

---

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the EURALO monthly teleconference today on Tuesday, March 27, 2018 at 18:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Wolf Ludwig, Wale Bakare, Oksana Prykhodko, Matthias Markus, Sébastien Bachollet, Salve Nilsen, Yrjö Lansipuro, Roberto Gaetano, and Lutz Donnerhacke.

We have apologies from Erich Schweighofer.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Yesim Nazlar, Mario Aleman, Evin Erdoğan and myself, Claudia Ruiz doing the call management.

Before we begin, if I could please remind everyone to state their name when speaking for transcription purposes, and with that, I turn it over to you, Olivier. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Claudia. And welcome to this EURALO monthly call. Have we missed anybody in the roll call so far? I don't see anyone missed in the roll call, so that's fine. The roll call is complete. As you're seeing, we're using Zoom today, so bear with us as we're not so used to using this type of tool since the Adobe Connect is still offline for the time being.

If you wish to speak, the system is pretty much the same as the other system. If you haven't got a Participants window, then go at the bottom

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

of your screen, there should be a tab which says “Participants” that will appear. At the moment, there are 18 participants on the call. When you click on that, you will see a participants list, and at the bottom of the participants list there will be a button called “Raise hand.” With that button, when you raise your hand, I should be able to see you. If I don’t, I’ll ask staff to let me know who has raised their hand.

So today, we’ve got a call that will be focusing primarily on the policy discussions and also on the next EURALO webinar. We’ll have a good summary of the ICANN61 activities, the last meeting that took place in Puerto Rico, and then a short discussion on the Community Regional Outreach Program. Is there any other business to add to this call? I don’t see any other hands at the moment. Let’s do test here. Has anyone put their hand up and I can’t see it? No.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Olivier –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so I see Roberto now.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If I can speak, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Sébastien. Go ahead, Sébastien, and then I’ve got Roberto after you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: But it might be easier for Roberto to speak. I guess he will do the same thing that I wanted to do. Then go ahead, Roberto, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Roberto Gaetano.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can hear you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes, I'm having a little bit of difficulties as usual with the computer. I think it's the same thing. I think I would like to have at least a straw poll if it's not possible to have a consensus call during this teleconference about the [inaudible] or the support by EURALO for the candidature of Stephane, a friend of us and a colleague who has passed away in tragic circumstances. I don't want to make a long speech, but I think that if somebody has shown the multi-stakeholder approach, it has been Stephane, and it will be not correct that the submission of the proposal will come only from the house, from the contracted party house. He has been a constant [muse] from the side, business, noncommercial and ALAC, and I think that this should be – this is an emergency situation in

---

which I think that we should overcome the rule and have a support.  
Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Roberto. We actually have an Agenda Item #3 in memoriam Stephane van Gelder, so we will be touching on this and we might extend that to more than a minute. And please remember to take your hand down afterwards, because it's impossible for me to take it down or for staff to take your hand down. Otherwise, we'll have too many hands. Thank you, Roberto.

Okay, so the agenda is approved as currently displayed on your screen, and we'll move swiftly to the action items of the last call. And they are all complete, which is a good thing. I know that there are action items from previous calls. There's still one that Silvia is following up with Jean-Jacques Subrenat, but if you then look at the other action items, that of the Board conference call, the 18<sup>th</sup> of January 2018 – and we haven't had any other call since – the first one was to do the setup for the webinar on GDPR with a euro-specific approach, and we are looking at having a second webinar in April, so we're going to be discussing this on this call.

The second proposal was a topic framework of interpretation and develop a checklist for human rights impact assessment. That will also be organized for the week of April. I understand that Annette Mühlberg is supposed to lead the organization on this. However, from an e-mail that I sent earlier, she is actually off work for the time being, so we might need to delay this from the week of the 9<sup>th</sup> of April to a later week

---

in April. If staff could take note of this, please, and follow up with Annette and see how we can do this. And perhaps we're not even at an advanced enough level for this.

The third proposal was to do with the registration directory services and SSR2, Security and Stability Review Team #2, and so it would be a webinar that would focus on security aspects, privacy versus security. That is probably likely to be happening much later. We might do this in May so we don't have too many webinars one after the other.

Scrolling down the page, on the CROP requests, we're going to have a discussion about CROP later on this call, and we have the bottom two action items on this page which say Olivier to get in touch with Chris Buckridge from RIPE inquiring about the upcoming meet in Marseille. That's been done. And to explore collaboration with CENTR on the goal to sign a MoU in Barcelona in 2018. I have gotten in touch with CENTR, and unfortunately, there were very few Europeans at the meeting in Puerto Rico, so I have not had a chance to meet with the people from CENTR in Puerto Rico, but no doubt I can continue being in touch with them using telecommunications.

Are there any comments regarding these action items? I am not seeing any comments, so the action items are complete and we can continue swiftly with the next agenda item, and that's in memoriam for Stephane Van Gelder. You've heard from Roberto Gaetano just a moment ago of the tragic disappearance of Stephane, and this was something which I thought was perhaps important to have one minute of silence if we could have on this call for Stephane. It's something that the ALAC has done in 2013 for another one of our community, Gareth Shearman who

---

---

passed away in 2013 as I mentioned. And when we stated an ICANN meeting, we had one minute of silence. So if we're all okay with it, then I can start it now, and we can then address what Roberto has mentioned immediately afterwards.

Thank you very much, everyone. So after this minute of silence, Roberto suggested – as you know that Stephane was a member of the EURALO Individuals Association, the Registry Stakeholder Group is putting forward a suggestion, a nomination for Stephane van Gelder to be nominated for the ICANN Ethos Award. The ICANN Ethos Award goes to people who have shown involvement and displayed qualities of bringing dialog throughout ICANN with many different communities and the very – I'm just paraphrasing. I know there's a whole thing about it on the website, but effectively, people who have been exceptionally good in working across all of ICANN and getting ICANN's communities to work better together. And Stephane definitely has a fit in this category having been Chair of the NomCom for a couple of years, having been in the NomCom for several years – the ICANN Nominating Committee – but also prior to this having been the Generic Name Supporting Organization Chair, GNSO Chair in 2011 and 2012 if I recall correctly. It's been quite a career, quite some time spent in ICANN.

Now, the problem that we have is we have a very short amount of time to get any resolution through [without] saying that the nomination comes from EURALO rather than coming from an individual. What we can do is a consensus call, a 24-hour consensus call. So if there are no objections by tomorrow the same time, then we can say that it's EURALO-supported.

---

What we could do perhaps to go further is to ask – to have a call – well, now effectively, a show of hands or support if we were to ask the ALAC meeting that takes place immediately after this one or one hour this one ends, the ALAC to put this nomination through. Because the ALAC will have the 15 members who will be able to conduct the vote there and then. Is this something that we would like EURALO to push, to ask for?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Olivier, if I may.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sébastien Bachollet, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Olivier. A few things. The first one is I think that EURALO must support this, even do their own document for that, but we can support whichever [us] putting [it in]. The second point is that a few hours after I heard about the death of Stephane, I put his name on the Ethos award with my name, and of course, I support whatever EURALO or ALAC will do. The third point, I just wanted to say a few words.

He was a member of the board of ISOC France when I was chairing the ISOC France, and we were also working together on the .paris before .paris became a registry. It was a long time ago, it was in 2007-2008. At the same time, we organized the ICANN meeting in Paris ten years ago. And I think he deserves to have this Ethos award. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sébastien. Anyone else to speak on this? Are we all in support for this? So in support for – I can certainly launch the 24-hour consensus call now. And I see from Roberto in the chat we can do both, EURALO is important because this is where he has been active, but ALAC support will be a welcome plus. So unless I hear otherwise and anybody says, “Look...” I see, hear all – I support the nomination from [Oksana], support the nomination from Yrjö Lansipuro, support this motion from Wolf Ludwig, so I’m seeing only support so far. Bastiaan Goslings as well, support, so I shall proceed forward –

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Olivier, I have supported.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Christopher. Christopher Wilkinson for the record, saying thank you. So what I’ll do immediately after this call, I shall e-mail the ALAC Chair to ask for an AOB, perhaps earlier than AOB, perhaps earlier in the ALAC call to ask for the ALAC to have a consensus call to nominate Stephane van Gelder, and I shall also at the same time issue a 24-hour consensus call on the EURALO mailing list. I think 24 hours is enough time for people to say yes or no, and I frankly don’t expect anyone to say no, but it’s just procedures that we have to follow and 24 hours for an emergency measure is something that is possible. The reason why we’re doing it quickly is because I believe that tomorrow is the deadline for nominations. So this is the reason why it has to be passed.



---

With this, thank you, everyone. It's terrible to start a call with such news, but we have to move on. Next is the public consultations and the policy consultations that we are going to go through sort of rather speedily. There are at the moment three statements in progress. The first one is the ICANN Fellowship Program community consultation. As you know, there appear to be some changes in the fellowship both in the way that it actually is run but also the number of Fellows who would be funded. So if you care about the fellowship, please comment on this.

The next one is the data protection and privacy issues, the ICANN-proposed interim model. Of course, that's the famous General Data Protection Regulation issues, the GDPR that was brought in by the European Commission and that is likely to greatly affect ICANN's WHOIS model. And so ICANN the organization and a number of parties have come up with an interim model for the time being, and that is being proposed. We have both Alan Greenberg and Bastiaan Goslings holding the pen on this.

The third one, and that's – by the way, the comments as you can see, the first two comments are finishing on the 30<sup>th</sup> of March, so we only have a few days if you disagree with the draft that is currently on the page. And I believe that the draft is prominently displayed on the page or should at least be prominently displayed. And of course, I'm wrong. There should be a draft somehow or something drafted to that effect. Perhaps the ALAC will finalize this in the call immediately afterwards. But certainly put in your comments.

And third is the plan to restart the root key signing key, the KSK rollover process. That's a process that was stopped a while ago, about a few

---

months ago because there was a concern that some of the resolvers – it's to do with the root system – were not ready for it and significant parts of the Internet might stop working, or at least significant parts of the DNS might stop working, thus affecting end user experience. You'll notice here a number of penholders for this. There is a huge debate that took place at the ICANN meeting within the ALAC, and we will be touching on this shortly, immediately after as one of the next things in the summary of ICANN61 activities.

The new public comment requests to which the ALAC needs to make decisions are as follows: there's a draft procedure for community generic top-level domain change requests. That's something which we should really have been looking at a bit more carefully. I see here the 2<sup>nd</sup> of April is the deadline or this, and because it deals with communities, it really is down to the community registration policies and so on. And there is some discussion here, but not very much, so please comment on this. It's quite important if you believe that community top-level domains should [have some] kind of a priority or something in the next round or any subsequent round of new top-level domains being launched out. Then one really needs to define how these changes to the community TLDs could be made.

There is one comment that ends on the 17<sup>th</sup> of April, that's the Uniform Board Member Integrity Screening Process. I'm afraid I haven't read this one yet, but I gather it's to do with the board members and to find out if they are engaged in any activities that might hinder their activities on the ICANN Board. There's a draft project plan for the proposed name collision analysis project, the NCAP project. That's that project that was launched already a while ago, but that actually involved the Security and

---

Stability Advisory Committee, and what it is doing is to study the likelihood of collision with names that are already registered or are already widely used. The risks effectively are for .corp, .home and .mail strings. And the ALAC has had some good involvement in the past. As long ago as in South Africa if I recall, the board was about to allocate those strings or these were about to be allocated, and the ALAC pushed for the SSAC advice to be taken into account. And of course since then, a lot of things have happened, but now there's a whole study that's going to take place on these names to see if they could ever be released at some point or another.

Finally, one on the ICANN reserve fund, a proposed replenishment strategy. As you know, we've had also a long discussion on this, how to refill the reserve fund. And in the times that we're going through at the moment where there's also a very lean budget, one really has to be quite careful about the amount of money and how quickly one wants to replenish the budget. So quite a few public commenting at the moment, and I open the floor to anybody who wishes to comment on any of these. I'm not seeing anyone at present putting their hand up.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Well –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, Christopher Wilkinson.

---

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I'm sorry to sound a bit negative, but I was at the San Juan meeting and followed all the debates, but in fact, the texts that you've referred to, I wouldn't know where to find most of them. I think particularly in the absence of Adobe, which I notice that somebody on the call has managed to get into a chat, but I've scrolled through the messages we've received, I see no links to an Adobe chat. Could you send a reminder with the links or ask the staff to send a reminder with the links to all these texts? I only have the links to the three ALAC texts which are on the agenda tonight. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Christopher. In theory, I think that all of these are linked from the actual agenda page. So the agenda page in the e-mail that you should have received –

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: But I haven't got that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, you haven't got that? Did you not receive this by e-mail? Yes, Heidi? Go ahead. Heidi Ullrich.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. I know that Alan is planning on putting the documents in the ALAC chat right prior to the ALAC call. So Christopher, if you're on that chat, you will see them then. Otherwise, we can even perhaps send an e-mail to you directly for that. But again, I think Alan is still working on the latest version.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Okay. I'll have to look after this call.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thanks so much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you, Heidi.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Okay. Sorry to cause trouble.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, it's okay, Christopher, but in theory, you should have received the invitation for the EURALO monthly call, and that has a link to the agenda of the EURALO monthly call, and all of the links are in there. That's at least what I'm using to be able to go through this.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I'll have to do a search. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. Any other comments? I'm not seeing anyone putting their hand up, so we can then swiftly move to the next part of our agenda. And first, I'd like to thank Bastiaan for picking up the pen on one of these topics [inaudible] the data protection one.

So #5, the webinars. There is a bit of a question as to what was the next webinar that we were going to do, webinar or workshop as such. The previous webinar that we held was in February of this year, and it was about the practical implications of the General Data Protection Regulation. And it had an ICANN flavor to it, but it also had some allusions as to what this means for the person in the street, for our end users, etc. As you know, a large number of our members are coming from organizations that are At-Large Structures, and At-Large Structures, because they deal with end users, probably – very probably – are also affected by the GDPR.

So the suggestion that was made by the EURALO Board – and actually not just by the board but EURALO members who were in the Geneva Internet Governance Forum and when they had their little brainstorming session, the idea was to perhaps have a second workshop to get our At-Large Structures to share on what they're doing about the GDPR, if anything at all, and perhaps to even share any good practice.

Now, I'm not sure whether anybody on the call today already would be happy to flag this so that for the next EURALO call or between now and the next EURALO call we could have such a webinar. And it doesn't mean that you need to produce ten slides or something. If you can just

---

do – what we can do, we can send an e-mail out to our At-Large structures saying, “Hey, can you do one slide on what your organization is doing about the GDPR?” And perhaps we’ll find out that none of the organizations are, we’ll find out that some of them are doing something about the GDPR and making sure their databases, etc. are up to date, and perhaps they can share some information with us as to what we should look out for, what other At-Large Structures should look out for.

The more I deal with this topic, the more we find out with others that very few people are aware of how this whole thing works, and very few organizations in Europe yet are actually taking proactive action. Yrjö Lansipuro, you’ve put your hand up. You have the floor.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Yes, thank you. Just to mention that the ISOC Finland in cooperation with Open Knowledge Finland – and actually, this latter organization is doing most of the work, but the idea is to produce what is called MOOC, the Massive Open Online Course, on GDPR and those aspects of GDPR that are of relevance to end users, not so much on WHOIS. So what I’m saying is that by the end of April, this would be developed to be presented [inaudible] as one example of what ALSes [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yrjö, you’re being very faint towards the end of your intervention. Could you please just repeat the end of your intervention?

---

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Yes. I'll try to speak louder. What I was saying is that at the webinar, preferably at the end of April, we could present the outlines of this Massive Open Online Course on GDPR which is intended for just end users, ordinary people. We could present that as an example of what ALSes are doing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

That's great. Thank you very much, Yrjö. So just to summarize that – I'm not sure whether everyone has heard so well, but I've heard you loud – well, maybe not loud, but faint and clear though that you are proposing that we get [inaudible] to present the massively online course that they're putting together about these issues that were presented to our community. I think that sounds like an excellent idea, and we could have them and we could in the meantime also invite other At-Large Structures if they have any information that they wish to share about how they're touching on GDPR in their community, and that hopefully will make for – that actually definitely will make for a very interesting webinar.

Are there any other comments or suggestions? Does anyone else on the call here – can anyone else share at the moment what their organizations or doing, or would anyone actually stand forward to be happy to share this? I see Bastiaan, for example. Bastiaan's At-Large Structure is in the Netherlands. Would you be able to be in a position to share what – in fact maybe both on your professional life and your At-Large life the GDPR is addressed?



---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Olivier, if you can put me on the line. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Sébastien, we'll put you in the queue. In the meantime, I'm not hearing Bastiaan.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Yes, Olivier, thank you. Can you hear me properly?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, now we can hear you. Yes.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Okay. Well, thank you for inviting me to take the stage here. To be honest, I still represent the Dutch Internet Society chapter as an At-Large Structure, but I'm not on the board since recently anymore. So I'm not exactly sure. I'm not on the mailing list either, so I would have to check with them exactly what is going on. And I don't mind doing so. And then if interesting and relevant, we'd be happy to share that during maybe the call that Yrjö suggested.

In the meantime, I am very busy, you know, on behalf of the Internet exchange I work for. And it's actually a lot more work than we anticipated initially to see to it that we're going to be compliant as of the end of May. I would have to check what I can share there also in terms of confidentiality, etc.

---

With regard to the first part of your question, the At-Large Structures' activity, yes, I would be happy to share that. I'll have to see what they're doing at the moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That's fine, Bastiaan. Thank you. Yes, that would be helpful.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: If we can get some people together, that would be –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. If we get a call out for volunteers now, then people have the full month because we're looking at the end of April. People have the full month to first inform themselves and then to find out what they are allowed to share. As you said, I can certainly understand that in some cases it might be privileged or confidential information, but the lessons learned would, I think, be very helpful for anyone who hasn't even looked at the topic yet. And I've realized this because having just come back from the UK and discussed it with many people over there, the number of companies that have really done something about it is not very large.

Sébastien Bachollet next.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Olivier. I would like to give you a few information about what ISOC France is doing. There's a project going on, the

---

[inaudible] about the data protection, and the second point is that there are – in trying to discuss with both [inaudible] to having the law include the possibility for group action around the question of data protection. Therefore, I think that the Chair of the ISOC [inaudible] France chapter will be happy, I am sure, to give you an update on what they are doing in more details than I am able to do right now in just two minutes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sébastien. Let's please entice the ISOC France Chair to respond positively when we send out that call for volunteers to speak about that organization.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Let's move on and continue to the next part of our agenda. Time is ticking and it's already past the half-hour mark. The summary of the ICANN61 activities. It says here after my name, it says "all," which effectively is asking anyone who was at ICANN61 to provide details of what's been going on. And in fact, the first subsection is the Cross-Community Working Group on Accountability. As you know, that's been a very long process. It's taken several years to reach this point. We're now in Work Stream 2. Each one of those subheadings is linked, so this one is linked to the main page of the Work Stream 2 dashboard with all of the latest reports from Work Stream 2, but I would like a volunteer

---

who's been very much involved with Work Stream 2 to take the floor. And perhaps that might be Sébastien Bachollet, or others that I'm not seeing at the moment. So Sébastien, [inaudible] the floor on this.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. During the ICANN61 meeting, we finalized the last – I guess it's three or four – report on the individual items, and now it's a done deal. We have a final nine subgroup reports agreed by the plenary, and what some people and staff in particular are trying to do is put that together in one single document. We will have an executive summary of all the documents and it will be discussed in the next few weeks, and then it will go for public comments for 14 days I guess, and then we will discuss – the group, the plenary of the CCWG on Accountability – will discuss the comments and we'll hopefully have a final full report for the Panama meeting. And we hope that it will allow during the Panama meeting to have a discussion with different SOs and ACs who are the chartering organizations to decide if they support the document. And if they do so, then it will be sent to the board for final action and agreement. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Sébastien. Are there any comments or questions on this topic? Christopher Wilkinson.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Unmute. Right –

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, you're not muted, you're fine.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I found my way onto Zoom for the first time in my life, so it's quite complicated to read the tiny print on the screen. The only point that I would add regards to the subgroup of Work Stream 2 on jurisdiction which I followed to a very large extent, the final discussion in San Juan was about a clause to the effect that we expect discussions on certain aspects of jurisdiction to continue. There are continued strong reservations about the final document from several governments, notably Brazil, and I think it's important to recognize that even a board discussion and decision on the Work Stream 2 document regarding jurisdiction will not be final.

As I said in the meeting, this report will have legs. Brazil will certainly raise it in the GAC, and I would expect the United Nations and the ITU to take the report into consideration. It's a very difficult subject because basically, the American private sector legal profession who dominated the subgroup could not possibly accept the reservations of several governments regarding the long-term jurisdiction and the corporation status of ICANN.

So in spite of the enormous amount of work that went into this and I think the loyal attempts of Greg Shatan to try to reach a compromise and a consensus, this issue is not closed.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Christopher. That's a helpful update for you. If you could also take your hand down please by clicking the "Raise hand" button or "Lower hand" button. And I don't notice any other hands up at the moment, so maybe we can go to the next topic, and that's Work Track 5, the geographic names at the top level, another big discussion that has taken place and that is likely to come to a head again between the GAC, the Government Advisory Committee and the Generic Name Supporting Organization.

Christopher Wilkinson, did you want to say a few words on this as well, please?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I must unmute again. There we go. Yes. I posted to the Work Track 5 list a summary of my comments in the meeting which have already received some pushback from other participants. I think At-Large needs to rethink this issue from the point of view of the individual user in each geographical area or group that is considered, and I think starting from the bottom up from the users' point of view, one would reach a policy which would be ultimately acceptable to the GAC though it would not include all the GAC's interests and requirements.

There are two fundamental issues. One is subsidiarity. Which level of public authority or community should be involved with approving or not a geographical term? And the second fundamental issue is what I think we can just call granularity. For rough calculations, there are more than 100,000 geographical names in the back of most global atlases. Obviously, we cannot possibly work on the basis of 100,000

---

geographical names. So at some stage, the community and governments will have to draw a line as to at what level do they wish to protect geographical names.

There are subsidiary issues which some people make a lot of, notably the overlap between certain brands and certain geographical terms. For example, there's a brand of fountain pens called Montblanc, and I believe there's nobody at the top of Mont Blanc to ask whether or not they agree to the continuation of the use of their name for that brand, which is a bit of a reductio ad absurdum, but on the other hand, there is a major issue between several governments in South America and the Amazon corporation about the use of the term .amazon.

I think ALAC should adopt a position on this in the next few weeks. I've got plenty of stuff written down to base an ALAC position, but I've frankly got no idea how to start the ball rolling. Alan Greenberg has told me in the recent past that he wished to set up a panel of ALAC members to discuss these issues. He has not done so.

Furthermore, the ALAC decided to designate five delegates from the regions to participate directly in the Work Track 5 work. I don't know whether that's been done, and I certainly don't know who they are. And I think my replacement as the coleader for ALAC, Javier Rua, doesn't know either. So we're navigating a little bit on our own without any express support of possibility of consultation of At-Large members. I'll leave it at that for the moment.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Christopher. Yes, thank you very much, Christopher. Next is Yrjö Lansipuro. And Yrjö, you're currently muted. You might wish to unmute yourself.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I'm getting no feedback at all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Can you hear me?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, are you there?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, I'm there. I'm absolutely there, and for some reason –

HEIDI ULLRICH: Claudia, do we still have Olivier? It might be that his phone has ended after one hour. That happens [sometimes].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Can you hear me? Hello?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Claudia, do we know if Olivier is on?



---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: This is crazy.

YESIM NAZLAR: Hello, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Yesim.

YESIM NAZLAR: Let me try to check with Adigo if he's on the phone bridge or not quickly.

HEIDI ULLRICH: [inaudible] mute.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not on mute. I'm testing. One, two, three, four, five. Okay, I can hear you all. Yrjö next, please.

ROBERTO GAETANO: In the meantime while you are fixing this problem, can we give the floor to Yrjö who has his hand up? Just for the matter of –

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

---

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Sorry, Roberto. Yes.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Okay. Can you hear better now?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Go ahead.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Basically, WT5, I'm one of the five representatives supposed to be there for EURALO. The going is pretty slow in Work Track 5. We're going through a list of geographic names which were designed as such in the 2007 GNSO policy and in the Applicants Handbook. And it's pretty slow, as I said.

The basic problem seems to be that the GNSO is saying that the Applicants Handbook did actually sort of interpret the 2007 policy in their own way, and so the starting point for the new round should be the 2007 policy and not the Applicants Handbook. And of course, the GAC is of the other opinion that the Applicants Handbook is where we should be starting from. And we haven't even come so far as to discuss those other geographic names that the GAC would like to include. So that's the situation after the meeting in San Juan, and the next meeting of this work track is on the 4<sup>th</sup> of April. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yjrö. Can everybody hear me now?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you very much. Olivier, I know that you're back.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Can you hear me? Can anybody hear me?

HEIDI ULLRICH: [inaudible] hear you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: This is ridiculous. Can anybody hear me now?

ROBERTO GAETANO: He looks muted.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So this is not a problem with –

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Olivier, yes, we can hear you. Or I can hear you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, just a moment. We're just in contact with him.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Some people can hear me, some people cannot. I think Adigo has dropped off the line.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, I guess it's Adigo who's dropped off the line, because I think people can't hear me either.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, are you able to hear us? We'll just see if we can unmute.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Exactly, they can't hear you either.

HEIDI ULLRICH: [Wale,] are you able to continue chairing until we get him back?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Can Adigo please dial again in – not me, but call [inaudible]

YESIM NAZLAR: Hi, Olivier. So Adigo [inaudible] confirms that you are back on the phone bridge. Could you please reach out to us through Skype so we can see if you're back on and you have audio or not? I see you're typing right now.

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yesim, can you hear me? No.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You see, Sébastien, we're both on Adigo and they can't hear us.

YESIM NAZLAR: Okay, so it's something related with Adigo. It seems like Adigo has disconnected their connection with the Zoom which is why we cannot hear Olivier when he's speaking through Adigo. I'll just make sure that Adigo is connected to Zoom properly.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, you can try. Until the time they heard us, it's not working.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, I'm now speaking from the Zoom because it seems that the Adigo works only in one way at the moment where the Adigo channel that Sébastien and Bachollet and I – we're on the channel and we couldn't be heard but we could hear everything that is happening. So since we don't have very much time and it is four minutes before the official end of this call, let's just continue. I'm currently now speaking from Zoom, not speaking from the Adigo.

And unfortunately, we will not be able to hear from Sébastien anymore unless the Adigo manages to fix – [inaudible]. Can you hear me? Aha, it seems to be working again now.

---

YESIM NAZLAR: Yes, Olivier, it should be working back again. So if you can please try the phone bridge now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Speaking from the phone bridge. Can you hear me?

YESIM NAZLAR: Okay. Perfect. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Super. So we're back in order. Thanks very much, and sorry for all of this. Welcome back. Geographic names at the top level, I think we've had our discussion, and thank you for your comment, Yrjö, on this.

And next, we can then look at the General Data Protection Regulation discussions. This one we can do very quickly since we've spoken about it quite extensively. So ICANN has come up with a model called the cookbook. They have now shared it with the community, they've got some significant feedback, and at the end of March, they anticipate having an interaction with the Article 29 working party. Those people are from the European Commission and European Union's General Data Protection Regulation people, effectively, and they are likely to be discussing the proposed model. And as you all know, the GDPR will come into enforcement on the 25<sup>th</sup> of May 2018.

What I have heard in ICANN was that because ICANN is showing that it's trying to find full solutions to the problem, whilst the solution will not be implemented – implementation will certainly take place after the

25<sup>th</sup> of May – having the plans, it is hoped that there won't be any enforcement because the plans are there and are showing that ICANN is going in the direction for the compliance on these issues. Data protection and privacy, you can see that there are lots of different updates, and the latest one, 21<sup>st</sup> of March, updated the one which you would be interested in if you wish to continue forward.

Okay, any comments or questions on the GDPR and the additional points on the GDPR?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so the next topic of discussion, big topic of discussion at least in the ALAC and in the At-Large community was the root key KSK rollover which is a pretty big issue. And perhaps if I see that – do we still have Lutz Donnerhacke on the call? We have Lutz. Maybe Lutz could say a few words about this. Lutz was the original penholder for this comment, and then a lot of discussion took place in Puerto Rico about this whole key rollover, and it's all to do with DNSSEC. And if it doesn't work, then parts of the network will stop having a reliable or working DNS.

So Lutz, could you say a few words, please, on this? And where are we heading with the two sides of ALAC, one side saying we should not perform this root KSK rollover until we're absolutely sure that things will work out without end users risking being disconnected, and the other side saying we need to do that because if we don't, then we don't know if we ever could in a time of emergency. So, Lutz.

---

LUTZ DONNERHACKE:

That's correct. Yes, it's true, we have two opportunities. First opportunity is to do the rollover, and the second is to postpone it up to an indefinite time. So it's a very easy decision we have to comment on. The problem is that originally, it was thought that every key material should be rolled over in regular intervals. It does work very fine on dependent zones, on private zones in the DNS because they can [inaudible] their trust in the parent zone.

The [point from the] parent zone thing, the current active key in use is the [following] one, so the trust goes backwards to the delegation [for a key], and in the root, we have a problem because we have nobody who can tell us or tell the machines, the resolvers, what's the correct key. In order to get trust into the root, we have to distribute the key material for the root using different nontechnical [ways].

Usually, during the first key rollover, the key signing ceremony, there was a huge media interest. A lot of technical interested newspapers print key material, print hashes or some information how to get the information from – how to start. The various operating systems are distributing the root key material and [inaudible]. So we have huge source of information for the key material, and the issue we have is we want to change it. So we have to change all those sources. That's one point.

The second point, we already have a signed zone in place. If we change the key material and the resolver is set up with the wrong one, the older one and we change or remove the old key, then the resolver can't validate anymore. And if it has a validation error in the root zone, no DNS is working at all. I have personal experience with a broken root



---

zone with broken signatures. It's really the case you have to get to the console of the machine. You can't log in remotely, you can't do anything anymore, and you have to go there and to repair it.

So saying all this, changing key material in the root zone should not ever happen. On the other hand, we have to roll over. There might be an emergency, then we have to roll over very quickly. Or we want to change the key material, we want to change algorithms, we want to change keys, we want to use bigger keys eventually. So we have a good motivation to do this. In order to do so, there's something [on] the protocol saying if you are validating resolver software and you have a key and you learn a new key through the DNS from the root zone, store it.

When using this RFC, RFC 5011 which might be deployed, the resolver's already learning the new key and can seamlessly move to the new key without any problem. So the hope was to change the key last year. We already introduced a new key, but we had to remove the old one, and we postponed it last year simply because we gathered some information that several resolvers are using the old key and never used an update algorithm to update to the new key.

The problem is there's no technical way to check if a resolver is correctly working or not. We can only check if the resolver is currently working with the current key and we can't check what happens if we're using another one. The only way to check is to do the rollover. So the question we have is, do we have a problem with it or not?

---

The main point is if we postpone it, a lot of other players in this area, especially from the IoT department – which are very lousy in security – they are using preconfigured software, put it in, and after that, they are going to say, “Okay, we have shipped it, we do not support it anymore,” and [inaudible] all of them won’t work.

In the meantime, a lot of software comes with DNSSEC enabled from the repository, so they install in the IoT community DNSSEC-enabled software. And if we do a rollover regularly, we get a lot of devices in the network which can’t roll over at any time. So if we do not roll over now or in the very foreseen future, we do not get deployment for rollover technology in all these devices and we do not get practice in all operators.

So the two ways are, first, do the rollover and use especially the ALAC structure to educate the people out there to ask the ISPs, “Are you really doing the right thing?” Or the other thing is to say we didn’t get enough information. We know it’s hard to gather information, but let’s wait a few months, years or decades in order to get enough information to say if we can safely roll over or not.

My personal preference is to do the rollover. Thanks to Alan, I prepared a website where you can check that your ISP is correctly and what will happen if the KSK rollover will start. Please try it out and tell me what happens. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Lutz. And that’s very helpful. I’ve put the link over in the chat again for anybody who has missed that tool.

DNSSEC.donnerhacke.de. And I might share this with the ALAC on the ALAC call later on since the matter of DNSSEC will no doubt – and sorry, KSK rollover – be touched on. So that’s very good.

Let’s move then to the next topic, and that was the ICANN budget. I was just going to mention very briefly in the ICANN budget that there was going to be a reduction in the current ICANN budget. As you know, we had a long discussion in our last call about it, there was a lot of pushback for a number of cutbacks that were made, and now the ICANN budgets are going to be looked at again by the ICANN Finance department and the Board Finance Committee, and they should be coming back to the community with a new proposal for the adjustment of the budget. So that’s going to happen.

One of the potential avenues for cutting costs – quite dramatically, actually – is the reduction of the number of organizational reviews that take place simultaneously. Apparently, a number of them will be there next year. I think – is it seven or eleven? One or the other. Oh, seven. Seven reviews simultaneously which takes a lot of volunteer time and a lot of staff time, and certainly a lot of resources. So these could be perhaps changed or spread out in time. That does require however a change in the ICANN bylaws, because the reviews themselves are bylaw-mandated. They are a part of ICANN’s accountability process. But when you look at the At-Large review which has taken two to three years to perform, to do, and we have to have a review every five years, you really are looking at starting a review as soon as you finished the previous one, which is a little bit much.

---

Are there any other discussions and topics that I haven't touched on that we haven't listed in our agenda that took place in ICANN61? Anybody else who was there or participated remotely and wanted to share their thoughts? And I am aware we're ten minutes beyond the limit of this call. We've got a short extension.

I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so let's move on to the last part – or the next part – of our call, the CROP travel, community regional outreach travel. And it was just to announce that our outreach strategic plan was mentioning – our strategy for 2018 was mentioning that we would be attending several things.

EuroSSIG was something that we were not going to attend, the summer school is not something that we were going to ask CROP slot for, but in the CROP slots we mentioned re:publica, we mentioned EuroDIG 2018, we mentioned also SEEDIG 2018 and I think that – yes, we also mentioned CDPD, Computer's, Privacy and Data Protection which unfortunately took place very early in the year, in January, 24<sup>th</sup> to 26<sup>th</sup> of January and so we missed that. And the Internet Governance Week in Brussels was also the 23<sup>rd</sup> to 25<sup>th</sup> of January, so we missed time to fit in the calendar. We also missed the Easter European DNS Forum that was listed in our strategy.

But what we didn't miss of course was the approved – well, the CROP for the two trips that we've had so far, that we've applied for so far. The first one was for Wale Bakare to go to the Internet Governance Forum in Geneva. That was over in December. And the second one is one that we had just filed, and that – I hear – has just been approved and that's a proposal for Matthias Hudobnik to go to the re:publica. Matthias is a

German speaker as well, so he will do very well over there. He's from Austria, and he has in the past already been on a CROP trip for the last EuroDIG that took place over in Estonia. So he knows what's asked of him, and the outreach part, that's the first time we're going to be going to re:publica. Very thrilled that he's going to link up with Annette Mühlberg and with Oliver [Patrick] who are based in Berlin and who both are going there, and he will also link up, I believe, we Adam Peake from ICANN staff, from the Regional Vice President's office. So he's going to get, hopefully, much support, and we're working at the moment to get him some brochures to be sent over to him from the Geneva office.

Now, another potential trip, the next trip would be a trip to the RIPE NCC meeting that takes place in Marseilles this year. It will take place in May, and that's between the 14<sup>th</sup> and the 16<sup>th</sup> of May. A number of people were potentially going to be able to make it. I'm just down the road – down the railway line, should I say – a couple of hours' train line away in Nice, and Sébastien Bachollet is a couple of hours' train ride from Paris, so either of us could probably cover this unless somebody else wishes to cover this.

I understand that Bastiaan Goslings is already going to be there as part of his work. So that's already someone from our region who's there, but obviously since he's there as part of his work, it's quite unlikely that he will be wearing an At-Large hat or a EURALO hat. I totally understand that, but at least we have someone who can make introductions and help us out with this new environment.

---

---

Any comments or questions, anybody who wishes to volunteer for this trip? I'm not seeing any hands up. I see that Heidi has asked a question in the chat.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sébastien can always wear his At-Large EURALO hat. But Heidi, please, you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. I'm just commenting that on the EURALO discretionary funding for fiscal year '18, EURALO still has \$912, and local travel could be included in that if the request is made early enough. Again, the request needs to be three weeks in advance of the event. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: And that includes train.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That includes train. Okay.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Heidi. That's helpful. I was not aware that local travel could be included in this. I'm sure that it costs less than €900. Although we are dealing with the Cannes Film Festival at the same time and it might well be that €900 doesn't get you as far as the station in this sort of environment. Who knows.

We will follow up on this. I've not seen anybody else standing forward to represent EURALO at this meeting. Unless somebody else wants to come forward, then perhaps we can actually get two people there, one person on CROP or using local travel funds and the other person could actually apply as a Fellow on behalf of the EURALO and mentioning that he application for fellowship which closes on the 6<sup>th</sup> of April, application for fellowship is for someone from EURALO to come. So in the light of having some good follow-up to our MoU, it would be good to have a real presence over there.

I'm not seeing anybody putting their hand up, so let's move on. Oh, just mentioning the last thing which is the remaining slots that we have, remembering that we are finishing this fiscal year at the end of June, we have to now seriously think about the last three slots that would be remaining, or the last two slots that would be remaining if we use a slot for trip proposal three.

So either two or three slots that are remaining would likely be for EuroDIG 2018, probably two slots I think, and that is on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of June this year, so we do have to be quite active because yes, it starts as early

---

– sorry – as the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> of June and there's a six-week limit in advance. So we need to do this quite early on, and also because it's something that's in a neighboring region, we are going to have to negotiate this with the Regional Vice President, because it is a European event that is technical in another ICANN region.

So let's file for this as soon as possible. If you have any suggestions for candidates who would be good to send to EuroDIG or if you would like to volunteer to be active, then please drop us a note and drop the note either to Wale or to me, or to staff of course, and we'll take this up. If we have many people who wish to stand forward, we'll have probably to get the EURALO Board to make the choice.

Any Other Business, part #8. I'm not seeing any other hands up at the moment. There are some discussions about ATLAS III which will include General Assemblies for all the RALOs. So correct, there will not be a General Assembly in the forthcoming year, or at least a funded General Assembly in the forthcoming year. What we have asked for is an additional budget request for an expanded assembly with some activities and some food and capacity building sessions in Barcelona at the Barcelona meeting in October 2018.

With this, I don't want to make it any later for all of you. Thanks for bearing with us in this time of technical hardship when we're not used to a different system than the usual system that we have. I think it's gone down rather well. I hope that staff have gotten well trained now and have become experts in Zoom, and Adigo experts in Zoom too. And I'd like to thank you all for this meeting and for your contribution to



---

this. And I guess that Yesim will be able to close at least half of the windows that she currently has on her screen.

With this, I invite you for next month. In the meantime, keep on being interested and involved in ICANN, and especially in those policy comments. Have a very good evening, everyone. Goodbye.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Thank you, everyone, for joining the meeting. This meeting has now been adjourned. The audio will now be disconnected. Enjoy the rest of your day/evening. Goodbye.

YESIM NAZLAR:

Thank you. Bye-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**