

27 January 2010 At-Large Director Appt Process - Transcript – EN

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Is there any questions or comments from Spanish channel at this stage? If not, we shall start the general review and discussion. Not at this stage? Okay. Anyone in the Adobe Room wish to speak to the white paper? If--go ahead.

Christopher Wilkinson: Cheryl, I don't understand what you mean by the Adobe Room. I've got this Adobe screen in front of me. Is that it?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It is indeed, Christopher, yes.

Christopher Wilkinson: The notes, the discussion notes?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct.

Christopher Wilkinson: That's what you're referring to?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's right.

Christopher Wilkinson: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And that allows us to all share the general notes, where we'll have the agenda that is identical to that on the Wiki, discussion notes which staff catch outcomes of today's call, and the opportunity for everyone to have an ongoing chat which is, of course, accumulative to the topic. So, in fact, within those windows in the Adobe Room, Christopher, you should have information from each of the three calls, the community calls of this matter.

In that room, for those who haven't used it before, on the lower left-hand side, there's a Status Option button which allows you and I'm doing it now--to raise one's hand and to lower one's hand, along with various other things like agree, disagree, or slip away. And that is the way that you can get in the speaking queue part. For those of us who are not in the Adobe Room, I will also make sure that we do a general call.

Okay, so if everyone's clear on the logistics, let's open for the general discussion on the white paper. And I'll go around in RALO order, if you all don't mind. I know a number of the regional At-Large organizations have met specifically on this topic. And I'm also aware that some people are needing to perhaps leave this call as early as they possibly can for various reasons.

And to that end, if I can ask Tijani, are you speaking on behalf of AFRALO? Dev had sent his apologies. He will be joining us later, though.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, I'm not--I didn't have a mandate to speak on behalf of AFRALO, but we had a call for AFRALO, and people who were there almost all agree on the same things.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent. Would you care to give us a brief and general first comments on the white paper? Thank you.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: You want me to give these? Okay, okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Please. Go ahead, Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, thank you. So I think that those persons who did this white paper, we have to thank them, because they did a very good job. I have some, if you want some worries--not worries, but some, for example, about the criteria that we put here. They are not measurable. So they are more, let's say, subjective than objective. We can't measure, for example, the record on working to build

consensus with a diverse (inaudible). It's not measurable. It will be the feeling of people. And this can give (inaudible) for some people that are not well known by the people of the Selection Team or the Selection Committee. Do you understand?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I do.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. That's the--.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Would you care for us to deal with these issues one by one, or to present them all, have them catch it in the discussion notes, and then have other people discuss those with you?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I think that it's better that we go according to the agenda, because in the agenda, you have the steps, for example, for the ABSC and ABSDT. I have comments on those. What else? For the term, I think it's okay. I don't have anything to say.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: It's better to follow the agenda.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Fine, so the rest of your comments at the moment will be of this general matter. We'll capture them and put them in for the discussion in the rest of the meeting, then.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, continue. Thank you.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, so the matters of the ABSC and the ABSDT from AFRALO will be addressed under those agenda items.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just looking down, Hong, you're still with us?

Hong Xue: Oh, yes, I'm here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, Hong, if you would like to, from APRALO's perspective, raise any of the issues that we have discussed at our meetings. While I'm chairing this meeting, I'll hand over to you. I don't see any of our executives on the call. And also, when you're giving your personal opinions, if you can just highlight that they are personal or otherwise. I'll hand you the microphone.

Hong Xue: Oh, oh sure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead, Hong.

Hong Xue: Oh, this is actually my personal opinion. I do not represent APRALO. And as far as I can remember, we haven't composed any official comments to the white paper. But I made some comments I posted on the Wiki page.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Hong Xue: So (inaudible) it's a long one. When we go through the agenda items.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Then in terms of general?

Hong Xue: In terms of general, I remembered APRALO calls, we talked about the election model, and we talked about electoral college. Sorry, my, I don't have much energy to recollect all those points.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's fine, Hong, but obviously, we want to make sure all voices are heard, and you're one of those people who have taken a considerable time to make comments, and I know you're not particularly well. So I wanted to give your voice an opportunity early in the making.

Hong Xue: Oh, thank you very much. But if it is so necessary, perhaps you could help me. To your point, we talked about it at our conference calls. I'm sorry, my brain is not working well, so I can't remember it that well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, so if I pop my APRALO representative hat on for just a moment, then, as is often the case, we tend to discuss things and I guess a number of comments put through in our monthly meeting if we have issues with things. The lack of comments on general terms from APRALO is an indicator of general comfort on the white paper processes, with the exception, of course, of some specific concerns that individuals may have and have put into their comments.

There is not an official APRALO view for tonight's meeting other than that business being reflected previously, and I'm still hopeful that Karaitiana or some of the other executives from APRALO will be able to join us. But it is a particularly friendly time for people in our region, whether they will or otherwise.

Moving on to EURALO, who would like to speak on behalf of EURALO in general terms on the white paper? I don't see Wolf listed, so is it to be Sebastien or Christopher?

Christopher Wilkinson: Hello, this is Christopher. I thought Sebastien was on the call.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, he is.

Christopher Wilkinson: Because my personal position is not necessarily that of my ALS, not necessarily--.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Fine, well, Christopher, you've got the microphone now for a moment, so give us your general views from a personal perspective, and then we'll hand over to Sebastian for any specific EURALO outcome.

Christopher Wilkinson: Well, I don't know. I think it's still the same concern I had when we discussed it the last time, Cheryl, that the options, the ALSs that I've spoken to, they're not, by no means to all of them, but I would prefer each ALS to have a vote.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, so it's an electorate, not a general issue at the moment seems to be your dominant--okay? Fantastic. Uh-huh.

Christopher Wilkinson: But I've set this out before, and we know that it goes and comes. So I think Sebastien should take this matter over.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Certainly, that's not a problem. I'm just very keen to ensure that all voices are heard here. Sebastien, go ahead.

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you. I would have preferred that both would participate and take the lead on that, but I think we, we're along a change on the--.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry, (inaudible) on. Wolf is not in the Adobe Room. Is he on the teleconference call?

Sebastien Bachollet: No, no. I don't think. I was expecting to have him today, but he is not.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Tell me what happened. Misdirected the matter, that's all.

Sebastien Bachollet: Oh, no, I expect (inaudible). And we had a long discussion on this issue. I think we are fairly comfortable with the overall solution. Now we have some points where some of our members think that we can do better. But the idea's not too much to change the document itself, but maybe to try to apply as much as we can in our region what we would like to see done, like more inputs from the LACs and in each part of the process. But generally speaking, I guess we are quite happy with the outcome of this particular document to date. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. If we can now move to LACRALO. Carlos from Spanish channel. I don't see any other executives in the English channel. Is there an official LACRALO view in terms of general view of the white paper?

Interpreter: Give me one second, please. I'm not sure he can hear me. I hear noise in the background, but give me one second.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Certainly. Not a problem.

Interpreter: Okay, and Cheryl, I'm sorry. Sergio Salinas--oh, here we go.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent. I think there's all sorts of things happening on the Spanish channel.

Interpreter: And now, and this is Carlos speaking.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you.

Carlos Aguirre: [Interpreted](#) What I wanted to tell you from the region, and this is what we spoke about in the last teleconference, we've made some comments in regards to the white paper where, in particular, we do agree on this regional overview with our document. There are certain issues that were raised, and we will bring them up during the course of the teleconference. And we do have other members of LACRALO who have issued those concerns, such as Mr. Sergio Salinas. So during the course of the teleconference, each of us will be able to make those comments, but on a general overview, the comments on the white paper is that it has been very well done in general. I just think there are some little issues that we'll be raising during the course of this teleconference.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So very similar in some views, then, to what we've heard from AFRALO and EURALO to date, then?

Carlos Aguirre: [Interpreted](#) That's right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. If we can now move to Latin America (inaudible), not scrawling down my notes properly. Evan, if you could make a contribution in terms of general white paper, recognizing, of course, Evan, that as well as the authors of the white paper, and, of course, as one of the (inaudible) in this process, NARALO has done an awful lot of the foundation work. And I think we should recognize that and thank NARALO in general for the contributions they've made to this process. Go ahead, Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I'll keep it brief for that reason. Just to let you know, there's actually a check going on in the, there's a scope check going on amongst NARALO people right now who have chosen not to be part of this call for reasons I don't understand. But that's how it is. The concept has been raised--sorry, let me restart.

Generally, there's broad approval for the kind of process that we've been going through with, as people here probably realize, a number of specific individuals who have very strongly raised the case for having public elections and a self-nomination process without limit. For instance, it's been raised that in California, voters have been able to choose on a ballot from amongst 135 candidates and were able to successfully select between them. So there's been questions raised by some people about having to have a system that vets candidates. Essentially, the proposal is being made that anybody who wants to run should be allowed to run and that we perform an appropriate service of informing the voters on how to choose between them.

Beyond that, there generally hasn't been a lot of discussion recently. As you know, most of the NARALO work has been done some time ago. There hasn't been, besides what I've just said, much news since then.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Thanks very much. It's a very nice segue, I think, to looking at the matters

of draft candidate criteria and the calls for statements of interest. So before we move formally to that agenda item, can I ask is there anyone in, first of all, the Spanish or French channel who wishes to speak in general to the white paper and highlight any particular points that they may not have had time to put on the Wiki?

Antonio Medina: [Interpreted](#) I am Antonio Medina. I would like to say something.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Please go ahead, Antonio.

Antonio Medina: [Interpreted](#) I just wanted to clarify, on a previous LACRALO meeting, we had stated that from LACRALO we were going to nominate our choices upfront, but there's also the option of any RALO to nominate freely their own candidate in that this is what I wanted to mention, that there's two options for the RALOs to nominate their own candidates. Therefore, anybody who wishes to freely appoint themselves to do so.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Certainly the matter of the RALO appointments where more than one RALO--in fact, I think the proposal was to have three or more. In a model way, we have five RALOs for consideration. If such a person hasn't been self-appointed from the--sorry, not self-appointed, self-promoted--to the slate of candidates as a result of the call for statements of interest is something the white paper does discuss. I see Carlos and then I see Sebastien. Carlos, go ahead, and then Sebastien.

Interpreter: One second, please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No problem.

Carlos Aguirre: [Interpreted](#) One of the subjects that we discussed in the Latin American region and the Caribbean and that has been raised by one of the IDS leaders was related to the voting process. And really, at the end of the voting process, what happens if there was a tie? Who would solve this problem? Who would break that? If with the amount of votes, it was possible to solve this issue, because this is, there's no specific clause in the white paper that talks about breaking the tie.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Certainly. Carlos, I'm happy to respond on behalf of the group that put the white paper together. This was a matter that was discussed, and it was felt that, one, the white paper, because it wasn't something that had been discussed by the community in previous calls, was able to remain silent on that.

Should a tie occur, they raise a number of standard forms of rerun of a partisan election. If you can't break a tie, then you could have various methods of cast through from casting votes being put by perhaps the electorate again, or in fact something as simple as choosing out of a hat is even possible. If you feel that the community, if LACRALO feels that the community needs to have a prescriptive method of breaking a tie, then I suppose that's one of those so-be-it discussions.

But we are very cognizant that we also have a very tight time course, and if we spend another two or three months discussing a set of options for avoiding a tie situation or to solve the choice if we have an exact tie situation, then we would probably miss our deadline. And, of course, the simplest way to avoid a tie is to have an electorate model. That means the total number in the voting population is operating in a system where a tie is not possible, and there are ways of doing that.

Sebastien's put his hand down, but Alan has put his hand up, and I know we spoke extensively on this matter.

Interpreter: And Mr. Salinas as well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, okay, thank you. So I now see Alan, then back to Mr. Salinas and then Evan. Alan, I'm assuming this is in response to Carlos's and LACRALO's question, I think it's up. Go ahead, please, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, yes. Okay. Just a quick note to say that the white paper does mention that it is an issue which needs to be discussed. We didn't forget it. As you pointed out, there had been no prior discussion, and we didn't feel it was necessary to put something in place.

There are a number of solutions, as you point out. It is mandatory that we have a written rule prior to the start of the election so we don't invent the rules as we go along. But my feeling is similar to yours. It needs to be decided, it needs to be put in place, but none of the options are particularly greater than the other. And I'm not sure it's worthy of a lot of community discussion. It certainly can, as you pointed out, if we need to. But it is important that it be written prior to the start of the election process.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely. Evan and then back to Mr. Salinas, and I will also see if Carlos has a follow-up.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi. I had the fortune of sitting in on the LACRALO call, and I understood the concerns. No matter which of the recommendations in the white paper is considered, as long as we have an even number of voters, especially as we get into the second or third stages of the vote, it is possible to have a tie. So this is something that probably does need to be threshed out before we send the next version of this to the SIC. I do think that this is going to be a concern. There's a possibility, if we have 20 voters, that with the second or third round, you could have 10 and 10. And definitely I think there needs to be something concrete put forward to address that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Certainly, Evan, and I think when I was making my initial response, I did say that the number in the electorate was one of the simplest ways of avoiding this outcome. And I would also suggest that when we've had discussions from an electorate point of view within APRALO for whatever forms of election we've had in the past, one of the practices that the Asia-Pacific region has adhered to, and would obviously feel very comfortable with in a model for this type of appointment process, is to ensure that you have an odd number so it can't become a problem.

Mr. Salinas? Sergio?

Sergio Salinas: [Interpreted](#) Yes. And this is just a proposal in regards to a tie. And the proposal is the following, and this is what we have spoken about within the LACRALO meeting. We do realize that this could be a possible option. The President and the Secretary could be elected within this meeting, and then the President would have the possibility of having a (inaudible) vote. And so in that case, the President would be the one to break the tie.

Another subject that we dealt with in respect to raise this as well is we should at least have, within that election, to have one candidate per region. At a minimum, in order to even deal with this issue about an election, is to have one candidate per region. That's all.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: May I ask about this on that back to Mr. Salinas. In what way does having one candidate per region within the set of potential people to vote for--remembering we're not discussing the electorate at this point. We're looking at the candidate slate. How does that address having a tie issue, and how does that address having an outcome that is a globally representative person of At-Large?

I can see where having names on a list that three, four, or five, six or seven depending on how many RALOs we have in the future may do that, but I'm, from--this is me from a personal perspective, not the Chair's perspective--am wondering where having a mandate of, "If we have five regions, we have a minimum of five candidates," how that contributes to a globally representative outcome as opposed to a set of round-robin votes which can name the least likely representative and popular candidate may win? And then I'll see Sebastien. (Inaudible) From LAPRALO, yes.

Sergio Salinas: [Interpreted](#) First of all, that was just a suggestion to deal with diversity. Beyond that, I

think every candidate will have a global vision to represent everybody from every region. But as a foundation, it would be able to have a candidate per region if there were more of that problem. You know, three from NARALO, four from APRALO, two from LACRALO. I mean, what's important, like I said, as a matter of guaranteeing diversity, I think that it would be good to have one candidate per region as a minimum requirement, and to then be able to raise up even more candidates depending on whoever wants to be nominated.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. I think we might come back to that in further discussion, then. Sebastien, go ahead?

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes. Two points. First, it's to break a tie, I guess we need to find a way to do that, but don't spend too much time on that. Because I hope that we will be able not to 10/10 at the end of the day. That, nevertheless, may be productive.

My second point, and I will say it's more important that please, we are just one organization, one group of people to put one people in one seat in the bowl. And we can start to struggle each with every others, but I dream one, that one region could decide to support somebody from another region.

That's, I will take one example just to show you what could happen. I know that is not candidate, and I hope he will not to be bothered too much about taking his name, but if Adam Peake was living in Japan as a NomComm for the EURALO is candidate, with EURALO pushing that candidate and that APRALO, because he is living in the region, decided that he's also a good candidate for them. Why we need to have two candidates?

And I understand the question of diversity. We need to have as much diversity as we can, but did we say that we need to have as much women as men as candidates, as we will say that we need to have white, black, and other color. I will miss the right word and I will not try to make the names. Because we need diversity. Yes, we need diversity. Yes, definitely. But at the end of the day, we need to elect one people, and that's our tricky situation. Then just take care of all that. Thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, thank you, Sebastien. Any other comments specific to the matter of the candidate listing having a regional diversity criteria in it or any other form of diversity criteria in it? Anyone else wish to speak to that matter?

Alan Greenberg: I will--Alan.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I'll just say what I put in the chat, and it's equivalent to what Carl Auerbach, a person I often do not agree with, said. If we can't start thinking of ourselves as one group and get rid of the regional bias and the regional representation issue, we are lost. We have one seat; we may end up with two. We're never going to have five. It's not going to happen, and we have to start thinking of having someone who can represent At-Large, not a region. Otherwise, I think we are doomed.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed, yes. I'm perilously close to packing up my bat and ball and going home. If we go to a regional model, then you probably have my resignation. Siva, go ahead. You may be on mute, Siva. Siva, we can't hear you.

Siva Muthusamy: I'm sorry, I'm sorry. I've had some trouble. Yes, my comments are next to the regional representation for candidates, and we put on, we have a system. If we have a system, the idea can be that the maximum number of candidates from a region is one, and after that the regions have to work together to arrange a consensus to a (inaudible) conflict. But similar, the merits of specifying that candidates should come from a region has to be debated. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. I would like, then, to pose from an Asia-Pacific perspective, with the

region of greatest inter-regional diversity, if it's limited to N equals any number, but it says any number less than probably 10 or 15 per region, our diversity will not be seen to in such a model, and therefore, we would probably believe that such a model is faulted.

Secondly, if we look at having regional diversity in some way mandated into this process, how on earth does that make what I hear from the ALSs in some of the discussions from Europe, and what we certainly heard from some individuals in their comments, how does that then mesh with as individuals rise to put themselves forward from within the at-large community--lower-case, not as endorsed regional candidates--and indeed for people who have, as some people have argued, no, in inverted commas, "at-large" or ALS or regional or ALAC connections, to also be considered for such a role?

Now, I'm not asking about the debate on whether or not that's a good criteria or other. I'm asking how, if we bring in some form of mandated regional diversity rule, as opposed to what the white paper has enshrined within it for discussion, a mechanism where regions can ensure that highly qualified and, in their view, providing it is three or more of their views, ideal candidates who may not have been included for whatever reason that the ABSC did not include them, it can be put in by the petition method. Can I ask for Carlos and then Siva to respond to those questions, please?

Hong Xue: Cheryl--.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, Hong, please, I can hear you there. Please jump in, because I just, I just have huge issues on how regions who are less diverse than ours can say regional diversity is going to be met by one name coming in.

Hong Xue: Oh, wow. Sorry to (inaudible). I know you're asking African RALO anyway.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And also Siva, who is from our region.

Hong Xue: Right. Diversity's a big issue, and of course the question is whether diversity should be one of the criteria. The answer should definitely be yes, especially from the perspective of the Pacific, which is the most diversified region, ensuring that how to make it procedurally feasible, how to build it into our process. It is something we'll think about. I guess nobody on this call are committed to oppose diversity as a criteria; that issue is how to realize that.

From my very limited experience with nomination committee--well, not ours, not At-Large--while (inaudible) is so confusing use this phone call, I mean, for ICANN NomComm, diversity is one of the elements that should be considered to assess the qualification of the candidate, a group of candidates, in comparable conditions.

In our case, I'm just thinking about Cheryl's very insightful comment, and I want to follow that. Whether we want to make one candidate per region as a mandatory requirement, this is very interesting, very interesting thinking. Because it will be related to the power of the nomination--sorry, tell me the word you've chosen to describe. Is it Selection Committee?

Unidentified Participant: Selection Committee, yes.

Hong Xue: Oh, okay. It depends on the, how to define the power of the Selection Committee. If diversity is something for the Selection Committee to consider and decide, then it should be solely in their discretion to decide whether they want to have a diversified selection or not. Or, in another option, and if we make this one person/one region mandatory, then the Selection Committee will have to think in this framework, in this nutshell. They have to select, oh, wow, it is five pigeonholes and put people in. That's totally two methodologies. We will have to think about which way to go forward. I don't have conclusions here but to listen to the other colleagues. Back to you, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Hong, and it's a matter of methodology.

Siva Muthusamy: Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, go ahead, Siva. I did want to go to the Spanish channel as well, but you can go first.

Siva Muthusamy: Yes. First, my point is not to make it mandatory that it should be one candidate from a region, it's rather to make it a convention to work towards a maximum of one candidate per region. And this is that along the lines of thinking of some election processes that I've seen in India, there are conventions that are not in that process of building consensus.

One year there is a candidate from the southern region, and the next year there is a candidate from the northern region, and there are such candidates that exist in the various forums. For example, in Internet domain process, it's better if one of the candidates is a man this year. To bring in gender balance, next year the candidate is likely to be a woman. So if we bring in some convention among regions to build a consensus, then it should be possible to have one candidate from Latin America for one year and the next year, the candidate could be from Asia, and one year the candidate can be a man, and the next year, the candidate can be a woman.

But after saying all this, I also considered the merits of what was said in the last (inaudible). She talks about various (inaudible) sense of this idea of limiting the number of candidates, so I would like to reserve further comments on this and come back to this point by email or by written comment. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We're putting a final set of recommendations through as a result of today's meeting, so I find the likelihood of full and frank communitywide discussion on this particular subject as an opportunity very unlikely.

And I would like to remind everybody, before I move to Latin America and then back to Alan, that we have diversity control mechanisms on the Board structure. That's one of the reasons NomComm has its rules. Our focus is on a single--numero uno, one--representative who may be--sorry, not representative, let me retract that--appointment, they are not our representative--an appointment to the ICANN Board who could be there for three consecutive three-year terms, if the community believes they're doing a good job.

So let's make sure what we're focusing on is not some philosophical, ideal piece of claptrap, which is where I believe we're heading in this conversation now. Rather, something that we can have a person appointed to the Board that can have the widest at-large--lower-case--end Internet user community belief that they are a representative of views that the average Internet end user and registrant would want to see taken to the Board of ICANN.

Now I'd like to go back to Latin America and Caribbean and anyone in the Spanish channel to see whether this discussion on regional diversity and mandates or mechanisms that ensure other than what is in the white paper, which is the petition model, needs to be further discussed. Because if it does, then I think we need to look very seriously at our timing for today's call. Tricia? Hearing nothing.

Tricia Drakes: Yes, I'm sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, go ahead. (Inaudible).

Tricia Drakes: Now, in regards to diversity, diversity goes beyond race or gender and all those things. It has to do with many other issues, so it's really very complicated to include within the document the subject of diversity. And I do think that the simple fact of mentioning that would bring about a big problem. I mean, a certain concept of diversity should be in the document, but that is going beyond the understanding of each region. It's a very complex issue and, I mean, maybe we can try to define it somehow in the document, just to have a better understanding of this concept. And Sylvia would like to

say something as well at the end.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Perhaps we can go now to Sylvia before Alan. Go ahead.

Sylvia Leite: [Interpreted](#) I do agree with what Siva and what Carlos said. Really, what it is, the issue of diversity is not something that can be obligatory, because when something is imposed, there are never good results. I think that each region can adopt their own methodology in order to bring about diversity within their representatives. We can mention it, but not as something obligatory, because then I think we're getting involved into something that will bring problems in the future. But yes, mention the importance of diversity and that we do approve of diversity, but not as something obligatory, and that was all. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. And again, I would remind you that the Board structure itself for ICANN has considerations of diversity enshrined in its rules, and the Nominating Committee forms of making sure diversity happens on the Board is something that's a very important part of ICANN and need not be tried to be fixed by one tiny part of a single appointment process. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, two quick points. On the issue of regional rotation and regional representation, we discussed this on the very first call. We very quickly came to the realization that would strongly disadvantage the At-Large person if we needed to rotate or we needed to do that kind of thing, and it was deleted from the list of options. I am really worried that we're going back full circle and spending a half an hour to discuss something that we already talked about and decided was not a good idea. That's number one.

Number two, we started off this meeting with someone saying--I don't remember who--that perhaps we needed objective criteria for selecting the person, that all of the criteria we talked about were subjective.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, that's Africa, and I'd like to move to that now, because it does bring us to the candidate criteria.

Alan Greenberg: Just one comment, because it applies to whether we pick someone from the right region. If anyone knows how to pick a person for a position based on completely objective criteria, and you guarantee success, I suggest you publish it, because there's a lot of people looking to employ people, looking to find a spouse, that if you could find these rules, you would make a lot of money. I think we're talking about very subjective things, and you have to do it and hope you do it right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And perhaps at that point it might be appropriate to go back to Tijani, seeing it was something that was raised from the AFRALO point of view. And we do need to focus on the draft candidate criteria.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, I do think that there is enough criteria from ICANN and from the NomComm that we have to add more, especially because what we are adding are subjective criterias. And we either have to add only one point--the candidate must be from the At-Large community, meaning from one of the RALOs. That is, from one of the ALSs.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So you're saying that candidates who, through whatever mechanism, put in their statements of interest that are endorsed or otherwise, must be a member of an At-Large structure? Is that--let me be clear. That is what the comment is saying?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. That's what I think and what in Africa we think.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. I think we can only note that, because I can imagine we'll have as many people in other regions arguing the exact opposite--but I see Evan's hand up--and I'm fairly confident that some of your members would be in absolute opposition on that particular point. Evan, go ahead.

Evan Leibovitch: Actually, I wouldn't just say individual members. I'd say even the people who don't necessarily agree with going back to the 2000 election would not want to limit the pool of candidates to those that are currently within the ALS structures. That experience within ICANN might be a criteria of who people vote for, but it should not be a criteria of who stands for election.

There have already been a couple of individuals who have been mentioned in passing in conversations within NARALO of people who I think would be excellent candidates who, for various reasons, are involved in Internet governance but are not involved in ALSs. I would not want to artificially limit their ability to stand for election. And who knows? Maybe it is possible that some people are right, that involvement in current ICANN culture is not necessarily a key ingredient in understanding what the public at large needs out of ICANN.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh. With that, we could simply not worry too much about this process. We should put a budget application together, and the At-Large community could hire a head-hunter to find us a perfect Board member. That would be another way of doing it.

Evan Leibovitch: Or possibly at least a paid, perhaps a paid consultant to the Selection Committee.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, a head-hunter and there's all sorts of opportunities. Tijani needs to be called again, and if we can now ask for any other comments on the draft candidate criteria and move to how we will be needing to call for an SOI for this first appointment process that the white paper has discussed. Siva, did you wish to speak to what you were talking here?

Interpreter: And Mr. Medina does have a question when--.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Siva Muthusamy: No, I don't want to take any more time. I've posted on the chat window, so that's very clearly done.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, thank you. Mr. Medina, go ahead, Antonio.

Antonio Medina: [Interpreted](#) Yes, and this is my question. At this moment, and I have been thinking about this, and this is related to the possible candidates who, let's say for example, already have a position within ICANN. Is it possible for candidates who already have a position within ICANN to be nominated or to run? And if they are elected, would this mean that they would have to resign to that position or to that charge in order to assume the new charge? Or do they have the ability, or in this case, the disability or the lack of capacity to run because they already have a position within ICANN? Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can I ask Antonio to define "position in ICANN" for the people on this call? Are we talking, as Siva was putting in the chat room, specific criteria such as not being a registrar or an employee of an ISP or other Internet service or Internet infrastructure business, or are we talking about individuals who are on a contract or employment basis with the company called ICANN? What exactly is Antonio referring to?

Antonio Medina: [Interpreted](#) I'm not just talking about, let's say, somebody who has a paid position with ICANN. But, for example, somebody that's got an actual position. For example, Carlos Aguirre is the President, is one of the ALAC representatives, let's say. Now, in this case, could he run or not? And second, let's say this person who's a representative, would then they have to resign to be an elected representative if they run?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alan is, I think, you've started talking about the bylaws. If you'd like to respond specifically to Antonio, then?

Alan Greenberg: Sure. The rules are pretty clear that, for instance, in a supporting organization--and we

presume the same will apply with the bylaws for the ALAC and At-Large--if you are a member of a committee and your name is up for a Board position, I believe you can no longer participate in any discussions about selecting a Board member. And once you are elected, I believe you have to resign as a member of that group.

I don't remember exactly, but in general, a Board member cannot occupy another position within the organization. There may be some exceptions. There are also rules that you cannot be a Board member if you are an official in a country that makes decisions regarding the Internet and things like that. So there are specific bylaws. We will have to follow them. They will have to be adapted for At-Large, so we can't say exactly what they are, but there will be a set of rules which will be put in place about that. And in general, one cannot hold another position at the same time as holding a Board position, but you can run for it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Does that answer your question, Antonio?

Antonio Medina: [Interpreted](#) Yes. Thank you very much. And can I ask another question?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Just put that on hold for a moment. I'll move to Tijani now and then back to you, Antonio. Tijani, go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, yes. The reason that I say that the candidate must be an ALS member is that At-Large is the sum of all those ALS representatives. And since this member, this Board member, will be appointed by At-Large, I think that we have to appoint someone from their members. Because people who are not inside At-Large, they can be appointed by other people. Who can defend our positions? Who can speak about our concerns? I think one of us.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Tijani, and there are many people who agree quite passionately with that view. And there are also people who agree to disagree--.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I know, I know.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Quite passionately with that view. And I think one of the reasons that the white paper has discussed the draft candidate criteria and the call for statements of intent to be as open as is humanly possible is to satisfy all of those needs and let the electorate decide once the candidate pool has been put together.

Back to your question, Antonio. While Tricia's getting Antonio's question organized, can we find out, Matthias, there seems to be a call dropped. We've got the beep-beep happening in the background. Is there someone we know who's dropped off?

Matthias Langenegger: We are in contact with the teleconference operator.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, thanks for that. I just didn't want someone to have dropped off and us not know about it. Antonio, you have a question?

Sebastien Bachollet: Maybe it's me, because I--it's Sebastien--I changed phones because I was in chat and my computer was in trouble. Then I quite oddly get out, but then maybe it's me.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Well, I can hear--yes. Antonio, your question?

Unidentified Participant: Something about a proxy is the message in the chat.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Maybe my screen hasn't refreshed properly. Tricia, can you give us Antonio's question, or we will move on.

Interpreter: One second.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you.

Antonio Medina: [Interpreted](#) Can you hear me? I'm so sorry. I was muted. I apologize. I don't know what happened. What I wanted to know is that it must say--and this is not during the voting process--let's say a person who wants to vote is not able to vote that day because they don't have access to the Internet or they don't have access to the ballot. Can they delegate their voting power to someone else?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If I can answer from the perspective of the use of the current tool, which is the Big Pulse vote, there are mechanisms to ensure that connectivity at the time of the vote is not in any way a restriction to the person who is authorized to be part of the electorate. So at this stage, no proxy is in any way, shape, or form required.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I would suggest that if we had a situation where someone was going to be hospitalized for a month and could not participate, we could handle that on a one-by-one basis.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed. And some of us may end up slitting our wrists during this process, so it's a very valid discussion. I think I may be one of those.

Ladies and gentlemen, we need to have a call put out to the widest possible community, short order, after this community call, so that candidates, however they believe they are representative and however they believe they have the core values and criteria that I trust we are soon going to agree to, to at least list for the call, can then become the fodder, the selection puddle for a group which is the At-Large Board Appointment Selection Committee, something that is very similar to a Nominating Committee process for the whole of ICANN, can then go through a sifting and sorting process. Can I ask now that we focus on the specifics of the draft candidate criteria? Do I have agreement on that point?

No, we still think have discussions on proxy. Can I ask, who showed that you ask the, let the Spanish channel to explain--just to me, perhaps--why, when connectivity to the Internet for a period of possibly as long as 15 or 30 days can be compensated for, would a proxy rule ever need to be written into these discussions?

Interpreter: I'm so sorry. Could you repeat that question again, please? I don't think I got that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Why do we need any form of proxy? Because after 15 to 30 days, even if you're disconnected from the Internet for that period of time, we can ensure that the people in the electorate can find a way to vote. And if that question has been settled in the Spanish channel, fine. Evan, I saw your hand flash up. And we have music in the background, which is delightful.

Evan Leibovitch: Soothing piano music is maybe a good idea.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's trying to soothe some of us, which possibly could be a very good thing for your Chair at the moment. Okay. I see no hands up before I'm going to ask for a specific discussion or comment on the draft candidate criteria as listed in the current white paper. And I will go around, region by region, so be prepared. Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: AFRALO's view on the draft candidate criteria?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: AFRALO thinks that we put a lot of criterias which are not measurable. So the best is to, it is to add to your criterias of ICANN and of the NomComm a single criteria which is the candidate must be from the At-Large community.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, so it is with the addition of membership of ALS that AFRALO believes that is an additional criteria that is desirous.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, so noted. Thank you. And, in fact, the ABSC may indeed choose to weight such a criteria in their deliberations. Hong? Are you still on the call? Matthias, have we lost Hong? She wasn't well.

Siva Muthusamy: I'm from APRALO, and--.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I know you're from APRALO. At the moment, I'm asking, have we lost Hong, who's made considerable comments on these things in the past.

Matthias Langenegger: And Cheryl, this is Matthias. I think we lost her. She's no longer on.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Thank you very much. Siva, go ahead.

Siva Muthusamy: Yes. That's why I started talking, and I have a point, but this (inaudible) cannot be passed along as an official comment from APRALO. So I need to vote, not (inaudible) traditional qualifications for the (inaudible) of ICANN (inaudible), do you have any alternative that the candidate has no affiliation to (inaudible) and group (inaudible) business?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Siva, I'm sorry. There's quite an echo. Can you just slow down and perhaps that will help us understand what you're reading out to us, because I'm sure the staff are having some problems capturing your words, just as I'm having some problems hearing and discerning each of them. So just run through that statement a little more slowly, please.

Siva Muthusamy: So when you say that the candidate has no affiliations to user communities and groups than for business. Do you mean that the candidate is preferably not a registrant or as an employee in a significant capacity for a registrar or ISP or any other business related to Internet service or Internet infrastructure? We may prefer to have a candidate who may not have a conflict of interest, especially on business-related deliberations.

Interpreter: I'm sorry. And this is Maya, the Spanish interpreter. Would you mind repeating that for me, Cheryl? I really didn't hear that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, Maya, I--.

Siva Muthusamy: Is something wrong?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Siva, is there anything that you--?

Siva Muthusamy: I don't--.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Siva, listen to me, please. It is impossible for the Spanish interpreter to work out what you are saying. Can I ask you to tell me, is there anything that you are reading out that has not been put into the chat space? Yes or no?

Siva Muthusamy: Well, I put--.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: About the specific criteria.

Siva Muthusamy: Part of it was not on the chat space. So I copied and pasted it now, so I don't have to read out.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, that's fine. Because then what I will do is make sure that that is now read to the record so that the interpretation channels do have a clear set of words to work with. Are you happy with that, Siva?

Siva Muthusamy: Sorry, I got (inaudible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: May I read to the record for the interpreters and some of the rest of us what you have put in the chat space?

Siva Muthusamy: Yes, please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. This is from Siva. It is a personal view. It is obviously representative of some views within Asia-Pacific, and it has been very important to make sure we are clear in our discussions whether we are talking, as I have told to also do, on behalf of ourselves or in an official RALO capacity. Siva has asked us to consider the following.

"At-Large specifies additional qualifications for this Board position as an understanding of the potential impact of ICANN decisions on the global Internet-using community and the Internet end user community in particular. Here we may also say that the candidate has more affiliations to user community's end roots than to business. We may say that the candidate is preferably not a registrar or an employee in a significant capacity of a registrar or ISP or any other business related to Internet service or Internet infrastructure. We may prefer to have a candidate who may not have a conflict of interest, especially on business-related deliberations." There is a suggestion that the candidate preferably comes from an ALS, and he--this is Siva--fully supports this motion.

We should also note that Evan is agreeing on the limitation of candidates to prevent employees or shareholders of contracted parties. But in his view, further restrictions are not going to be required as we put out our call for statements of interest, and that has agreement from Carlos Aguirre.

Sergio, then Alan. Thank you, Siva. I'm assuming--.

Sergio Salinas: [Interpreted](#) Yes, well, many, many things. For what Siva said, obviously, the elect representative does need to be someone who thinks of the interests of the users and not of the companies. So what Siva said is very on point.

On another point, though, I don't understand the issue about the proxy. If we understand our, the ALS has the option or as part of ALAC, if we have an ALAC representative, if we have an ALS or one or two or three people, why is it that anybody that is part of the electorate is not able to just vote? Many times many people that are voting from ALAC, they have the proxy from their organization, and that was just my comment.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Sergio. I think also, we need to be very careful where we use our language, that a proxy may or may not in law be a directed vote. And I think we might be mixing up votes that are directed versus votes that are cast in the name of another person and are not necessarily directed. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I've lost track of where we are. On the issue of proxies, that's part of the discussion on electorate. I thought we were on director criteria right now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, indeed.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. On director criteria, I think we need to be very careful about what we put in about what someone may or may not be. Ultimately, we are going to elect someone who has gone through whatever the selection process is, the ABSC or something else that we select, and then gets elected by the majority of the group.

Especially in developing countries, people wear many hats. Look at the number of people who move from the CCNSO to the ALAC to the GAC, and many of whom also have business interests in their own country. If we start putting on rules that you cannot do this, we may be eliminating some very good candidates. If you look at Asia-Pacific as an example, you've had, I believe, a chair or a secretary who runs a TLD.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's correct.

Alan Greenberg: There are a number of other examples. If someone can convince everyone that they

really understand the issues of users, do we really want to reject them because of where their paycheck comes from today? Remember, we could elect someone today, and three days later they go to work for some other company. It happens all the time, and the rules do not allow us to pull them back. So I think we need to, again, we have to evaluate people on criteria. It's going to be objective--or, rather, subjective--and we have to try to pick the right person. If you start putting rules in place, you're going to eliminate some good ones, especially in developing countries, and I thought that's what we're trying to push.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That has my personal support, Alan, but I doubt that everyone would be supportive of that.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not expecting people to agree.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Evan, go ahead. Evan, you might be muted. Is Evan muted?

Matthias Langenegger: Functionally, if not really.

Evan Leibovitch: I'm speaking of--.

Matthias Langenegger: Yes, we've got you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We've got you. Go, Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Oh, okay. I never turned it on. All right, anyway--oh, I can hear myself, so I apologize for an echo, so I'll keep this quick. There's a real world example in NARALO of why I'm disagreeing with Alan, and it happens to be the fact that North America picked an employee of a registrar as our representative to the NomComm. It has since left to what I consider to be ridicule and other parties who have said, "Well, if you're just going to pick an employee of a registrar, do you not have a sufficient pool among the billions of people out there to find somebody who's not part of a contracted party? Why even bother having someone separate from At-Large if you can't find somebody from At-Large?"

And so I would say that if a person became part of a contracted party, yes, I would suggest they would have to resign because they would not be part of the audience that is at-large. We represent billions of people. Can we not find people amongst them that have no interest in being part of a contracted party?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: One would like to think so. And, of course, draft candidate criteria can have language in it that ensures that there is a bit of preferred options. I also think that we need to realize that the ABSC, the Selection Committee that does the first pass of vetting all such statements of interest, will have to work in a very transparent and accountable manner and will be responsible to the community that appoints them to ensure that such methodology does result in a slate of candidates--however large a number that is--that gives the electorate a set of people, a group of people, from whom a majority support appointment can be wrought, and of course, with the addition of the petition process that ensures that should someone be dropped from the listing, that the regions in the majority of case regions, fully believe should be in the electoral choices of candidates, that they are put back in.

I think we're becoming a little bit focused on the minutiae. We at this stage need to have a first appointment process that runs in such a way and on such a time course that by our midyear ICANN meeting, the election can, or the appointment process, can be finalized. And it's coming down to that, that I'll remind the people on this call and the wider community who will be looking at this and the outcome of this call in various ways, on Wiki or listening to the MP3, that what we need to do now, at the closing of this call--which is in a very few minutes, I will hasten to add--is put out a call for statements of interest for candidates to self-promote or to be promoted by others, who are aware of a set of criteria which this community, those in this call and in the assembled ALSs, believe are desirable.

The white paper outlines a number of the criteria that we have from our other examples in the NomComm or the Board rules, and there has been discussion tonight of the desirability of things like well grounded in Internet governance and Internet matters; to be primarily focused on end user and end user interests; and indeed, to be a member of an At-Large structure, can all be considered as desired criteria.

Can we have agreement on this call, and Evan, can you ask the staffer that's working in chat that he know if any of what we're saying at the moment is counter to their discussions, because we need to be aware of their discussions. Evan, is anything you know of draft criteria in the white paper and the imperative to make a formal call to the wider community for a statement of interest?

Evan Leibovitch: Well, first of all, within the NARALO chapter, there hasn't been anything happening within at least 20 minutes. And it was basically--oh, I hope that's not my feedback--the NARALO chat was basically about not putting any limits on people's ability to run as candidates, at least not limited to number. So essentially, there's no comment on the criteria, but that as many people as want to who fit the criteria should be able to run, and there should not be a committee that vets that number down.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry, there should not be a committee?

Evan Leibovitch: What is being said is that if there is a vetting, it would only be to measure people against the candidacy requirements. Beyond that, there should not be a limit to people's ability to nominate themselves. And if that means there's 100 people on the ballot, well, then, so be it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, that's fine. Now, we've heard from AFRALO, we've heard to some extent from representatives of APRALO, and we would now like to hear from Europe, specifically LACRALO again, limiting ourselves to the need for draft candidate criteria as listed in the white paper, to be amended or added to. And then I'd also like to ensure that we look at the matters of ABSDT and ABSC.

EURALO? And Christopher, if you speak, you're here twice, which may mean that you're muted twice. So Sebastien and then if Rudy or Christopher would like to speak.

Sebastien Bachollet: It's Sebastien. I guess we agree with current popular on the white papers. Thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Music to my ears. Thank you. Christopher and/or Rudy? You may need to star-seven to unmute yourself.

Christopher Wilkinson: Okay. This is Christopher. I'm on the call, back on. Sorry to have gone off for a little while. I agree with Sebastien's statement now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. Anyone else? Rudy, did you want to bring any European viewing on candidate criteria and call for the SOI?

Matthias Langenegger: I show Rudy's no longer on the call.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, okay, but he is still in the room. Okay.

Unidentified Participant: Evan just made a relevant comment on the chat.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Okay, so, Evan, do you want me to read to the record? Or are you able to with your echo? Okay. As Evan is muted, I'll read to the record. Evan wanted to add that the comments he just added are some people's individual comments from a NARALO chat that he's running--or was running--in parallel to today's community call. The general consensus from NARALO has still been in support of the processes detailed in the white paper. Thank you very much for that, Evan, and it is, as I say, continuously important that we make sure when we're speaking and when we're being heard whether we are speaking on our personal behalf and view or whether it is that of the community which

we represent.

Latin America and Caribbean, if I could have, either from those in the English channel or those on the Spanish channel, any particular comments on the draft candidate criteria? I'm seeing general agreement with what we've discussed so far, and then the impending call for statements of interest. Perhaps Carlos.

Sylvia Leite: [Interpreted](#) Nothing so far. And this is Sylvia speaking.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you.

Sylvia Leite: [Interpreted](#) I think that in the LACRALO conference, LACRALO does support what appears on the white paper. I mean, there are some discrepancies. I think that we would need more time to discuss it, but in general, we do support what appears on the white paper.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, thank you very much. Evan, did you want to say anything?

Sergio Salinas: [Interpreted](#) And I'm done.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry. Go on, Sylvia.

Interpreter: That was done.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, thank you. Evan, is there a particular NARALO view you would like to bring in now on the draft candidate criteria and the imminent call for statements of interest to be collected? Okay, Evan says no. He's--and I must say I'm not surprised, with the background in the foundation of the white paper discussion having been very much born from the loins of NARALO discussions. I would be surprised if we had considerable tweaking that was needed.

If that's the case, then I see from this community call, the following action item can be ministered, and that is that a communitywide call should be promptly put out for statements of interest from individuals who believe themselves suitable, capable, and who meet the draft candidate criteria and listed characteristics of our desired characteristics that we've discussed here today, that the form of statement of interest and letter, short CV, and note explaining why and how they believe themselves to be a suitable person for appointment as the At-Large Director to the ICANN Board, should be forwarded to a given email address.

And I would now like to find out from you all, do you wish to have the At-Large Board Selection Design Team tweak the particular mechanisms of how this is to be done, or do you wish to have any discussion and give them specific leadership and design criteria? Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I was just going to point out that originally we had discussed having a specific set of questions which they answer. You now went into that, so--.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, that's something that the Design Team certainly should attend to. Is this community call happy to allow the At-Large Board Selection Design Team to go into the particular logistics of how this call is to be collected and what types of call criteria are passed on to the ADSC for their consideration?

Alan Greenberg: If we want to have a call coming and going out soon, we don't have a lot of time to do this. And I would suggest that yes, the Design Team, whose membership needs to be finalized in this meeting, be allowed to put something together quickly. And I would suggest that it not be a very prescriptive one like the ICANN one--we don't have the time to refine that--but that it does identify a number of things the candidates, the prospective candidates should address in their statements.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Can I ask, is there anyone who disagrees with that way forward, that they make themselves known now to us? I'm seeing green ticks, but no red crosses. Excellent.

And it is our intention, then, as we wrap up, as we will be soon wrapping up this community call, it's our intention to follow the general timeline and milestones that were outlined in the white paper, in which case one of the matters we need to attend to is not just putting out the call for statements of interest, but also, we need to formalize both the ABSDT, Design Team, and the ABS Committee; in other words, the group of people who will be going through these statements of interest.

I know some of the regions have discussed this already, AFRALO being one of those, but it's important that we haven't announced on both these matters and that a call for regionally balanced membership and general at-large membership of either of these--either the Design Team or the Selection Committee--also go out as soon as is practically possible. Is that what this community call believes? Does anyone not agree with that? Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I would suggest we need to have, decide who the Design Team is, in this meeting. We certainly have the flexibility of adding a person if they come in later.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure.

Alan Greenberg: As long as anyone who wants to participate in this understands this is going to be a lot of very intensive work over the next couple of weeks, and then a bunch of work on an ongoing basis. But if people are really, really willing to commit to it, that's fine. But they should understand what they're getting into. But I think we need a core team to start working today and tomorrow out of this meeting.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed. At the moment, I believe that everyone who is involved in the white paper is still willing to continue to serve in the Design Team. That is not, of course, the case for the Selection Committee, because any member of the community who is going to put in a statement of interest can clearly have nothing to do with the Selection Committee. I saw, I think Sebastien's hand went up first, but Tijani, you seem to be first in line, so I'll take it in the order that the Adobe Room put up. Tijani, then Sebastien.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. Thank you, Cheryl. So for the Design Team, I think that we have to compose it now, very soon, because we are already late regarding the milestones. Second, I think that we have to decide the composition of this team. Right now, we say in the white paper that it will be composed of all or part of the, particularly from the committee of At-Large. And it could be, or it has to be, not restricted to those people, and that's all. I think we have today to decide the composition of this team, because it is the first step, the first thing, the first practical thing that will be done passing from this team. That's the first point.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Tijani, just to take your first point first, at the moment, the work group, the ad hoc work group that formed as a result of the last community call to put the white paper together, happens to be about one-third of the ALAC and of one regional leader.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: One-third of the ALAC?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Are you suggesting that it has to be, that the Design Team should be the ALAC as a whole? Because I wasn't clear if that's what you were saying.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: So you think, Cheryl, that the Design Team must be the ALAC, the whole ALAC?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, I personally do not, because to get the whole of the ALAC to work, I would need drugs and electric prods. We've never managed to get a 100% commitment from all ALAC members on anything, even attending a face-to-face meeting where they're funded. So the likelihood of getting them to work in short order in such an important matter as this, I think, would be ridiculous.

What we do need to do is make sure that we have broad cross-regional representation and that there is

no limit to that being the only members of the Design Team. The Design Team should be open. And it should be subject to very close scrutiny and accountability. And I would like to think that it's the members who've already committed to the white paper process, plus some more. And it's plus some more from this meeting that I'd like to see. I see Sebastien, then Christopher, then Alan. And then I know you do have another point, Tijani. Sebastien?

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes. One of the questions I ask from myself, it's I think I would like to--one moment and I would like, I assume that's possible, and maybe today, not to be any more member of any other committee, because other well matters the same and I am not saying that they need to do the same, but as I will be candidate for the vote seat, I think it's, I do enough work on that. But if the committee is saying that I still need to work on that, I will do with pleasure, but I would like to be sure that--my point of view is that I need to be outside. If you think that I need to stay, I will stay. But--.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: As Alan has pointed out, Sebastien, the white paper specifies that if you're a member of the Design Team, the minute you put in an application, the minute you put in an SOI, you are not a Design Team and you are not on a Selection Committee.

Sebastien Bachollet: It's why I, it will happen?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. So you're preparing now that, because you are going to put in a statement of intent, that Europe should replace you in the Design Team.

Sebastien Bachollet: And one reason for that from my point of view--once again, it's my own point of view, and I don't ask the others to do the same. It's that when people are working, and if it's at the time of the issue of the SOI, it's a little bit too late to have people coming into the group, and I suggest that we change me now. But at the same time, I have none proposal, but one of the difficulties that we didn't have time to discuss into any details and my suggestion that the two other European ALAC members, one of them will be a member of the ABSDT, and the other of the ABSC.

And I will leave Christopher to say something because I don't know what he wants to say, but if there is no other candidate today to be on the ABSDT, where it's a more urgent plan, I will suggest the name of somebody else. But if Christopher, as he's participating for this call, is willing to be the second of Europe participating to this group, I think it's better to have somebody already participating today. Thank you.

No, I'm sorry. I have one additional point. I was at the AFRALO call, and I've had discussion with Dev on that issue, and I follow what happened on the list. From my understanding, Dev put the name of Tijani to be member, to be the member of the ABSDT. As Tijani (inaudible) could say by himself if he's willing to do that, but I think it could be a good idea to have him onboard now and to have the DT working as soon as possible. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Sebastien. I will go back to Tijani, but I see now Christopher, Alan, and then back to you, Tijani. And when you come back to the microphone, Tijani, perhaps you could respond to that specific matter that Sebastien raised. Christopher, go ahead. You might be on mute. Star-seven if you need to unmute yourself.

Matthias Langenegger: It doesn't hurt to do it anyway.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Matthias, can we unmute Christopher from your end rather than--?

Christopher Wilkinson: Okay, okay. There's a delay after star-seven before we--.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, we've got you now. That's the important part.

Christopher Wilkinson: And yes, it works. Great, great. Well, Chair, I was going to say something similar to Sebastien but in more general terms, because I didn't know that he was going to make a

personal statement like that, which I fully support. All I was going to say was to encourage the Chair and the staff to ensure that there is no conflict of interest in the whole of this process. And insofar as quite a small number of people, even if you take the large definition, quite a small number of people of examining this process on behalf of at least hundreds, if not thousands, of members of ALS, let alone the whole of the Internet users.

We need to be cautious about any risk of--to use a strong word--appearing to be a bit incestuous. So I applaud Sebastien's statement. I think in an appropriate manner, it should be generalized. I'm not going to suggest how it should be generalized. The staff and the Improvements Committee know all about this, so I'll leave it at that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay--.

Christopher Wilkinson: Regarding my personal participation in anything else, to be quite honest, I don't yet know what an ABSC and the other one actually is. So maybe we've got a bit too many acronyms here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, we went to great lengths to make sure that they were clearly explained in the white paper.

Christopher Wilkinson: Okay. Well, that's my fault.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The ABSC is the group that will be receiving and reviewing the statements of interest.

Christopher Wilkinson: Yes. Well, given the importance of the first, I'm obviously not going to volunteer myself on this call. If ALAC or EURALO wish to ask me to do something, on the basis of their decision, I'll consider it and (inaudible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You would be willing to serve, which is a very good thing to hear.

Christopher Wilkinson: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, Christopher. Alan, then I think we should pass it to Tijani again before we go back to Sebastien. And I should also note that Evan, he did put to the record that in his view, the SC, the ABSC, the At-Large Board appointed Selection Committee, should be populated, if at all possible, by as much ALS membership as we can encourage to be involved. This is another method of ensuring that the rank and file are particularly involved and that we, on this first appointment process--and remember, this is just a first process. Part of the process is reviewing and putting in any changes that the community feel would be worthwhile for future processes. And that in this first process, we avoid as much nepotism and as much conflict as we possibly can. Go ahead, Alan, then next Tijani, then Sebastien.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, just to review a couple of things that were said, I think in the white paper--I hope they were. The ABSC is selected, the members are selected, with the exception of the Chair, by the RALOs. So if the RALOs, and presumably RALO decisions are made by the ALS representative. If a RALO determines that their member should be one of the ALAC members, as I think was just suggested in Europe, that's their call. If a RALO determines that it should only be grass-roots people who have never been to an ICANN meeting, that's their call. So there's no one else to blame but yourself. You pick the people that you think are right. I mean, I believe that was the recommendation.

In terms of the Design Team, I think we need a lot of work done very soon, and I would not want to eliminate people because they may plan to submit a statement. They certainly can. The rules, I believe, already say that if you are a member of the ABSC, you must not submit a statement of interest, which is identical to what's in the ICANN rules in the corresponding one.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I'll just point out on the Design Team group that has been working already, over Christmas we put in several hundred hours of time on this process. I think there's going to be a comparable expense and time over the next couple of weeks to get it all pulled together. So anyone who's willing to take that on, I don't want to refuse.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, no. The role of the Design Team is actually pretty huge, and certainly one that is essential to any success of this process. Tijani, going back to you, you have a couple of matters to respond to. You had an additional point you wanted to make on behalf of AFRALO plus the recent matter of the AFRALO discussion on ABSDT and ABSC membership.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: That's right. Thank you, Cheryl. I am hearing myself. There is an echo. I don't know why.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, there's just something we can't--.

Matthias Langenegger: Everyone has one now.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. So first of all, I want to applaud what Sebastien said, because he can't be a candidate and member of the committee who will provide the election. That's normal. And I, and it's written in the white paper. But for the ABSC, it's not written, and we have to add it, even for the, it's more compulsory for the Selection Committee than for the Design Team, because the Design Team will do technical work, while the Selection Committee will do the selection. It's more, there is application in this work. So that's the first point.

The second point, you said, Cheryl, the Design Team must be open. I don't think so, because the Design Team will do specific work and very important work. And if you give this work to an open team, it will not be done. We have to design, we have to appoint people who want to work and who are able to work to finalize the procedure, to do all the work which is assigned for this team.

For the Selection Committee, it's more or less clear in the white paper, the composition of this team. And I agree with this composition. I think it's fair; it's good. While for the Design Committee, I think that we need to find people, to find competences who want to work or want to do this at this work, because we need them today to work. Because we are already behind our milestones as it is designed in the white paper.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You keep saying this, Tijani. In what way are we behind in the milestones?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Pardon, yes, I can read here, January 14, call about (inaudible) Board member selection design team. We are not 14th today; we are 27th.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But you've already got a Design Team which is, in fact, the ad hoc work group that is functioning. You've got the current membership.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Oh.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But that's all right. I mean, some of us are more than willing to move on from that, and Sebastien has indicated he would prefer not to continue in that role, which is, I think, our meaning of "open," that we need to make sure that we have a good coverage of keen workers. And there's one suggestion that perhaps that could be the ALAC as a whole, but I just doubt that would be a practical matter. But that said, what else is it that your AFRALO has been discussing in terms of who to put into those teams?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. If I come back to what's said, Sebastien, concerning my appointment by Dev, or my, the suggestion of Dev that I serve on the Design Team, I am proud to do that. But I asked AFRALO to decide on it, and the people who reacted said that I have to be on the Selection

Committee.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: So it's up to, I am ready to do this or this, but not both. It's not possible.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, of course. Understood, okay. So you're saying that, it's like Christopher, you are willing to serve in whatever capacity your region feels is appropriate? Is that correct, Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, you're right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, good. Sebastien, I see your hand is up for another statement. Please go ahead.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes. About Tijani and which group, I think one of the difficulties that the first people answering the mail of Dev said yes, see, and it was, I guess, a mistake, and not a position to say that better in this one or this one, because effectivity is quite complicated with our (inaudible). But Tijani, you may check on that and I will support that you participate as a DT, because you have the knowledge we need into your region to participate in this one.

I would like possibly to put names, just, it's not ratified yet by EURALO, and I hope that it will be in the near future, but the suggestion is that Patrick Vande Walle could be as a DT and Olivier could be a second one.

Regarding the Selection Committee of the ABSC, I really think we need to have, in this group, as much as possible diversity. It's why, I know that it will be EURALO to decide, but I just want to give you this information. I was in contact with Veronica Cretu, who was the first ALAC member from EURALO. And she's willing to serve if there are no trouble involved, and I guess that (inaudible) at TIBS that she will travel to make that work. And she could be a good candidate. And maybe Adam Peake, because he used to be into the NomComm, and we need to have this knowledge inserted. It's not to say that all that couldn't be participating other member if we decide to have a larger group than 10 people, but that's two names I am willing to put at the EURALO vote of discussions for in the next occasion. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, and quite clearly, I would think that matters of membership and the roles of people in the ABSDT and the ABSC will be agenda items on each of the regional meetings. Sebastien, you have your hand still up?

Sebastien Bachollet: Just once again, I heard both people saying that I can stay up to the SOI are released. My suggestion is that, really, I will leave as soon as somebody from EURALO is on charge of that, not to leave the seat empty. But really, I want to leave, not because of the work. Obviously, I want to say, but as soon as possible. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Certainly. Thank you, Sebastien. Appreciated. By my reckoning, we are in fact now at the outstanding items and matters raised. And one of the matters raised, Alan, is transport to the chat space, and that is the question of is there any impediment, is there any reason, that a person could not be part of the Design Team and indeed of the Selection Committee? A very valid question. Nothing comes immediately to my mind, other than certifiable insanity. That would be an impediment for them. But I'd be interested to hear very briefly the views of the group.

Siva, no, it is not the Design Team that determines eligibility. The Selection Committee would be using a mechanism of some form of measure and discussion of the SOIs against candidate criteria. The Design Team is a purely process-focused activity. We've already, as Alan pointed out, in excess of 100-plus hours work put over Christmas in developing the white paper, and probably at least that, if not double that, expected in the next few weeks.

Okay? Is anybody wanting to raise an argument against dual membership if one is crazy enough to be

in the ABSDT and then their region wishes them to also include them in the ABSC? It is possible, for example, based on the experience of Tijani, his name has had in the AFRALO conversations, that he is willing to serve in either capacity, that they might prevail on him to serve in both. I see no impediment other than the human capability of doing so much work. Christopher, go ahead.

Christopher Wilkinson: Well, this is just a superficial opinion from the basis of the debate, not anything more. But from what I've heard, it would seem to me that there was a good argument for establishing continuity between the white paper authors and the Design Team. Otherwise, the Design Team is going to have to relearn so much as to what arguments persuaded the white paper authors to go in a particular direction. Now, that can't be 100 to 100, because obviously, some people, and already heard, will desist. But I think you need continuity there.

Where you need perhaps objectivity and independence, it's at the level of the Selection Committee. Just a suggestion.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And that certainly was the central tenet of the white paper. But in raising this tonight, there is possibly no good reason for an impediment. If, for example, the African region did want someone, and they were able and willing to serve in both capacities and they were fully accountable to their community in doing so, we probably shouldn't make a ruling against it.

Christopher Wilkinson: I would accept that. I don't think that there is an objective reason for refusing people to continue on the Selection Team, but I think it should have enough new blood to be, seem to be independent. And there are very few people who have enough time and--.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Exactly, and it's probably the latter that would be one of the strong pushes for fresh blood to be involved.

Christopher Wilkinson: Over to you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Christopher, anything more from you?

Christopher Wilkinson: Not just now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okey-dokey. Can I ask, then, is there any other outstanding matters or arguments that we need to cover off tonight? Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I just wanted clarity coming out of this meeting. At this point, I am presuming that the existing Design Team, which was the officers--Dev from AFRALO and Evan, which were the group that put together the white paper--will continue unless any ones of them chose to leave, plus others that are identified quickly in the next few days who want to put in the effort and time. Is that the decision that we've come up with?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's the status quo of this conversation as far as I'm concerned, recognizing that Sebastien has said he would prefer to be replaced at EURALO's earliest convenience.

Alan Greenberg: And I said "minus those who choose to leave."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I understand that. I'm just making it, if the difference between choose to leave and making a declaration that you are perfectly happy to continue to serve until you are replaced, that's all. I think Sebastien's being fairly careful to make sure his willingness to continue to serve is also clear, I think.

Okay. Is there any other matter?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Cheryl, can you please repeat the proposition of Alan?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alan was saying that the existing Design Team makeup, which is the officers of the ALAC and, at the moment it was Dev, who has been involved in that ad hoc work group, that the

fact that he put your name forward in the AFRALO list probably means he'd like to do a lot less work on this. But that they continue and are supplemented with whomever else comes forward--perhaps yourself from AFRALO, certainly someone to replace Sebastien, as he's requested that at least one person be named; there may even be more than that--will be able to join the Design Team as they continue their work. And yes, Evan is in the group.

We already have--look at the authors of the white paper. They're happy to continue to serve, but they'd like more people. Is that clear enough?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. All right. Well, I'd like to bring this call to a close and thank those of you who have managed to stay throughout this complete community call, recognize those that for real-live commitments have had to only engage with us through part of the call, and thank them in their absence now for the commitments they've made to this very important process, and look forward to having the next phase, as the white paper has proposed, to go ahead with the call for SOIs, the confirmation of the ABSDT, and the feedback coming in for ABSC membership from the communities and from the RALOs. And I assume the very next thing that we will need to do is put out some outcomes from today's call and that the Design Team will be working on wording that up. Then that should go out to be announced in the next day or two.

Tijani, is it possible for you to at least take a role in the Design Team until such times as the ABSC is formed? If so, I think that would be greatly appreciated, because we certainly do value the contribution that Africa has made into this process, and I would like to keep a fairly high level of involvement.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. Okay. Thank you, one and all.