longer-term comment of having another summit, I know that's been discussed in various ways, and I'm going to, hopefully, most effectively hand the baton to Theresa on how do we address on a multiple year comment. Or possibly address it in this year's fiscal year operating plan.

Theresa Swineheart: Thanks. I think there's just two facets going specifically to that one. The issue of having additional summits and things like that, I think, is an example of input both on the strategic plan on the comments made earlier on outreach and reaching out and also on increasing participation and various other elements.

I think what's oftentimes very helpful is also to highlight why it's important not just for the community to come together but also how the output and the work of that kind of event contributes and builds into ICANN's overall work and public interest work -- or public interest responsibility.

So -- you know, having -- the first summit was essentially, it was very important, and achieved many results on a variety of fronts, and there are new benchmarks to look at what might be the outcomes or goals or strategic objectives of future ones, and I think in providing any comments, whether to the strategic plan or to the operating plan. So, again, high-level or a more detailed few to highlight what some of those benchmarks might be and how they fit in for the community to be fully engaged and be contributing to the -- not only the focused areas of the strategic plan but then also the operating plan. Because they are -- that allows an assessment, also, how one can scale it or align it across the organization and potentially build -- leverage it (inaudible).

I don't know if I was very clear. I've only had one cup of coffee.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You were, indeed, clear, and, in fact, I was imagining the regional leaders on this call desperately scribbling away notes and typing down, doing the "we must prepare the following parts," as they are very effectively developing the regional discussion and input, which, I'm sure, both of you, if you haven't already done so, will take the time to look at our wikis and see what's happening in almost real time.

Kevin, if you thought the floodgates were open last time, we never had even this much work done this far ahead last time. So -- hang on, honey, it's going to be an interesting ride.

Olivier, the floor is yours, followed by Evan, and then very short, if I may ask, for both Evan and Sebastien because you both held the microphone before, and we do move on with our agenda. Thank you, Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I have two questions. The first one is -- well, the first one is actually just a comment, which is that I don't see any mention of risk analysis for ICANN purposes or risk analysis of what ICANN is doing out there. And there is actually something, which I don't see, either, which is a SWOT analysis. I always thought that strategic plans had mention of strength, weaknesses, et cetera, et cetera. And this, to me -- sorry -- doesn't look like a strategic plan. It looks like a plan of what we're going to do in the future. It's very broad, it's very well written, it's got good intentions, but it's not actually a (inaudible) that's strategic.

So that was one comment, and I'm sorry if I come out a little bit harsh on that. The second comment -- the second thing was a question, actually, and that's on page three, where there is the mention of

everyone connected. And I know that's something that is within ICANN's new motto or something. But I wanted to find out what one means by "everyone connected." Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, Kevin or Theresa, who is going to pick up that point?

Theresa Swineheart: I'm happy to touch on it briefly and then, Kevin, if you'd like to. I think the observation about the risk factors and things like that is good, and I would hope that people would put that into comments that strategically one would obviously want to be looking at that as an organization. So, again, I would recommend that.

On the "everyone connected" -- interesting. Again, this one is in brackets because we were looking forward to having input. We oftentimes talk about a single interoperable Internet, and that sounds nice for those of us who live in the world of names and numbers, but what does that actually mean? Does that -- what does that mean to the average user or to the average citizen who may not be versed in Internet lingo and terminology.

So that was an example of when one's promoting a competition trust choice and innovation as a high-level focus area -- what might be considered a strategic objective under that from an outcome of a user standpoint that everybody is connected. Once they can get online, they have the ability to communicate and connect with anybody. So that was an attempt to term a strategic objective that would fit in under that to capture the global nature and the interoperability nature of the Internet in a simplified way.

But other terminology and ideas of how to phrase that -- or if -- is it a sense that it might be interpreted the wrong way. Please provide those comments in.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Olivier, do you still have your hand up?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: It's interesting -- I just wonder whether it is within ICANN's mandate to ask for everyone to be connected to a single Internet. I'm playing devil's advocate here and trying to, you know, to use this in a (inaudible) sense.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, yes, and I think the points that have been raised, at least in the preliminary draft work I've seen from several of the regions, and Gareth has certainly -- you're on the call, Gareth? Would you like to just briefly say how your ALS is dealing with this issue? You may be on mute. Star 7 to unmute.

Gareth Shearman: I was muted, Cheryl. Yes, I raised that issue because this is something that our ALS is looking at and trying to encourage the Canadian region to take seriously the idea that it's important that all our citizens are included in the Internet infrastructure and have the ability to enjoy -- to be a part of the Internet economy and the Internet world. And this term we are using, visual inclusions, is one that we've crafted to try and solidify that concept.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Gareth, and I think if you can ensure that within the NARALO and, indeed, the ALAC input, a little bit of background information such as you shared with us tonight and perhaps some of the ways you've come to this term might be quite useful. Evan, the microphone is yours.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Two things -- one is a small point and, Theresa, I think you might want to, on that list where you've got on page three, where you've got the different silos, I think you might want to put the high security TLDs under one of the strategic projects for promoting competition, trust, choice, and innovations. It strikes me that the design of that was explicitly to try and increase trust in at least a certain subset of the TLDs.

Theresa Swineheart: Can you just repeat that? To include the -- ?

Evan Leibovitch: The high security's own TLDs that were introduced in Seoul, and there is now a

working group trying to define it. It looks like an initiative of ICANN that's deliberately designed to try and increase public trust.

Theresa Swineheart: A security in TLDs you mean?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Theresa Swineheart: Sorry, I'm having trouble hearing. Security in TLDs, okay, great -- I'll make a note of that again but please incorporate those into the comments, too.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. The other thing, and I guess this is to Kevin. And just to go back a little bit into what Sebastien was saying about the summit -- being the kind of massive project that it is, would it not make sense to have it at a high level in the strategic plan so that if it was thought of in advance, that ICANN could do multi-year budgeting so that there wouldn't be as much pain, say, in specific summit years if this kind of thing was planned for sufficiently in advance? Is there a way to try and deal with that? Is it worthy of actually having the summit mentioned as a strategic project in the plan?

Kevin Wilson: Yeah, I think the short answer is yes. I think that's a great way to handle it, and as far as the multi-year budget, obviously, the way our by-laws are written as a one-year fiscal year budget, the last year or two -- I can't remember if it's in two years -- we've shown a multi-year specifically because the new gTLD program had such a large impact on our finances. So we've shown that multi-year budget, and this would be an interesting improvement, I think, on that process by actually plugging in a large expenditure like that at some point in the future.

Evan Leibovitch: Just the idea of sort of sharing the load and sharing the pain, so to speak, over multiple years as opposed to seeing it just a big, single-year bite.

Kevin Wilson: Right.

Theresa Swineheart: Yeah.

Kevin Wilson: I think that's a great idea.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It comes back to those terms like short, medium, long, and contingency planning. Evan, anything else, or can I move to Sebastien?

Evan Leibovitch: That's it, thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, Sebastien.

Kevin Wilson: Cheryl, could I answer one other question?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, all right, Kevin.

Kevin Wilson: On the risk, I think that was a great suggestion for the strategic plan, and, as Theresa mentioned, to input that. I did want to emphasize, though, that risk management and SWOT-type analyses that were mentioned, are part of ICANN and most of you probably know there is a risk committee that was formed a little over a year ago, and there's been a lot of activity in that regard. So I think to plug that into the actual strategic plan document, I think, is a good suggestion. So, anyway, sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, no, don't be sorry. Thank you very much for that. Just before we move to you, Sebastien, can I ask participants in the call if they are in agreement for us to extend for another 10 to 15 minutes? I do want the regions to be able to review some of their input and make sure that each region has had a chance to hear from the others as well as exposure of Kevin and Theresa to the work you are doing? Everyone happy with that? Kevin, Theresa, could you stay with us for another 15 minutes or so?

Theresa Swineheart: Of course, of course.

Kevin Wilson: Sure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. Sebastien, the floor is yours.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes, thank you. I was disconnected during one part of the meeting, and I maybe missed something. But I wanted to highlight, was even say it's -- and we'll write it in the draft proposal comments from EURALO, and I hope it will become an ALAC proposition that we need to see how we can organized general assembly for each region and some in right order for the next years. And it could be years.

But I was really puzzled because Kevin said something like we have to decide if we have a general assembly or an ALAC meeting, and I think it's not the point. If we don't have ALAC meeting, ICANN didn't have any comments coming from the At-Large to them, and that's monetary. As well, it's monetary to have the regional meetings because they are contracted partly with ICANN, and we need to find a way to have that included in the budget. And perhaps it's not between ALAC meeting and RALO meetings, but it's between -- I don't know, some other activities to be not organized for in other part of ICANN, and that needs to be, too, organized. We need, really, to have that at the strategic level and then we need (inaudible) to include that at the financial level.

And my last point, and I will help you to go to the next item, Cheryl, is that I see that we are four regions who write something on that strategic planning. And I think it's great to see that we have good work done by GLSs in a lot of region. I know that (inaudible) didn't write something but work a lot on that, and all the region work, and what we need to now to do it is how we gather all those comments to one single one. But that shows that summit in last year was good because we are able to have more people involved now after this meeting. Thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Sebastien, and we are now moving to item 4 on the agenda, which is going to put Theresa and Kevin far more into listening mode, but I'd also like to thank Kevin on how you're making -- or you were, at least, doing some other than being at a computer. But I am going to encourage you. I might send you a pop quiz later even to look at the regional workspaces. You see he knows I will -- to look at the regional workspaces within our strategic planning wiki and to see the current and ongoing work that's happening from that grassroots part of our organization of ICANN into this process already. And I think that's part of our accountability and transparency.

Right now, I'm going to do a round robin, and I'd like you to keep the round robin. And I know it's going to be hard for some of you -- to that sort of three-minute mark, if you can, recognizing that what you have got in your regional workspaces works in progress. But if you can pick out some of the high points and respond to the questions that we have on the agenda -- that three- to five-year high-level strategic objectives in terms of the four areas of the work that are outlined in the strategic plan. And the other matter, which may be more difficult for some regions, depending on the discussion stage than others, is what sort of metrics we might be able to look at for this whole process.

And going in alphabetical order, we'll move to AFRALO first, and, Dave, you've held the pen on the reporting of the AFRALO discussion. Dave, would you care to speak on AFRALO's behalf then, or would Tijani prefer to? Tijani, you or Dave?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Tijani speaking. I prefer that Dave will speak on behalf of the AFRALO. He developed the basic document.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. I suspected that would be the case, but I did want to check. Go ahead, Dave, the microphone is yours.

Dave Kissoondoyal: Okay, thank you very much. So I am going to go briefly one or the other on the

four areas of work that the plan mentions. The first one is to preserve the DNS ability and security team for the AFRALO (inaudible) status and ability and security of the DNS (inaudible) for ICANN and the global Internet. Therefore, we think that ICANN should prioritize the support for the implementation of the DNSA.

AFRALO also supports ICANN initiative to work in partnership with other organizations to develop a concept for a model for a DNS collaborative security response system. ICANN (inaudible) are training for CCDL operatives are highly recommended by the AFRALO. And then AFRALO also views that ICANN should come up with a plan for disaster recovery and business continuity for its own operations. This is for the first work of (inaudible) center in the plan. And on the second one, to promote competition plus choice and innovation. We, AFRALO, have used that in line with one of ICANN's core values, which is introducing and promoting competition in the registration of domain names where (inaudible) and beneficial in the public interest ICANN should make the application fee on new domain names within the reach of each individual alike.

There being high application fees creates a disparity between the have and the have-nots. Therefore we urge ICANN to review its application policies.

Secondly, we know it is a positive taken by ICANN to promote the IDNs. AFRALO also believes that there is no better way to promote trust, choice, and innovation without public At-Large involvement. Therefore, AFRALO supports ICANN's initiative to enhance the (inaudible) of the public Internet for its At-Large structures.

The third work mentioned in the plan -- (inaudible) INR and other (inaudible) operations. The AFRALO takes positive note of the fact that ICANN will make a significant investment in operating the INR (inaudible). AFRALO is of the opinion that there will be numerous changes in the years to come with a number of gTLDs increasing. Their implementation of DNSA, the aspect of IDNs, and the migration to IBB6. Therefore, it is important that ICANN stays on top of this and monitors the scaling of the root system.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Dave.

Dave Kissoondoyal: And the last one --

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, we didn't really want a full reading, just the high points. Go ahead. Wrap it up.

Dave Kissoondoyal: On the fourth one, contribute to shipping the IC Internet ecosystem. AFRALO thinks that (inaudible) of commitment that was signed in 2009. ICANN has built up (inaudible) goodwill, therefore AFRALO comments that ICANN's decision honoring the obligation from the (inaudible) by implementing community reviews and (inaudible) on all major decisions.

And then the last point that we want to bring is about the bridging the (inaudible) divide. We think that (inaudible) is a social issue (inaudible) amount of information (inaudible) who do not have the Sudan connect. Therefore, we urge that ICANN has an annual funding of \$64 million. If some of this funding should be allocated for initiative that can help to bridge the (inaudible) divide. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Dave. And, Kevin, I think you'll hear just from that African region input, as it currently is, let alone how it's going to be when it's bundled up and passed onto you and then becomes part of the greater At-Large input.

We have already somehow picked up on your request you made earlier on, and taken the level of comments, I think, to a new benchmark. So it's not just the hodge-podge and perhaps very mosaic set of comments you got from us last time. I think you'll find they are getting pretty close to our own gold standard.

Moving to APRALO, Karaitiana, are you on the call. I see you in the Adobe Room, but I haven't heard you on the phone bridge. You might be muted.

Karaitiana Taiuru: Hi --

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: There you go. Okay, it's all yours.

Karaitiana Taiuru: Thanks. Let's, more or less, concentrate on the APRALO for the moment. Some of the main issues there since we have been APRALO, is unfriendly meeting times for ICANN meetings. This meeting call is a good example, where we said at 5 a.m. New Zealand time; I think 3 a.m. Australia; and much earlier than that for other people in APRALO.

Also, we are interested in increasing our participation but all the Asia Pacific meetings, which comes over funding for a lot of things, and just trying to make our face more visible when it has more interaction within the region.

We also -- we haven't got a firm view at the moment, but assuming a lot of work with ICV for (inaudible) and integration, which we are so (inaudible) and get some firm policy and some -- what's the word -- yeah, working with other organizations. And of the idea into other big (inaudible) APRALO.

There's still a lot of work to do, and so we had some difficulty trying to coordinate people when have problems due to the time zones.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, KT. It's not, of course, just limited to time zones, and I think you'll probably hear similar things from a number of other parts of the ICANN world where English is not the first language, and the matters of simple text and small bite-size and understandable briefings, regardless of what form they come in. We see the changes such as the radio output that Scott has worked with our community as providers of many voices. So we've had a little advance preview of some of those initiatives, and they're the sorts of things that, certainly, Asia Pacific with its some 50-odd languages would be very, very keen not to necessarily have ICANN in production in 50 languages but in a -- how to say it -- sort of provide us with the macro-approved template, and then the locally -- tune into the local language use.

So there's some working smarter and not harder opportunities that I think APRALO will be bringing towards the outreach.

EURALO -- Wolf, you prepared or are you seconding this to someone else?

Wolf Ludwig: Yes, thanks a lot, Cheryl. I think I don't have to repeat our position because it would take too much time. I guess that you can see our workspace and to contribution, especially Sebastien has drafted for today's call and to discussion. And I prefer to leave the floor to Sebastien if he wants to add something to it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Wolf. Go ahead, Sebastien.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes, thank you very much. I just want to (inaudible) that in the three first items, I guess we can find some commonality with AFRALO. I think we can word it in another way. It's why it's something. And I will not repeat what I say already about the idea of outreach, general assembly, and the summit. Just, once again, to stress that to have that in the strategic planning, we need to find a way to say what we want to do. It's why I came up with the idea of "one country one ALS." It's not to say that everything exists six words, but it's give an idea where we want to go. And maybe we will decide that it's just 80 percent of the country will want to reach 90 percent. But we have to try to go in that direction because we need an ICANN more accountable to the world, and to have an ICANN more accountable to the world when it should be participation in each country. Thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Sebastien, and because I can't help myself, and I'm feeling naughty at this hour of the morning, I'll just use what Sebastien finished up saying as an example of how laudable terms and intentions can be misinterpreted and make sure that it isn't misinterpreted from the call records here.

When EURALO says "one country one ALS," they are not limited a single ALS per country, which is one way of interpreting those words even when our English is very good. What they are saying is, and this is something I've heard from, I think -- yes, now, indeed, in all of the regions, certainly Asia Pacific has said their aim is for a minimum of an ALS per country.

And as we move to the challenges of language and interpretation, we are moving to LACRALO. Is it going to be Silvia or Dev who speaks to this matter?

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you, Cheryl. I agree with you. Thank you for interpretation, thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not a criticism. I'm just saying we really have to dot our I's and cross our t's and make ourselves clear. Dev or Silvia, who is speaking on behalf of LACRALO? You may be muted. Star 7 to unmute.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you. Let me try to summarize it quickly -- regarding the first two areas, you know, I think one of those areas are, you know, all of those areas, sorry -- important (inaudible) objectives. I think I have some more comments on the last one in terms of contributing to shaping a healthy Internet ecosystem. I think one key strategic objective should be improving the accessibility and dissemination of documentation generated by the work of ICANN and its stakeholder groups. End users, and I think especially those not familiar with ICANN, and not having the benefit of attending any of the public ICANN meetings, to understand ICANN and the supporting organizations and the discussions of the policies used. It's very difficult for our end users to really grasp what ICANN is doing and, therefore, if you can't understand what ICANN is doing, it is very hard for them to contribute and participate.

So -- and right now I think what's happening is that the -- all the documentation generated, it's not really done in a system. That system of what are tacked on process rather than a core process. So that's one point.

Also quickly, and I think it's more echoing what Sebastien has said, you know, I think if you want we want to get to (inaudible) that to be heard on all Internet, really, to just use, ICANN should report At-Large and the RALOs and its efforts to get new ALSs and especially from those countries that (inaudible) At-Large presence.

And, finally, with more of a comment (inaudible) that ICANN should do more to really strengthen the local Internet communities because ICANN refers to local Internet communities when we've got CCTLD issues and what should happen to its country CCTLD. The problems, I think are quite often, the (inaudible) Internet communities are just not aware of each other, and whenever ICANN is attending support, you know, attending or supporting or giving a presentation at an event, it should really try to make a -- it should make attorneys aware of the local stakeholders such as At-Large that are involved in our ICANN policy work, and possibly and/or attempt to make sure that the stakeholders are present at such events. I think that would really do better in strengthening the local Internet communication.

I think that's it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Dev, that was perfect, absolutely perfect. Moving on to NARALO, Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Thanks. First up, I want to say I hope it's not held too strongly to one country one ALS or the North American region is in trouble.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (laughs) Oh, I don't know, I think you'd be nicely managed, if we got you down to that, but go on.

Evan Leibovitch: I'm not going to repeat what others have said, except I'm going to expand a little on what Dev has just said -- accessibility of good quality, plain language information about ICANN is a must, specifically for, in fact, allowing our ALSs to fulfill their mandate. They can't help give good policy advice into the regions going into ALAC unless they have got good information with which to work. So this is, to us, a priority. Not just for our own region and our own ALSs, but for the public at large.

Consolidating of the public face of ICANN is also important. When I came in originally, it was really confusing. There was (inaudible) department for doing public outreach, there was ALAC, there was NCUC, and there was a whole different range of venues through which somebody in the public could get involved in ICANN, and it was really hard for people to understand which path to take in.

I think it's going to be important to simplify that, consolidate that. I think you did a fine move by bringing Nick into the position he is now, and I think that will help that, but this needs to go further in terms of simplifying that. Anything else I want to say has already been said very well by others.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, Evan, I appreciate all of the comments and, more importantly, I trust that -- excuse me -- (sneezes) -- I do apologize. That's going to make it interesting in the transcript, never mind. I do hope that both Kevin and Theresa are pleased with the level of input that we are able to present even at this stage in our processes and that they are looking forward to what's in store.

I've got a need to read to the record, Adam has -- from EURALO, although living in Japan -- has had to drop off the call, so it's a very unfriendly time for him, but he is still on the At-Large -- sorry, the Adigo -- I'll try again. The Adobe Room for the call. He is raising four particular questions, which I'll read to the record, as I promised him I would -- questions, which I do think go to our next steps and where we need to look at synergies in the AOC environment. So -- it's going to very briefly cover the next and final agenda item, as far as I'm concerned at least.

How will successes of the strategic plan be measured? Is it going to be specific goals and dates, et cetera? Is that sort of metric going to be necessary? What will there be care with the Internet ecosystem activities leading to stick very closely, be wary, to stick very closely to ICANN's mission and avoid the complications of politics. And, of course, Adam works in an IGF world a lot, so he does know what he's talking about, and I think that's something each of our regional leaders need to be very aware of as they are writing their particular contributions from a regional perspective as well.

Leading on to the digital divide. For DNS-related work, as Theresa describes, he felt what she had said was excellent but certainly suggests dropping the use of the term, "digital divide" by ICANN. And perhaps some of these other language choices, which were brought up in today's meeting may be helpful there as a replacement, because he fears it tends to suggest to parts of the ecosystem, will read into this, as an expansion on the measure on ICANN's mission, and I think that's probably a very wise thing to note.

And the fourth thing he raises is the INFORM participation and enhanced information flow to the community -- something we've heard from, I think, nearly every one of the regional presentations, so far.

Thank you, one and all, for the contributions from the regions, which are continuing and will be honed into what we need to see by the close date. Kevin, did you want to make any particular comments now, as we are wrapping up the meeting, and then I'll ask Theresa to do the same?

Kevin Wilson: Other than just thank you for your participation past and present and, obviously, the future. So thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks. Theresa?

Theresa Swineheart: Just to thanks for the opportunity and, again, the input from this team. It's really important, also going to the discussions on outreach and participation and specific examples and things like that. A lot of creative and good ideas out there, and we'd welcome to have (inaudible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, and I'm being left with a whole bunch of words floating around, a little bit like a word cloud. You know, I'm hearing "opportunity," I'm hearing "partnership," I'm hearing "professional." I'm hearing some really exciting things all of which wrap up perfectly as we look to the affirmation of commitments and the greater involvement of the infinite end user and for the community at large, both upper and lower case ANL. And most importantly, as we look towards the review of our accountability and transparency within ICANN. How important that this particular process is happening at this particular time, because it is, I think, a perfect example of how ICANN, the way ICANN has evolved in even the short time that I've been involved in the At-Large community.

Good morning, good evening, good day, good night, and thank you one and all for what I think has been a very productive and very rewarding call. And please continue your discussions. Kevin and Theresa, we have an At-Large Google Wave going, and all of this is being recorded in embedded Windows within that. So if either of you wishes to send me an e-mail address and be invited to Wave, you can review that in the ongoing discussion at your leisure. But we'll be getting it to you in the more normal form as well.

Thank you both and we appreciate the time that each and every one of the people on this call, and it's been quite a lineup. I'd like to make sure we record, I think, a really excellent lineup of participants both in the Adobe Room and in the telephone bridge. Thank you all.