

**EURALO General Assembly – Mexico City ICANN At-Large Summit  
(Held March 3, 2009)**

**Note:** Part 2 of the audio begins on page 11 of the transcript.  
Part 3 of the audio begins on page 39 of the transcript.

**Legend**

- Name: First name of member of group
- Name?: If we think we might know who's speaking but aren't 100% sure.
- Male: Unsure of who's speaking, but know it's a male.
- Female: Unsure of who's speaking, but know it's a female.
- Name: [French 00:29:52 - 0:31:06] We will identify a foreign language in square brackets with a time code for the beginning and end, so that you can quickly identify those passages. At the top of the transcript, we will advise you of the name(s) of the foreign languages you'll need to search for. For example, some transcripts may contain German, so you'll have to search for "[German]" instead of "[French]" to find all the passages. The speaker identification is the same convention as all the others. i.e. If we know the speaker's name we'll include it, otherwise we'll put a question mark after it, or if we can't even guess, then Male, Female or SP.
- [cuts out]: Audio cuts out for less than 2 seconds. We may have missed something. We do **not** put this if it's just natural silence where no-one is speaking. We only put this if we can hear that there was briefly a technical problem with the phone line and/or the recording which resulted in temporary loss of sound.
- [cuts out 2 secs] When the audio cuts out for 2 seconds or more we'll show approximately how many seconds were missed. We will most likely have missed something if it cuts out for this long.
- [-ation] If we believe that all we missed was the beginning of a word because the audio cuts out, we will just put the end of the word that we can hear. If we are very sure from context what the whole word is, we'll just put the whole word, to make it easier for the reader. However, if the word could be a variety of different things, then we will show only the part of the word we could hear or thought we heard.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **List of Participants**

**Important Note:** Please note that this should not be considered to be an "official" list of the attendees. This is just a list of the participants that we were able to identify during the transcription. There may have been others present that didn't speak and some people may have participated that were not on the official list of attendees published on the internet.

Bachollet, Sébastien  
Bertola, Vittorio  
Crepin-Leblond, Olivier  
Donnerhacke, Lutz  
Giza, David (ICANN Senior Director, Contractual Compliance)  
Greve, Dragoslava  
Jensen, Heike  
Langdon-Orr, Cheryl (ALAC Chair)  
Ludwig, Wolf (EURALO Chair)  
Karttaavi, Tommi  
Kleinwächter, Wolfgang  
Kummer, Markus (IGF Secretariat, Executive Coordinator)  
Manolea, Bogdan  
Mühlberg, Annette  
Peake, Adam  
Scartezini, Vanda (ALAC Vice-Chair)  
Senges, Max  
Ullrich, Heidi (ICANN Staff)  
Vande Walle, Patrick  
Vansnick, Rudi  
Wilkinson (?), Christopher

\*\*\*\*\*

Wolf: [...I said this.] [laughs] If this is not the case, let me take the chance...

Male: [Well, maybe you can leave it 00:08].

[group laughs]

Male: [inaudible] [every morning], [inaudible].

Wolf: Let me take the chance to open our second General Assembly. Welcome to all of you. I'm very pleased to have... Not all of our ALSes around the table – unfortunately some of them are missing – but I am pleased to have the majority of our ALSes here in Mexico and here at our second General Assembly.

And I would like to start with our agenda of the day. First of all, we have to approve the draft of the agenda, what I and the EURALO board prepared in the last two telephone conferences we had in January and in February. We have an agenda of 11 points. Does anybody have anything, any point to be added on this agenda?

If this is not the case, then I would like to ask anybody has seen the GA minutes from Paris in June '08. I think we had a discussion afterwards. Again, there were several revisions made already at this spot, therefore I think there is nothing else to be added.

I have another point on [1s... 02:14] 1c., we have to decide somebody taking minutes from this meeting. Is anybody volunteering?

Annette: Okay.

Wolf: Okay. Thanks a lot, Annette, for taking...

Sébastien: Only if you have your name [right spelled, then you're good].

Annette: No, I always [write] [inaudible]. [laughs]

Wolf: Okay.

Annette: And of course, [I see an alternate] from Bulgaria. [laughs]

Wolf: Okay, there is another point we have to add under 1d. It's the confirmation of attendees and people who are excused for today. I received one excuse from Bill Drake. He's taken... Bill Drake is Board member of EURALO and he's taken at a meeting, GNSO meetings in the Sheraton, and he told me if ever possible, he will try to make it, to be here for some time with us, but I would like to note him in the minutes of our General Assembly as excused.

Uh, Yes, Adam?

Adam: I don't think Vittorio has formally made any apologies but he did mention that because of his position on the At-Large Review, he feels somewhat uncomfortable with a direct participation in some of our work. Until the review process is finished, he feels there's a slight conflict of interest. So it's not a formal apologies but just a note of Vittorio's concern.

Wolf: Yeah, okay. I think under the circumstances we can also note him as apologized.

Another point which is necessary or important at the confirmation of attendees is the question of voting rights at the General Assembly and quorum. As far as I see, we have... I start to my right with Rudi, representing ALS, voting right; Dragoslava, voting right; Heike, representing ALS, voting right; then we have our colleague from Finland, voting right; Wolfgang, Lutz, Sébastien, Patrick, Max, Annette, Bogdan. I think Adam, I'm very sorry to say it, you are the only one in the room without voting right.

Sébastien: No, Olivier has no voting rights.

Wolf: Olivier has no vot-...

Olivier: I don't even exist.

Wolf: No, no...

Sébastien: Oh, you exist.

Olivier: [laughs]

Wolf: ...I would like to welcome Olivier at our General Assembly.

[group applause]

Wolf: Olivier participated on Saturday at the opening of the program in the IPv6 session in the afternoon. He organized this and he did a great job. I was very impressed. It was a very interesting session. And I had the chance to talk with Olivier last night after the dinner we had. I asked him whether he would be interested to join EURALO in the way as a special expert for IPv6 issues, and he confirmed that he is interested being part of the EURALO network and once ever we have the need for some more expertise on the IPv6 issue, he's prepared to help and support us. Thank you very much.

[group applause]

Annette: So one... [inaudible 06:46]

Wolf: Yes, Annette.

Annette: As I'm taking the notes, I just want to see that there is a formal approval by A and B. There was no one rejecting, but we formally take it as an approval, right? Okay. No objections. Approval... GA agenda approval, GA minutes from June? Okay, perfect.

Wolf: Okay. Thank you very much.

Annette: Do I have to take notes about the voting rights, because then I have to have some time to write down all the names?

Sébastien: You will get the list of the names.

Wolf: You will get the list of the names and then we will count them and... Adam, please.

Adam: I don't mind about voting rights. I'll probably enthusiastically vote and then you can ignore me.

[group laughs]

Adam: But what I would like to know is can I make motions?

Wolf: Yes, of course.

Adam: Thank you.

Wolf: Well, sorry, I take this for granted. You are in an important function as one of our three ALAC representatives, nominated by the NomCom, but for me you are part of EURALO and I'm proud to have you at EURALO. And of course you have every speaking right and motion right you want.

Any objections? I hear nothing.

Sébastien: Just...

Wolf: Yes, Sébastien.

Sébastien: I think that here in the room – I will not say “generally speaking,” but here in the room – we have also Oliver and if he wants to make – “Olivier,” pardon – and if he wants to make also a motion or say something, I would like to see

that it's up to him also and there is no problem with that. We are not a UN body.

[applause]

Wolf: I strongly support this. Thank you, Sébastien, and please take it serious. Okay.

There was Christopher just joining us. Welcome, Christopher. You have to fill in the list of attendees and you are also representing an ALS with voting rights. We are just under point 1d which is not... c and d – c. was minutes of the General Assembly of today and d. was confirmation of attendees, just to know whether we have a quorum, whether we can make any qualified decisions today. And I think we have a majority of ALS attending here or today's General Assembly.

I got a list of housekeeping announcements. Tuesday, March 3rd... This is to say that at the end of the meeting... First of all I think all these meetings are taped?

Heidi?: Yes, umm-hmm.

Wolf: So we have a backup in case we need it besides Annette's meeting minutes, but I'm confident they will be perfect.

Then – I just read it – we will be videotaping three people at the end of each session today, of each General Assembly, to highlight three outcomes from the progress made in the RALO General Assembly's working groups and thematic sessions. If you are selected to participate in the videotaping, we will need you to stay a few minutes after the session to record your comments. So far I don't know whether anybody has been preselected.

Then we are still missing an interpreter handset from the opening session at the Sheraton on Sunday. Please check again, whether just by incidence of course you picked it and brought it with you, just in case. Please return it because these applications are rather expensive and we do not want to have ICANN to reimburse this loss.

[inaudible – speaking under breath 11:35 - 11:42]. Yes. I think you have seen all the summit material which has been distributed so far, and I think you may have got a coffee.

This is all for the housekeeping announcements for the moment. I would like to continue with our agenda point 2, this was foreseen...

Heidi: You need to choose the three people for the video.

Wolf: Oh. Heidi's just saying we have to choose the three people for the video. Who is interested in forwarding this video message what we need for the closing session on Thursday? On Thursday early morning, there will be the official closing of the summit. As you may have seen on the program, this is a 90-minute program slot and due to the fact that we do not have 90 minutes as a time to present all the reports from the five working groups, from the various thematic sessions and the RALOs, we decided to make, to break it down to short messages. And these messages will be videotaped so it will be an audiovisual presentation, and we need from our RALO three people who are summarizing more or less the development of EURALO, the state of EURALO as you think it is – good, bad, medium, or better to forget. And who is volunteering for these video recordings?

Male: [laughs]

Annette: Wolf?

Wolf: [laughs] Yes, please, Annette.

Annette: Could we decide that...

Wolf: Yes, we take your motion. Annette is volunteering [to record a 14:12] video recording.

[group laughs]

Annette: Yeah, never raise your hand, yeah, I know. I just wanted to say could we decide that at the end so that we already have an idea of what we want to present and maybe we could do this in front of all the whole RALO so that it's a nice RALO picture there and then we just have two or three people

speaking maybe, but we all agree on, you know, what we're doing? I think that would be nice.

Wolf: An-...

Heidi: Okay. If I may, that's going to require all of you to stay behind after the end of this meeting so the videographer can take your photo. Is that going to be okay?

Male: Yeah.

Heidi: Okay. So then three people could maybe get a zoom up or step up and say the one or two lines. Would that be fine?

Wolf: This means everybody who is not running away after the meeting will be on the video. Wolfgang?

Wolfgang: Heidi, a question. There will be messages only from the RALOs, or from the working groups and from the thematic sessions?

Heidi: Yes. Yes, exactly.

Wolf: As well, as well. Yeah.

Heidi: So...

Wolfgang: Ah-ha.

Heidi: ...today at the working groups and today at the thematic sessions, that same message will be given.

Wolfgang: Okay. Good. Because then we have to look to avoid duplication.

Heidi: Yes.

Wolf: Yeah.

Wolfgang: Because messages which are expressed via the working groups...

Male: [inaudible 15:27]



Wolfgang: ...you know, come mostly from the RALOs. And so that means we have then [to ensure...]

Wolf: We should have different faces.

Male: Yeah.

Wolfgang: And my recommendation would be, you know, to have very brief messages, do not make long statements, and it's like in TV you have a slogan, "You have 30..." "What should I say?" and you say, "Whatever you say, say it in 30 seconds." So [it's number one and the 15:49]...

Annette: Alright, here we have our speaker.

Wolfgang: No, no, no, no.

[group laughs]

Wolfgang: So I just wanted to raise this question to avoid duplication. And then, you know, [if I have to, if you elect me at also], that some people have started to work to bring all these reports together in what we call now ICANN's Mexico At-Large Summit Declaration, which they'll summarize and that should we hand over in an official way to the Board on this summit meeting so that it becomes really an official recognized document. And in so far I think we should take care of formal support for this approach, and I think Adam and [Darlene 16:29] and others, you know, are working to harmonize the statements from the various groups.

Wolf: Okay. Thanks a lot, Wolfgang. Sébastien?

Sébastien: Yeah. What is important is that we have different faces for the different reports or so on, and the other thing is that we are willing to have the people express in their own language, even if it's not one translated. What we have to show is the diversity. And I don't mind if somebody is member of EURALO and not saying what I think. More important is that we show the diversity. Then I don't want to be here and to decide what everybody will say. I don't want to say, "You need to say that." You will say what you want. It's not an official statement, it's your position and your view of what is happening.

And I will be sorry, but I have to go to the other hotel at 12 and I will leave the end of the meeting before the end. Sorry.

Wolf: Okay. Thanks a lot, Sébastien. Well, I take this as a matter of course that all of us at EURALO and around this table share the basic principles and rights of freedom of speech, and of course nobody will be bound to any official talking. So everybody will express his or her personal opinion about it, and I also support what Sébastien said, that it should be also brought up in different languages to show, to express the cultural and language diversity we have in Europe.

Any... Yes, Adam.

Annette?: Did you do that?

Adam: I just wanted to say that there's the – excuse me, I've lost the place – there's the User House meeting starting at 12:30 which I think some of us should go to. Well, I would like to go to but I think that some representation should go to. Certainly it's an ALAC meeting, but... So some conflict with hanging around afterwards to do too much videographing, that's all.

Wolf: Okay.

Annette?: [inaudible 18:51]?

Adam: It's the User House of the GNSO, the future GNSO, which will be ALAC and NCUC, etc., at 12:30.

Wolf: According to my estimations about timing, I think with this agenda we will be finished around 12:30. I'm quite confident that we have to sit here until 1 o'clock.

Adam: If I can take more time, now that Heidi is out of the room and there are no staff here, the motion I was thinking to make was one to thank the staff for their support of this summit. And before making that motion, I wanted to just get a sense of the room, that there's no one going to say no, because that would be embarrassing if she was here.

Wolf: No, no. No, no...

Wolfgang: We could send also greetings to Nick because he is still... he was in the hospital and [he should 19:47]... [overtalking]

Sébastien: Mic! You need to be [record].

Wolf: I'll repeat it. Wolfgang suggested...

Male: [inaudible 19:55].

Wolf: Huh?

Male: [inaudible]

**[end of EURALO-GA-03-03-2009-EN-1, beginning of EURALO-GA-03-03-2009-EN-2]**

Wolf: Yeah, yeah, I know. Therefore I'm just repeating what Wolfgang said. We have the chance under agenda point 6 where we have the staff here again in the room to thank them for all their support preparing the summit, preparing the General Assembly, etc., and to forward a message to Nick.

If there are no further remarks, we had originally a second agenda point, a "Message from the ALAC Chair," as we had it in Paris. I think it's a different situation here. In Paris, we were the only RALO having a General Assembly. Now we have five parallel sessions here. So everybody will understand that Cheryl cannot be subdivided in five portions, so we have to accept her apologies.

Then I would like to continue with agenda item 3, which is the "Board Report 2008-09." It's a Board report. I think everybody has a copy of this. We prepared six weeks ago and it was already discussed by the Board, by some Board members at our last EURALO phone conference. It's more or less a résumé of what happened since our last General Assembly in June '08 in Paris. I think there is no need to repeat all what is written in the report. There are certain highlights. We had the ALAC election. Sébastien was re-elected for a two years' term to represent EURALO at At-Large. Patrick was elected for a one-year term. And last but not least, Adam Peake was elected by the NomCom, replacing Annette. And Adam's term started I think with the Cairo meeting, at the end of the Cairo meeting. Right.

There is an overview of several initiatives we had in the time between since Paris. I think one of the highlights was for sure the first European Dialogue on Internet Governance, which was co-organized by EURALO, and a lot of EURALO members around this table and even more participated in Strasbourg at the end of October.

Then I would like to highlight again this – there was in September, it was the 6th or the 7th, ICANN Studienkreis meeting in Helsinki, which is year by year organized by Wolfgang and which is a standing success. And I would like that we would have the opportunity to participate in a more active way as EURALO in the ICANN Studienkreis meetings, and I think to me it's still one of the most perfect opportunities for outreach activities.

Yes, Wolfgang?

Wolfgang: This gives me the opportunity to announce that the next meeting takes place in October 15-16 in Barcelona in Spain, and the local co-hosts are the ccTLD registry for Spain, .ES, and the gTLD registry, .CAT. So and this will be a two-day meeting and we have a free morning on the Thursday. That means if EURALO decides... I offered this already for previous meetings. If EURALO decides, you know, to get a spot there, then what I can offer is a free meeting space. So we cannot pay for other things, travel and things like that, but we have hired the hotel and so there would be a room available for this meeting.

Annette: Could you just please for the records tell me the date again?

Wolf: 15-16th of October.

Wolfgang: I think it's 15-16, it's Thursday-Friday, October.

Wolf: Barcelona.

Wolfgang: In Barcelona, a very nice place in October.

Annette: It's this year?

Wolf: Yes

Wolfgang: And the hotel is the Rivoli Rambla Hotel, which is in the very heart of this very vibrant city.

Wolf: Okay. Thanks, Wolfgang. Sébastien?

Sébastien: Yeah, you may have suggested that before, but maybe you can add on what was done in Paris. You were invited to talk to... During the EGENI conference and as EURALO representative to the meeting prior to the ICANN meeting. And it could be interesting to say that it was also a EURALO activity.

Wolf: Yes, but sorry, Sébastien, this we already did in Paris because the EURALO General Assembly was one day after the EGENI meeting, so I...

Annette?: [laughs]

Sébastien: That's okay. That's okay, [that was all 06:12], don't worry.

[group laughs]

Wolfgang?: [Off by one error.]

Male: [laughs]

Wolf: But...

Annette: But we can mention it again.

Wolf: Yeah, yeah.

Sébastien: No, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no. You're right, you're right.

Wolf: It was a good opportunity. We were invited and we were part of the panel talking about the interest of internet users.

And I think... Well, another event I would like to mention is just in end of July, beginning of August, Wolfgang will have the 3rd Summer School on Internet Governance in Meissen. I had the pleasure and the honour to have participated in the first edition of the Summer School, which was to me a very interesting, fruitful, and profiting opportunity. It's a splendid event with the best experts on internet governance you can have worldwide, and they assemble at the end of July and until beginning of August now every year in Meissen in Germany and...

Yes, Wolfgang, you want to comment this?

Wolfgang: Yeah, you know, what we discovered in the Working Group on Internet Governance in the United Nations was there is a lack of academic research and teaching opportunities for internet governance. And so we had two conclusions from that – we created an academic network, the GigaNet, and we launched the concept of a summer school where you have a package course of 40 to 50 hours which is according to the Bologna higher education system in Europe subdivided in three modules also. And the program is executed by really very good teachers. We have not only academics but practitioners as teachers. Annette had a special lecture on the role of At-Large in internet governance.

And so what I wanted to invite you is to help with outreach. That means that you distribute the call for application for the summer school, which is end of July in Meissen, Germany. And we have just recently published a call for application, and it's a good opportunity. We have also a fellowship program which is supported by a lot of ccTLDs, so that means if you apply then probably you can also get one of the 15 fellowship stipendium we have now. So we have up to 25 seats, and last year we had 167 applications for the 25 seats. But I think it's a good opportunity and the slogan is "For the internet governance leaders of tomorrow, learning in a multi-stakeholder environment." So that means that it's not a purely academic course, but it has an academic background and if you are an academic student, you will get 5 credit points according to the Bologna system if you after the course write an academic paper.

Wolf: Yes, thank you very much, Wolfgang. Annette, please.

Annette: As I'm taking notes here, I just saw the first European Dialogue on Internet Governance, there was one more activity and I would... I think it could be something which could be done also in other countries. We did the European Dialogue on a European level, but we did also a European Dialogue on Internet Governance on a regional level. So I helped, we helped organizing it in Germany. So it was the first time, and I can assure you in Germany it always looks nice with the government, you know, to have... and different organizations to do something together, but it is not easy. And it was the first time we did that together with business, internet service provider, and government, and it was very interesting because we had also here especially a focus on internet users in this and I think it could be an interesting issue for

all of us to exchange some experiences on that and think about if these are or help each other to push these discussions on a regional level.

Wolf: Okay. Okay, thank you very much, Annette, for this addition. I think you mentioned this also in the updated version of the EURALO Board Report. Yes, Lutz, sorry.

Lutz: I'd like to add an event of EURALO. It was the ENISA meeting in Athens. And this meeting was one of the primary resources which were the most valuable input for the [working group five 11:24]. We had a discussion about resilience of DNS and they put a lot of information what we have to do as an end-user organization and what an end-user organization has to bring up to the table in order to make the system work.

Wolf: Okay. Can you just repeat slowly again the title of the conference and where it was. In Athens?

Lutz: In Athens, in Greek.

Wolf: Yeah.

Lutz: It was ENISA. ENISA is...

Annette: How do you spell it?

Lutz: E-N-I-S-A.

Wolf: E-N-I-S-A.

Lutz: It's the Eur-... It's the...

Male: European [Network]... [overtalking 12:12]

Lutz: Yeah. It's part of the European Union institutions and the title was "Resilience of the DNS Security..." uh, "DNS Infrastructure." Not sure.

Wolf: Yes, thanks, Lutz. Patrick?

Sébastien: No, Sébastien, but that's okay. Just...

[group laughs]

Wolf: Sorry.

Sébastien: No, no, that's great because in fact Patrick and myself...

Annette: [overtalking 12:42]

Sébastien: ...Patrick... [German? – 12:47]. Patrick and myself were invited to this conference to talk there and we decided that I would be going there, and my flight was cancelled the day before and the replacement flight was the day after, then I was unable to come to attend to and to go to this conference. And we are lucky that Lutz was there because it was really unforeseen circumstances, and it's cost me a lot because I had booked my hotel and I didn't get any reimbursement for that, but doesn't matter.

Wolf: Okay, thanks a lot, Sébastien.

Annette?: [inaudible 13:34].

Wolf: Just to sum it up a little bit, because we had past activities since Paris and we mentioned already activities and plannings for the future, I would like to mention another one which will be the second European Dialogue on Internet Governance we are preparing at the very moment. The Swiss government announced already they are interested and prepare the second EuroDIG in September in Geneva together with the European Broadcasting Union. It will be held parallel to the last IGF consultations before the next Internet Governance Forum which is foreseen at the end of the year in Sharm El Sheikh. So I think the second European Dialogue on Internet Governance in September will be a great opportunity also for EURALO to be part of an ongoing process and be supportive of this process and will I'm sure offer again an opportunity for outreach activities for us.

So this to me sounds quite interesting, so for summer-autumn period of this year, there are, as we have heard, a lot of interesting events foreseen and we should try to be included in this as much as possible.

Yes, Heike.

Heike: Yeah. Have you decided on the date for the preparatory meeting for those who are interested in planning anything for the EuroDIG?



Wolf: We have no official preparatory meeting. We are still... We had our first preparatory meeting at the beginning of last week at the occasion of the Internet Forum consultations... Internet Governance Forum consultations in Geneva. We took the opportunity because Wolfgang was there, [Bertrand 16:09] was there, all the steering group from the last time, I was there. And [Tomas] presented the first planning parameters already, but we discussed whether or how the organizing group could be enlarged. We discussed how best the organizing network could be handled and managed in a more effective way – whether we should have a small steering group, etc. And then we were also discussing some of the program outlines and as far as I understood it, it was said for the second EuroDIG, it would be better not to have the broad variety of subjects we covered Strasbourg last year, but to concentrate a bit more on certain issues and to have a more in-depth discussion of the limited issues.

Wolfgang, is this more or less right?

Wolfgang: Yeah.

Wolf: Yeah, okay. But we have not decided on dates for the next step of preparing. A lot of this will be done by telephone conferences, which will be announced by [Lee 17:36] and [Thomas Schneider] who are still foreseen as coordinators, and this will be on short note.

Annette: [inaudible]

Wolf: Yeah.

Annette: It is typical internet world activity. It is very much online and just, oh, we bump into each other and say, “Oh, hi. Don’t you think it’s smart to have a meeting tonight?” There is no official preparation meeting like on a certain locality, but I think we can at least assure that any update on what’s happening will be sent to the EURALO list and we can gather proposals what to do. The agenda is not set yet, so I think that’s what we can surely do because it’s always difficult to always to broaden a group of, I don’t know, already 15 people to 50 people or something, but I think that’s absolutely possible and we can do that and... Yeah, I think even we could give an update within the next 10 days for sort of asking for proposals.

Wolf: Okay, thank you, Annette.

To conclude our agenda point 3, I would like to continue under point 3 of the draft report, you see observations and conclusions. I repeated some of the observations we had in the last Board report submitted in Paris, but I would like to say here again that I observed compared with EURALO's first year a considerable improvement and I'm very grateful for that. We had much more coordination among EURALO members, we had a much better information flow, we had three regular telephone conferences, we succeeded to establish a kind of fixed day per month for our monthly phone conference and I'm looking forward to have even a better group and work dynamic after the Mexico meeting.

Yes, Sébastien and Patrick.

Sébastien: I would like to take this opportunity to thank Wolf because if we are here today, it's because he put a lot of effort in the running of EURALO and it was a great improvement since last year. But thanks to Wolf.

Patrick: Well, I'd like add regarding participation, and I'm talking with both my ALAC and EURALO accents in the sense that often issues come in front of the ALAC with sometimes very tight deadlines and it makes it quite difficult to go to the RALO, explain the issues at stake, and then start the discussion within the RALO to ultimately brings something back to the ALAC. One good example I have is that you may remember some time in January, we had a discussion on what are we... will the EURALO draft a statement on the new gTLD process, and eventually we did. But the statement is still somewhere in my computer, or I would rather say on the wiki, etc., but it has not been used by the ALAC because in the meantime the comment period was over, a second draft of the gTLD guide came out. So in the end, by the time we got our comments and our statement together, it was more or less already outdated due to the dynamic of the process. So we should really look at ways to have some... I would say a fast reaction force within the EURALO that can act in a timely manner on such matters, because if we embark on broad consultations and wait for people to come up with suggestions, we finally end up missing the deadlines.

Wolf: Yes. But thanks, Sébastien and Patrick. Thanks for your compliments and... But Patrick, I think it was for sure a very good exercise in the sense of an EURALO internal coordination. It was our first political position paper we ever did to my knowledge and for me it was a good example how EURALO could function even in a more effective way and a more politically oriented way. In this context, I was so pleased about Olivier when he said, well, for any policy consultation on a certain subject, he is prepared to support us on IPv6. So what I see as part of EURALO's future, I would like to have a Board composed of persons who are specialists on different subjects so that we are a group working together as a board but we have kind of an organized work divisions – whenever something is coming up on this issue, that we have competence centres in EURALO and we should use them. And therefore, I was also pleased about what Lutz and you did on DNSSEC and it was very impressing what you did on Saturday afternoon in the first thematic session. I heard a lot of very positive feedbacks from it as I heard a lot of positive feedbacks on the IPv6 session, and this is my idea how best EURALO could function in future and could be more operational and more useful. And therefore, even if it had not immediate impact as you said because the deadlines were already over, I think it was a very useful endeavour.

Any other comments? I don't stress now more on the Board report because two points mentioned in this Board report which are in my eyes standing items are still critical subjects which has to do what I always call [enabling 25:34] environment. We need, besides the practical support we get by the staff, need some better working conditions. When we have a working program and we have a working budget, when we have planning about outreach activities, we also need some financial means on it. But I don't want to discuss this here in detail because this is listed under another agenda item.

I would like to conclude agenda point 3, "Board Report..." Yes, Adam?

Adam: I missed part of the Board report, and this may actually be irrelevant as it was an activity that was in Africa, not in Europe, but it says Adam did something. I helped organize the East African IGF meeting, which is not particularly a EURALO activity, but it may be relevant or it may not – I'm not quite sure. But there you are. I did something.

Wolf: Well, in my eyes it has a certain relevance in the ICANN context because...  
Yes.

Adam: And I spoke on behalf of ICANN at that meeting.

Wolf: Okay. Thank you very much for this additional information, Adam.

Are there any further informations, points...?

Annette: [inaudible 26:56] I didn't write that down.

Adam?: [inaudible]

Annette: [inaudible]

Adam: [So I don't know.]

Annette: So what shall I write, please?

Wolf: Well, Adam helped to organize...

Annette: I didn't write down any names, by the way.

Wolf: Okay.

Annette: I just said, "Meeting, blah-blah-blah," [inaudible 27:17]. I don't... This... In our notes here, we have some more [specifics here]. So I don't write down names but... [overtalking]

Wolf: You can write, "As centuries ago, once again Europe was involved in doing something in Africa."

[group laughs]

Rudi?: I believe it's not politically correct.

Sébastien: [Maybe 27:38].

Wolf: Okay. Okay. Are there any...

Annette: [inaudible] what?

Adam: Ignore it. [inaudible].

Male: Yeah, ignore it.

Annette: Then I ignore it.

Wolf: Okay.

Annette: You have agreement on ignoring it.

Wolf: Okay. It's good to have this information here now. I think this Board...

Annette: [overtalking] ...I don't [inaudible].

Adam: [inaudible] in IGF.

Annette: [Yes, I've]... Okay.

Sébastien: [Anyways], it's IGF, it's Africa, it's...

Annette: "Cooperation, East Africa IGF."

Wolf: Okay. Any more comments rega-...?

Annette: Excuse me.

Wolf: Yeah.

Annette: May I just... I wrote down "Cooperation with East African IGF." Is that fine? "Cooperation"? Adam?

Adam: Fine.

Annette: And I write this down because I think this is helpful as a strategic idea, what could be further activities, because I think of course we are EURALO but networking with other RALOs is really important.

Wolf: Okay. And it could also be mentioned under the EuroDIG activities because it's another examples regional internet governance for us.

So if there are no more comments on the Board report... Yeah?

Annette: Excuse me, I'm so... because I've got this duty to take down the notes, but here is a sentence above, it says "draft." And so I think there should be an

agreement, and before we agree on it, I think we should at least find someone who in point 2, "Other Activities," somehow takes out these question marks and empty brackets before we... you know, so that it really gets a formal paper then.

Wolf: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Thank you very much for this hint, Annette. I suggest we put out the question marks here and we make a simple reference to [the oral 29:56] information at our today's General Assembly. So this will be complementary. "What is not specified in this report can together with the meeting, the General Assembly minutes from Mexico read together," and then it's perfect.

Annette: Okay. [inaudible].

Wolf: Huh? No? Yes, of course. I've seen this by the way many times.

Well, it's now formally spoken very difficult to re-edit the draft and then we have to resubmit it. I would like to ask you, can anybody approve this draft version? If it's approved, it's not a draft version anymore. But the points to other activities should be related to the information we just got now today at this meeting.

Male: [That's okay 31:01].

Wolf: Can anybody agree to this?

Sébastien?: Yeah, fine. Yeah.

Male: Yeah.

Wolf: Are there any objections? Abstentions? Then I take this EURALO Board Report as being approved and we can go further...

Annette: How do you say "einstimmig"? [Non-numerously... 31:24]

Wolf: "Unanimously."

Annette: [laughs] [German – 31:28]. I really have a problem to learn this word. [laughs] Okay. Has b-...

Male: You?

Annette: [laughs] Okay, "...has been..."

Female: Annette... [overtalking]

Male: Yeah, I can...

Annette: "Un-ani-mous-ly." "Un-ani-..." Okay. "Un-ani-..."

Wolf: Yes, it has...

Annette: Wait. "Un-ani-mous-ly." Okay, thank you very much. [laughs]

Male: [overtalking 31:50]

Wolf: It obviously has something to do...

Max?: Have you heard of spellchecking?

Wolf: ...with "animosität," no?

Male: [inaudible]

Annette: [laughs]

Wolf: Okay. The next agenda item, I thought it may be a good idea, the At-Large User Summit is not over yet, but I think a very important part of it we had during the last days. There's still a lot of work to be done but I think it's a good point to have spontaneous review of your impressions, what you found was good so far, what you found was not so good so far. I would like to make a tour de table and having some short comments from everybody, please.

Yes, Annette?

Annette: Before short comments, I really would like to thank two persons here in this room, and that is Sébastien for having the idea and working hard on it, and Wolf who also has been working hard on really setting this whole thing up and with all these backs and forths and shifting of agenda and... and, and, and, and... And I think this has been a whole lot of work, and thanks for the two of you and m-... Yeah.

[group applause]

Annette: I was taking notes and then you could say the questions here.

Sébastien: Thank you, Annette, for your kind words. I think that if it's happened, it's happened because we all together pushed for that very hardly and that at the end we, a lot of us around this table make a lot of work to participate, to take care of one session or another one, to take care of one subject. I think that the European region, we're one of the most involved in the overall program with a lot of people taking care of subgroups and that's... I think, from my point of view, it's because we were able this year to work better, to have EURALO working better, it's allowed us to have more influence in the overall At-Large thinking and organization and especially for this summit. And I am sure that we will continue like that and I would like to say... I will not name all the people, but you know that all of you have made a lot to have this happen today in Mexico. And I would like to say, like Annette, that Wolf, thank you very much because you were really very involved in that organization and it's gone very well.

Well, I will just say a few words on that. I think, from my point of view, the dream was back in Lisbon, but it's more than my dreams. We have very good participation, good involvement of all the participants, and a very good [theme 35:49]. It's a very... It's a little bit too much overload of work because this week will be – it's not yet finished – just crazy. But I am sure that we showed to the overall community that At-Large is here and when people and the Board especially say it's a one-time event, I am quite sure that it will not be the case. ICANN will need us to come back in another summit. And thank you very much.

Wolf: Thank you very much, Sébastien. I would like to fully support what Sébastien said and I think we share a lot of points and feelings about the organization process of the summit. At the end, to me, what I can say so far from the first summit days, it's more than my expectations. I've seen some very impressive sessions on Saturday, the content and the intellectual niveau was excellent, and I think for the outside ALAC world of ICANN or observers, I got some responses even from governmental observers that I think now with this summit ALAC has another standing in the ICANN community, and probably the summit could contribute in a positive way to that.



I also want to include here at this stage Heidi and the staff. The staff was extremely supportive and I would like to particularly mention Heidi who came on board last autumn. So she is rather new, but she stepped in with enthusiasm and she was extremely supporting not only for the summit process, she was also very supportive for EURALO, and I had excellent collaboration with her, that I really appreciated, and I would like to thank Heidi a lot for the work you have done as well.

Heidi: Thank you.

[group applause]

Wolf: At this point, I also would like to say I'm very sorry that Nick cannot be here today with us. As you may have heard, on Saturday already Nick got sick after his arrival here in Mexico City and he had to be hospitalized. And fortunately he could leave hospital this morning?

Heidi: In two hours.

Wolf: Oh, in two hours. But of course he still has to recover, so he cannot just jump in again, but I'm glad that he's doing better, that his temperature is down again, and he is on the way of convalescence and I hope that we have the chance to see him not hardly working but at least to see him over the next days.

Heidi: Yes. He's hopeful that he will be able to join all of us at the closing ceremonies.

Wolf: Okay, this is good news. Thank you very much, Heidi.

[group applause]

Wolf: Now I will start with our initial feedback round on the At-Large Summit. As I said, I would like to make sort of a tour de table, and this time I start to the left with Adam, please.

Adam: I came into this rather late, having joined in November, and also feel I didn't participate particularly much in the organization, mainly because the summit calls were at about 4 or 5 AM and I'm not that devoted – for that, it's Japan time. But I think it's been an exceptional experience. So I think the first thing

is the recognition of the ALSes, and it's important for the future. This is the start of how the ALSes will work and I think where we go from here with hopefully the enthusiasm that will be going forward from the summit is really going to decide whether this At-Large Structure works or does not work. I think it's an extremely difficult structure to make work and if it's going to be a success, then you guys have given it a great foundation. So that's really very important.

And I'd noted down thanks to staff in particular – and I think we do have to write a motion noting that later, and probably a thanks to senior staff for the amount of time that they have devoted in coming to this event. I think hopefully it's a recognition that they find it important and I think we're extremely grateful to them that they've spent the time. Paul Levins in particular, Paul Twomey and so on, I think it's very good that they've come and they've spent... obviously a very busy work for them, and they've spent a lot of time with us. And so that's very much appreciated.

That's probably me done.

Bogdan: Okay, so this is my first ICANN-related event, and I'm positively surprised of the engagement of all the participants. And I think I had a better image of what ALAC stands within the ICANN, at least looking at the declaration in the first day. I particularly appreciated the Saturday and the presentations that were made there. And I do agree with you that we should not stop here and we within EURALO and ALAC should look further on how the ALSes can be involved in the future work and I'm looking forward to what we can adopt as EURALO in this respect. Thank you.

Annette: Excuse me. Did I... Just for the... [cuts out] Did I get that right, that you thought that ALAC had... you thought that ALAC had a better estimation, or how do you say...?

Bogdan: I had a better estimation, a better image on how ALAC stands within the ICANN bodies.

Annette: Yeah. And now you realized there are some problems?

Bogdan: No, and now I realized that we also need to do more in order to strengthen up this position. [laughs]

Annette: You're a born diplomat. Okay, thank you.

Vittorio: Yes, I don't feel very able to give a feedback on the summit, so maybe what I say can be taken as the judgement of an outsider. Actually, maybe it's better if I explain a little why I didn't participate too much, because I... Well, as you know, when I finished my cycle in the ALAC, and I had working in the ALAC for six, seven years, since before it existed, so I did need to take a break from this. Also, the final months were really hard, so I think at that point in time I wanted to actually stop to attend the ALAC and ICANN meetings. But then some people in the Board insisted that I be on the ALAC Review Working Group, and one of the parts of that was not to be involved too much inside the ALAC and the EURALO. So even though I didn't participate almost at all in the last year... And to be honest, if I go back previous agenda item, I'd say that one year ago I almost gave the EURALO for lost in the sense that nothing had happened for one year and at times that we even had Board meetings that failed, and so I almost thought that we would never go anywhere. And instead I'm really very impressed about what you have been doing and about especially the ability of building the group. So overcoming the differences which in Lisbon were huge, which people wouldn't almost talk to each other, and then now it's... I do see a group, people from the former two groups really working together.

And so also one of the things I thought is that maybe old people like me, the best thing they could do to help these forces to happen was not to be around, so not to be in the middle of this process.

[group laughs]

Vittorio: So all this, the sum of all these factors led me not to participate very much in the organization of this summit and not even in the sessions. Also because I am still on the Review Working Group which hopefully is ending the work in the next month or so – we just have to collect the final round of comments and finalize the report. But during this ICANN meeting I'm still on the Review Working Group, so I'd better... have to keep some distance from the ALAC.

So after all of this premise, I'd say that what I've seen is very encouraging. I mean, in the last months, I was involved in the summit by the ALS point of view, so I just was receiving questionnaires and polls, requests for [providers

45:23], this and that information, and it was somewhat frustrating because it seemed that we were getting questionnaire after questionnaire, and so it all looked very bureaucratic and...

So I was uncertain about the outcome, but what I've seen instead is very good. I think that even just the opportunity to meet each other, talk to each other was maybe the best thing. So apart from any substantial outcome that you might get in the sessions, just the opportunity to finally meet each other, a hundred organizations from all over the world, was really worth the effort.

So maybe I would have some [more 45:59]... Maybe, yes, the first session – on Saturday, was it? – was a bit too maybe top-down in the sense that it was not real discussion but a long series of presentations, and I understand that's necessary for new people. But apart from these minor things, I think in the end it's going to be a success. So I would actually support repeating these, and so I think I'll tell that to senior ICANN management and hopefully the Board will support the idea.

Wolf: [cuts out] ...much, Vittorio.

Before I now give over Annette, I forgot a point I think I communicated at the beginning of the week via the board list. This was a motion brought up on Sunday by Max. He raised four points, and one of his four points was that we introduce a motion and we discuss or pass a motion asking for a repetition of a successful summit. We have afterwards to discuss about the modalities at the end of this tour de table, but I think we should handle... we should treat this point under this agenda item. I forgot at the introduction.

Annette, please.

Annette: [inaudible – barely audible 47:30]

Wolf: Max made a motion at the end of Sunday's ALAC meeting, and he suggested that this summit shouldn't be a unique event but there should be a continuation in it. And if somebody can perhaps look on the wording... Max, you should know as you are the author of it.

Okay. Annette, please.

Annette: Well, I share Vittorio's feeling concerning the first day in the morning. I have to tell I was really afraid this summit won't fly. I felt like it was good that we had that such a lot of staff and Board came and shared their time with us, but on the other hand I felt, "Wow, they are not really at all focussing on internet users' issues. They are just, you know, saying what their position is, what is policy making, what is security, blah-blah, but they never said, 'And this is interesting to you because of...'" So they never really... there was no exchange between the users and these functions. And maybe this is a typical thing and this is something we have to work on. So the next, if there is some continuation there, I would really urge to have a closer cooperation in the preparation together with staff, so that staff also focuses on internet users' interests while they present their work. That's for the first part.

And the other parts, I was really delighted. I thought, "Wow, this is exactly need, that we..." Of course, you can always do something better, but to have panels on certain issues. I would love... I think it was really bad that we didn't have the come-together in the evening of Saturday. Actually, it would have even been better to have it on Friday, like a warm-up right in the beginning so that you get to know the people before you start discussing. So I thought it was a pity that we had the coming together at the end so that you get to know the people after spending the two days with them. So I thought that was a pity. But I also enjoyed... I was only in one working group of course, so I don't know about the others, but I heard just other people say that they also worked really hard. And so I've really appreciated it and I think it's a good start.

Annette: [inaudible 50:38]?

[group laughs]

Patrick?: I hope you know what you said.

Wolf: Max, please.

Max: Well, as you know, it is my first ICANN, so I have a very steep learning curve and it's really interesting. Thanks for everybody who gives me insight and who I have the chance to learn from.

I think I brought up most of the points, the observations that I made regarding the working and, yeah, procedures that are going on here. Maybe at this point

just to restate that I have the feeling that [Cal Auerbach 51:18] really brought it to the point when he said, you know, it's about power and it's nice to have an organization we are discussing here, but it's really about having an impact and finding ways of institutionalizing and organizing the procedures of how we advise and what is happen with the advice, and in that way I really appreciate the proposal, the idea – I think it's happening – that we are coming up with a final declaration from this summit, because that is a result and we can say, "Okay, this is..." and can always point back to it and say, "This is what we have been working on, why we were here."

And in that sense I'm actually a little bit surprised that we have to come up with it during the summit and that it has not been part of the organization and the people who, you know, yeah, started to think about all this.

Wolf: Okay, thanks.

Annette: Excuse me. A little break for me. What was your last thing here?

Max: I think it's okay if you just put that I really appreciate that we have a final declaration.

Annette: Okay.

Patrick: My first reaction would be to say that I have met many people over these last days and many people who were attending an ICANN meeting for the first time and who will go back home. First of all, they will better understand what this organization is trying to do and this will allow them to better contribute to the processes. I understand that a few are an ALS and the internet may not be your main subject of interest because you cover other issues, like freedom of expression in general, for example. I understand it's quite difficult to get involved in ICANN issues when you have to do it with very remotely from the organization. So being able to participate in face-to-face meetings with other people allows you to be better understand the context.

Of course I'm not talking about myself in this case because I think I'm a seasoned ICANNer, but I think that it was very useful. Also, I think that for future work, knowing and having had a face-to-face contact with other people will allow them to better work even if it's by e-mail or through wikis or through teleconferences. So if there was only one thing I would find as a good

outcome of this ALAC summit, is the [idea 54:16] that it will allow to better involve all ALSes.

But the other thing, important thing I think is that the working groups as far as I have heard... And I can only talk about mine, which was about DNS security issues, and I'm quite pleased of the outcome of this working group. And in that sense too, as you said, Wolf, earlier, I think that in the end it will give the ALAC a better standing within the general ICANN process. And also reactions I've heard from other participants who were not ALAC or At-Large members were very positive, and they were even impressed that we had been doing so much work and they were also impressed by the preparation work. And I think that's important because starting a meeting with a blank sheet of paper is not very useful. There is a lot of preparation work that has to be done, and in this case it was done by At-Large and ALSes and we have a great help from the staff, and I think you were right to thank the staff for their commitment on this. And obviously if we end up with a successful summit, I think it will be much, much easier in the future to convince the Board that we should try a second experience, until it becomes a habit.

Wolf: Thank you very much... [cuts out]

Max: I just wanted to add a point. As we're all looking forward to trying to organize some similar event again, the idea, everything is great. I was trying to or I am organizing a workshop in the evening. Just for the future, let's try to give a little bit more space before the recognition of the workshop. I think I got a message three days before I went [into the plane 56:49] and then they rescheduled the workshop. So just to plan everything with a little bit more space in between. Thanks.

Wolf: Yeah, okay. Thus noted.

There is Sébastien and I – I think we commented already our parts, we contributed already. So I give over to Lutz.

Lutz: Because everybody had said so much, and so much positive, I would like to add some negative points. First to all the ALSes here, I'm not satisfied with the preparation.

Wolf: With...?

Lutz: With the preparation before. We really do need your help and do need your participation in order to not start with a blank sheet in these summit papers here. And the other point is I'm a little bit... I might be not... understand how ICANN staff work. So now we have a background paper which was never present beforehand from the ICANN staff, it's translated to many languages, and the paper we prepared and discussed before are not translated. I might be get it wrong, but I'd like to add it here.

Lutz?: Background paper.

Wolf: Background...

Lutz?: Background.

Wolf: Background papers. Lutz, may I ask you, just to get it clear... I also would have wished having more of EURALO ALSes here in Mexico and here around the table. We sent out several mails. I reminded repeatedly some of the ALSes who are not here, "Please be aware there are deadlines for the travel confirmations. If you are not confirming in time, you are not supposed to travel to Mexico anymore," etc., and we did quite a lot to encourage as many ALSes as possible, but finally I cannot force them to respond to deadlines. [cuts out 10 sec]

Christopher: Well, basically I agree with what notably Adam has already said, but the main problem is the lack of infrastructure. We've all got personal computers here but it seems there's not one reliable computer available for editing and finalizing documents. I think we ought to have had far more preparation on texts. Some people prepared texts in advance of the meeting, but I'm seriously concerned that by between now and the end of today, it will be quite impossible to finalize a respectable document that will be taken seriously by ICANN.

Annette: Wait, wait, wait, wait. What shall I write down? [inaudible 1:00:24]

Christopher: Well, I think... I mean, it's nice to have the staff support, but I think actually the whole editing of the final document should be done by the staff with a proper desktop attached to a printer in the room. This business is impossible.

Annette: Oh, okay.



Heidi?: [inaudible]

Wolf: Wolfgang, please.

Wolfgang: Okay, I think there are various layers, and if you look from various positions to the summit, you can have different and even conflicting conclusions. Just to comment on what Christopher has said, it's indeed, you know, a weak point and it shows that ALAC has still to learn something and to get more [mature 1:01:15] – so that means to have really professional drafting process in place. And so this has to be learned. So these are lessons learned also for the future.

My general remark to the summit is that I put it into the historical context and I think a lot of us here went through the many, many years starting with the elections in 2000. And so I see this as a huge step in the right direction, after we went some steps backwards in the year 2001 and 2002. So I think I would say we are on the road, but we are still in the rain. So that means it's a step forward, but we have to build on it. And insofar I see it as a process, so not as a single event, and while I'm realistic and do not expect that we will have an annual summit, but I think something as a biannual or every three years, you know, would be rather realistic. And in between, we could have what we discussed also in our workshop, to have regional meeting for the RALOs linked to the ICANN meeting. So I think this would be, could be organized much more easier, would not need so much money to have a regional one-day summit linked to the regular ICANN meeting. And for us, this would mean that we would have the next European meaning let's say At-Large Summit in October 2010. So I think this is a timeline and then we could prepare for 2011 or 2012, the next global summit. Thank you.

Annette: Did I get that right? The regional meetings, you said it's a one-day meeting, it's connected to an ICANN meeting? Or what...

Wolfgang?: [It's a proposal 1:03:11].

Wolf: Could be connected with...

Annette: Okay.

Wolf: Okay, Tommi, it's you.

Tommi: [inaudible]

Wolf: Yeah. Would you like to comment, to tell us about your first impressions about the summit?

Tommi: Well, okay. Let me start by saying that ISOC Finland, even if we were one of the first ALSes, we haven't been very active lately and I admit to that. And coming here has I must say restored some of the belief I kind of have lost in this whole system during these years, because for a long time it seemed that nothing was happening. And now it seems that things are happening again and I'll try to be more active in the future.

Wolf: Okay, thank you very much. Heike, please.

Heike: Yeah, many of the points have been raised before. I think so far it looks like it's going to be a good thing, a success, and that's really pleasant, I think. So my comments are really more on the organizational side. For instance, preparing the statements is of course a good thing and I'm not sure that all the delays that we've experienced were really necessary. I mean, we had two surveys, what we wanted to do. So some of us knew before what we wanted to work on and it would have been much nice to have been able to work on it. For instance, I'm concerned with the gTLD process and it's only thanks to Patrick that we got the document out, basically. And we could have started much earlier, we didn't really need the second survey I think to know that this is an important topic. So this delay was completely unnecessary.

Equally, I have to agree with Max that for people who wanted to offer a session, it was really, really nerve-wracking to wait until three days before the summit or four days before the summit to get the okay, then get back to the potential panelists and tell them, "And by the way, we're on, so save the date." [laughs] So that definitely needs to be improved. That's not a good way to organize it.

And finally I would like to agree with what Annette said. I think it's not such a good idea to have the first day spent in lecture hall situations. I think it would be really good on the first day where people meet that potentially haven't met before, and that's the point of the summit, to get them more of a chance to mingle, to get to know them, and then maybe on the second day have all the

presentation of the high officials and really ask them, as Annette already said, to relate their usual spiel more closely to what At-Large might be about.

Wolf: Thanks, Heike. Dragoslava?

Dragoslava: I was very positively impressed by this summit, because it gave me the impression that things are starting to move. And this is the beginning of the right way, this is the path that... Even not the whole way, we have lots to do more, but this is the direction that we should move. I captured something important, I think Annette said it, that it is important ICANN to show to the users why they should be interested in those things. And not only it is because in some ALSes in some communities, we still have problems in activating end users to participate, we still have problems to interest them in those issues— because everything is work, everything is fine, so just users are using and not participating. And I think it's important that we find a way to prepare something like resumes, like briefings, short, structured in user-friendly language in order to make users understand why they should participate.

Wolf: Okay, thanks. Last but not least, Rudi.

Rudi: Well, being the last, I will try to be short. The summit for me is an experience in which I got a lot of new friends. Having so many ALSes present here and being in a work group where you have a diversity of culture and gender even, it's interesting to see that we can work together even without knowing each other.

Second point is that for me the summit shows that, and shows to ICANN that even users can organize something which is at the level that ICANN tries to produce. Nevertheless, they should try to listen to the user instead of commenting the user.

And last reaction is that indeed the organizing thematic sessions seems to be a very, very difficult thing. I just got yesterday in the afternoon, and that's the reason why all of a sudden I was a [wanton 1:08:54] person in the room, hunting for me, they decided to even change the hour of the thematic session. That's not a difficulty as long as you are able to produce something in the working group which should be finished at 4:30. Otherwise you cannot start your session at the time which is desired. Nevertheless, I have been pleased

with the fact that for my session I got a lot of attention of ICANN. It seems that four of the ICANN staff are going to participate in the session, which means that I have put a finger on a topic which is also of concern of ICANN.

Wolf: Thank you very much for these feedbacks and the diversity of impressions and ideas – all, including the critical ones of course. I think there's always an opportunity to progress and to learn for the future. I got... I understood an agreement in all of the feedbacks that having another user summit, or as Wolfgang said it or as I feel it, for me this the closing of the summit on Thursday, it's not the end of an event, I hope it's the beginning of a process. And therefore for this process it would be good to have more summits in future. I hope in the meantime ALAC will enlarge, the RALOs will double – not the RALOs in numbers but the numbers of ALSes in the particular regions. I see many blind spots so far in Europe. We are not very present unfortunately in Scandinavia, we are not in Britain and in Ireland. We could be better in the south and even in the east. And therefore I take this as more or less a motion of this General Assembly to suggest to have more of these summits in future. About the time settings, two or three years, this can still be discussed.

Adam, please.

Adam: I was going to ask for five minutes under “Any Other Business” to try and explain why I am an ALAC member, and it actually is relevant to this part of the meeting. So if you would allow me to... Why I applied, why I wished to become one, and if you'll allow me to do it now rather than it may be relevant.

Wolf: Yeah.

Adam: I've been involved in ICANN for quite a long time. I did things like [studied 1:12:21] the At-Large election that originally created, you know, the At-Large Board members and I believed very strongly at that time in the election process. Over a period of time, I came to a conclusion that I was wrong in that particular opinion and that the work that Vittorio and others were doing to create this ALAC structure was one that was important and worth considering to try and make work. And as I worked on the Nominating Committee for four years, I got the impression that it wasn't particularly working. It's a very, very complicated structure where we have the ICANN community meeting in the Sheraton Hotel, for example, and they want input from users. They need input

from users if they're going to be a multi-stakeholder organization, and to get that input, it has to go through us, the ALAC, as ALAC members; it has to come through the RALO, this particular meeting format; it has to come through the ALS; and then somehow it has to be information that is from and to users. And this is an extremely complicated and difficult process to make work. And I noted that when ALSes accepted to become an ALS, there is a minimum criteria for becoming an ALS and it says, for example, "Commit to supporting individual users' informed participation in ICANN by distributing to individual constituent members information on relevant ICANN activities and issues offering internet-based mechanisms to enable discussions of one..." And so on and so forth.

And I don't think that is happening anywhere, and the reason I joined was... why I wanted to become an ALAC member was to see if we could help that happen. And the first thing that has to happen is ICANN has to start producing information in simple, digestible formats that is accessible to users who are not necessarily experts in ICANN issues or particularly interested in every little sub-issue of a Generic Top-Level Domain. And that is something that as an ALAC member I will do my best to ensure happens, and I hope other people will support.

But it does mean that ALSes have to at some point fulfill their part of this bargain, which is to have a mechanism of making this information available once it's provided. And I don't know that there is any ALS that has a webpage – and please correct me if I'm wrong – that has a webpage that says, "We are an ALS. This is how you participate. This is the information we get from ICANN." I'm not sure that any of the hundred-plus has one at the moment, and I could be wrong. I know that people like Patrick blog extensively about it and this is... and we actually created a statement out of Patrick's blogging of the gTLD. So this is very important.

And I think this is relevant to the summit, because if we don't start making this system work, I don't think we can justify a second summit. It can't justify a hun-... you know, a million or half a million dollars without this process of information flowing from the user to the ICANN community working, and being shown to work in a transparent way, an accountable way. Otherwise what are we really? We have to have... You know, we're trying to influence policy, we're trying to dictate to... we're trying to set policy, so that information flow

has to be made to work. Perhaps it won't work, in which case we have to recommend a new way for users to be represented – not cancel user representation but find a way to actually make sure that users can participate in ICANN.

So that's sort of my interest...

Male: [inaudible 1:16:02]

Adam: Yeah. So that's kind of my interest in why I wanted to join the ALAC, and I think it's very relevant to the summit, because this is a good start for people to... you know, for "Let's try and find a way of getting digestible, understandable information to the ALSes and hopefully for the ALSes to become more engaged in this very convoluted and difficult process of getting contributions back to the Board."

It also relates to things like should the ALAC have two Board members? It's all about accountability/transparency, and it works both ways – it has to come from the user up to the ALAC, up to the ICANN community, and the ICANN community back to the user.

So I just wanted to sort of try and explain why I'm here and what I want to do in my two years as an ALAC member.

Wolf: Okay, thanks a lot, Adam. Bogdan?

Bogdan: Thank you very much, Adam, for the comment. It's actually very good. I think of course we all need to do more in our countries, maybe in our own language. We do have a little bit of information that we are members of ALAC and they can become involved, and in some events we also mention that, so if anyone wants to become they are welcome to join us. Of course, we also need support in ICANN in regards of the... it could be a one-page paper.

But coming back to the discussion of the ALSes, I don't know if we will discuss later about how to get new members. Okay. And then I'll intervene then. Thank you.

Wolf: We're here now for almost two hours. I would suggest let's do a break. I have seen there are several comments to what Adam said. This perfectly fits to me under agenda item 7, "Discussion and approval of the EURALO working

program and projects 2009-2010.” The whole outreach aspect, the whole question how better to involve existing ALSes and to attract new ALSes is part of this discussion under agenda item 7.

Max, Patrick, does anybody agree we just make a break here after agenda item 4? I would like to have your formal approval for the motion of asking for...

Male: A break.

[group laughs]

Wolf: ...this summit is a beginning of a process and there should be new summits considered, planned in future. Is there general approval on this point?

Yeah, Wolfgang.

Wolfgang: Because I also proposed it, I would add under the condition that has been specified by Adam. And I would like to continue the debate which was raised by Adam because that's very important, it belongs to our homework but I agree we can discuss this after the coffee break.

Wolf: Okay.

Annette: Coffee break sounds great for me and I will be pleased if someone else [could 1:19:19] [inaudible].

Wolf: Okay. Then we make a short break of 15 minutes here, and afterwards we continue and I will see whether the briefing on current policy issues, whether people will be available at then. Huh?

Sébastien: Okay.

Wolf: Okay, thank you so far...

**[end of EURALO-GA-03-03-2009-EN-2, beginning of EURALO-GA-03-03-2009-EN-3]**

Wolf: ...Switzerland was a host country for the first summit in 2003. After the Tunis summit in 2005, when the IGF was set up, Markus was chosen being the Executive Secretary for the Internet Governance Forum. And many of you have followed the ongoing process of the IGF and that IGF had in the

meantime three very successful annual meetings already, and I think it's thanks to Markus Kummer that the IGF became an institution in the meantime.

Markus is Swiss. He's almost my compatriot. He's therefore physically part of EURALO.

Sébastien?: Yeah!

[group applause]

Wolf: That was a reason why I asked him please come in and feel welcome.

Annette: Alright.

[group applause]

Male: [Welcome 01:22] [inaudible].

Markus: Thank you, and many thanks for your warm welcome. Good morning. It's a pleasure for me to be here. And thanks for your introduction, Wolf. Indeed we have a long history together, looking back to the days when we were member of the Swiss delegation in WSIS. But if you say that the IGF is thanks to me, I think then it's greatly exaggerated. I think it's a success thanks to all the participants, and many of you here were very active participants in the IGF. It's a success of the concept of a multi-stakeholder platform for policy dialogue where stakeholders participate as equals and we discuss outside of silos the issues where everybody who has an interest in this particular issue can participate. So I think time was ready and ripe for this concept and it is also interesting to see that significant actors such as the European Union... you may have heard in a statement they read in Geneva, at the consultations last week actually, went a step further in saying that the model of this multi-stakeholder dialogue should be used also for other policy areas.

But I mean this group and many individuals here have been so actively involved, so I don't think I need to give a long introduction into the IGF. I think you may be more interested to have an interactive session a bit, questions you may have and I answer, and maybe we can also discuss a little bit the contribution... As you know, there is... a European initiative is already afoot with EuroDIG, European Dialogue on Internet Governance, and there is an



overlap of actors. Around the table, they have some very active members also in this European initiative.

We have had a meeting last week and we have posted a summary report of the MAG meeting, it's up on our website. Just maybe if I can briefly summarize, we basically are planning to build on the format we used last year, but differentiate also a little bit based on the recognition that different issues need to be dealt with differently. There are issues where we clearly don't have a common understanding, when there's no convergence of views, and these issues mainly relate to critical internet resources which for some equates numbering and addressing. And there, there's no chance of agreeing on anything. [laughs] There is a clash of different opinions, and with these issues we felt it would be best if we just provide an open microphone session where people can say what they think, can voice their opinions, can voice their concerns – a real town hall's meeting.

There are other issues where there are elements of convergence on how to deal with certain areas, whereas on other areas there may be a need for a further deepening. And these relate to security and openness, where we have a better understanding of who does what and what the issues are, but clearly there is need for further exploration of these issues and also the question of balance between security and openness. I think this is a very elusive goal and the discussion on this will go on for many years to come, and if ever we find a conclusion, I would be surprised. It's like in the offline world, it's very difficult to find the right balance between security and privacy, for instance, but these are important issues.

Then there are other areas such as access where there is a broad convergence of use in some areas, whereas in other areas there may be a need for a further exploration. Issues related to the use of mobile devices or satellite for instance need further explorations. Other issues, on the importance of setting up an IXP, everybody agrees, so this needs to be dealt with differently. It's more a question of exchanging... sharing best practices and showing models that work, learned lessons from models that did not work. So there's a hybrid kind of format for these issues.

And lastly, other issues where there is no disagreement at all on the principles – let's say as an example accessibility for people with disabilities,

everybody agrees on the importance of the issue – and the standards, we don't need to elaborate them, they are there already, so it's more a question of raising awareness. This will be an issue which will be given to be dealt with by the various interested groups, dynamic coalitions and so forth in the roundtable format, and then they can come out and present what are the best practices solutions. It's a bit... The notion that came up then, it's not an output by the IGF but an output from or at the IGF, that people can take something home that was discussed there.

Another of those issues is protection of children. Again, there's agreement on the principals, although the Devil may be in the detail in this particular area, but we will deal with it in a similar way – invite people to prepare it at the roundtable and present the findings to the main session.

So these are the innovations, and then also at Sharm El Sheikh we have to fulfill the mandate which calls on the Secretary-General to hold formal consultations with Forum participants to discuss the desirability of the continuation of the Forum. That will have to take place in Sharm El Sheikh. Based on these consultations, the Secretary-General will make recommendations to the member states and the final decisions will then be taken by the General Assembly in 2010. But we will prepare all this as usual with online consultations. We will prepare rolling documents as an input into the meetings. And of course I would strongly welcome you also to make proposals, to give your input.

We set the first deadline 15th of April for proposing workshops. This time we suggest a more hybrid format. We explain this in the Summary Record. You don't have to present a fully-fledged proposal, just abstract of a theme you would like to be dealt with, and then we see on these bases... It's easier maybe to merge... If people invest too much in a proposal, we found they are very reluctant then to give up the proposals they had worked on.

So this would be my introduction and I would be happy to answer questions you may have.

Wolf: Thank you very much, Markus, for your explications. We discussed already earlier in this meeting when we had the Board Report of our activities over the last months, EURALO was an active part of the first European Dialogue on

Internet Governance, and we will continue I guess in the ongoing process. The next EuroDIG as I said before is foreseen for September... 14th-15th of September in Geneva. It will be at the same time as the IGF consultation...

Markus: Back to back.

Wolf: ...back to back, so to say, which gives a good opportunity for EuroDIG attendances also to participate in the IGF consultation, which will be the last consultations before Sharm El Sheikh. And I think it's a marvellous opportunity for exchange of views and ideas, etc., and I would like to encourage EURALO members. I know that some of them have been active in the IGF process as well. I see at least five here around... five to six around the table. And I think this exchange is a good opportunity to talk and discuss about the future of internet governance, whether it's ICANN-specific or it's overlapping, because a lot of those subjects are not specific merely IGF or not specific merely ICANN as it was seen still two years ago. I think we have learned in the meantime that there are a lot of overlapping concerns.

Are there any questions...

Male: [Just her... 11:45]

Wolf: ...to Markus?

Male: [inaudible]

Male: [inaudible] [you switch this off].

Male: [laughs]

Annette: From abroad.

Male: Yeah, [from]... Okay.

Wolf: Ah, this is remote participation. Okay, now I understand.

[group laughs]

Annette: Wolf, then could you just please reformulate the question just given to you by a computer?

[group laughs]

Female: Computer-generated question.

[group laughs]

Wolf: Besides computer-generated questions, are there any other questions, physical questions here from you? Yes, Sébastien.

Sébastien: Thank you. and thank you, Markus, for coming here to talk with us. I know that you were not yet arrived on Saturday when we start the summit of the ALSes, but I would like to know if you have any feedback on what's happened on this summit... not what's happened, but what are the feedback you get and if it could help or change the way ICANN is seen within the IGF process?

Markus: Sorry, I have not... I'm not able to answer to this question because I have not had any feedback and I don't have sufficient information to have an opinion.

Sébastien: That's okay.

Wolf: Yes, Max.

Max: As an active participant in the IGF and of the fact that now the evaluation has started, can you maybe point us to initiatives, texts that we can endorse or express our support for the institution as such? Or where is the debate happening, how to get into the debate and support the continuation?

Markus: Well, we'll kick-start the process by asking for contributions, and we have... Well, it's a bit maybe complicated, but I read out a series of questions at the consultations last week and our idea is to post these questions. We are circulating them in the context of the MAG just to see whether there are additional questions we should ask.

I mean, again these questions are not supposed to be a straitjacket that everybody has to ask the questions, but it's interesting. I read the other feedback from within the MAG. One of them was the notion of impact has come up before, has the IGF had any impact, direct or indirect? Now one MAG member said, "Well, we really don't have time or whatever for an impact assessment," but that's not the idea. It's not supposed to be an impact assessment in the sense you do of an assessment of a technical cooperation

project. It's more the question has it actually led to anything, the IGF? Has it induced any changes? I think it has already when you look at the various national and regional IGFs. There are initiatives, multi-stakeholder initiatives that would not have taken place without the IGF. It's [most then 15:26] meant to be in that sense.

There are the more legalistically minded who would like to go through each of the elements of the mandate, to tick a box, "Mandate fulfilled? Yes or no." This is one approach we can't take. Others however wanted to look more at the broader picture. Has it induced anything? But again, we are very open and anybody can make a contribution, whatever that will be – you can answer the questions but you can also write your own paper and we will post all of it.

If you look at the mandate, we are not called on to make an evaluation as such. All it says, the mandate, is formal consultations need to take place with Forum participants. It implies of course that Forum participants will also make their own evaluations so they can form their own opinion, but it's not required that we go through a lengthy formal process.

I did have this offer from infoDev. I had proposed this. infoDev offered to make such an outside assessment. I would have welcomed it as it would have made life much easier in a sense – we would have had something that looked objective – but there was very strong resistance against that, and I remember last week the Brazilian, for instance, he said we should not make life too complicated for ourselves. [laughs] Just have these consultations and he took at as a foregone conclusion that the answer would be yes. However, I'm a little bit prudent – you should never assume and you should never take any foregone conclusions, and certainly it makes sense to prepare these consultations at the IGF seriously. We don't want the Sharm El Sheikh meeting to turn into an inward-looking meeting where you just discuss IGF, yes or no. [Those, our 17:44] Egyptian hosts don't want that, they want to have their own meeting that discuss the substance, so I think we will need to prepare it, but we will do it as always based on the input that comes and we will post this input, we will synthesize and summarize these papers, and we will discuss them and we will develop a rolling document that will then go into the Sharm El Sheikh meeting and participants can comment on that. And I think we all agree there is always room for improvement. I mean, I would be

very surprised if people just say, “Yes, it should continue,” full stop. People have all sorts of ideas, what should be improved and changed.

Wolf: [Yes 18:32].

Max: Maybe one short question in the relation with ICANN, and I guess it would be more your personal interpretation rather than an official statement, but do you see the IGF as encompassing the topics of ICANN and as such, you know, being an umbrella institution in that sense for all the topics of internet governance, or does it makes sense to have, you know, sort of clarify “This is what ICANN deals with, this is what the IGF deals with,” to separate these two points?

Markus: Well, I think the way the IGF has developed, it seems clear that no issue is off the agenda. We discuss anything that also dealt with by other institutions – be that ICANN, be that the ITU, be that UNESCO. But we do this in a different way. We are not operational, we don’t have any management task, and also we bring different people into this discussion. You don’t have, for instance, Amnesty International participating in an ICANN discussion, but you have groups like Amnesty International that will participate in an IGF discussion. So some people may say this is overlap, but I don’t think so. It’s not a functional overlap. It’s an overlap maybe in some of the themes, but the way it’s dealt with as a multi-stakeholder forum for policy dialogue – [coughs] excuse me – it’s different than it’s dealt with in the other organizations.

Wolfgang: I just want to make a comment. I think both ICANN and the IGF are laboratories. Both platforms are moving into a new, still uncharted territory and trying to explore how global challenges of the 21st century can be managed in a new way which goes beyond traditional policymaking which we know from the 20th century. The difference is that ICANN is a microcosm, the IGF is a macrocosm. So that means ICANN has a very narrow mandate, the IGF has a broad mandate based on the broad definition which came from the Working Group on Internet Governance. And the problem is, I think... what I see – and this brings us back to the discussion which was started by Adam a little bit earlier – the IGF, as ICANN, is as good as the participants are. And we have now individual users are important participants in both processes. And insofar, you know, if they and their organizations like the At-Large Structures and the RALOs make their homework, they can make a

contribution, and insofar, you know, this has to go back to us and we have to rethink, you know, what we can do. I will not quote John F. Kennedy, who said, you know, "Do not ask what your country can do for you but what you can do for the IGF and ICANN." But I think this is really the challenge and we have to follow this, and we have to our homework first because we come... if we're asking for rights, we have to discuss also our duties.

Wolf: Thank you very much for this comment. Adam, please.

Adam: [cuts out] ...value of the IGF and I think the amazing thing that it's achieved is that it's spreading this notion of multi-stakeholderism out, and you see it sort of... little tendrils of it or links of it going into all kinds of organizations, and it's really important.

About the organization of the next meeting, going back to Hyderabad and how that was organized, it was almost a user-generated conference in the sense that, you know, there was a call for workshops and all these proposals were accepted and you could put on a workshop or another type of meeting. And then from those workshop proposals, people were invited to merge those proposals into the main sessions. And so you see this... You know, of the course the Advisory Group and the Secretariat did an enormous amount of work coordinating this, but this is an international conference, 1200-1300 people, ministers, CEOs, under the UN flag, but almost a user-generated, Web 2... you know, whatever, 2.0, silly comment you make. But, you know, it's an astonishing achievement that this international meeting is created by the people who wish to participate in it, and it's a real sign of its value as well that people are willing to put in those kinds of efforts and contributions. And I'm just wondering if that will be retained under the sort of structures that the MAG or you worked on in Geneva last week, because that would be... you know, I thought that was a great achievement for the IGF.

So that's one sort of comment. How would you like regional activities and national activities to be taken into the IGF? That would be... You know, how do you expect them to be involved in the IGF? That would be another question.

And then a personal sort of observation is I'm concerned that the JPA, if the United States government does not release ICANN, will put a terrible cloud

over the meeting taking place in Egypt, well, perhaps 4-6 weeks later. And I don't know how we would get around that, but it would be... you know, you can just imagine the reaction if ICANN is retained under the Department of Commerce's – whatever we call it – oversight or control. Then the meeting and IGF would be clouded. And it's a difficult thing for you to comment on, but I just wanted to make that point.

Wolf: Markus? [laughs]

Markus: Well, last one first. Then people would shout, I think. But you could also take the other view – you know, it would create additional interest. [laughs] But I'm not that particularly concerned because in that area, I think... And Hyderabad showed we can actually talk about difficult issues in the IGF context. So whatever happens with the JPA, yes, people will discuss it without any doubt, but I don't think it will take over. You know, there is enough sufficient interest on other issues – protection of children, multilingualism, accessibility, whatever – where people are willing to drive their agenda and they're not that concerned about the JPA. Some people are, some others are not.

I very much share your assessment that the... I know there are different views. Some said last year it was too workshop-driven, the agenda. I take the view that it precisely provided value to the meeting. It is concerns that come in a very bottom-up, user-generated as you put it, and they're not thought about it in a central secretariat or MAG. No, they're just put forward.

There are issues – sustainable development, climate change, accessibility for people with disabilities, protection of children – that came bottom-up into the meeting, and we hope very much that the way we are doing it provides the same input, that they will maybe redefine the agenda a little bit, certainly set priorities within the agenda, and that based on the input we get we can then also bring some stakeholder groups together, maybe create roundtables on similar issues where there's a certain amount of convergence of great, bigger workshops, but also influence the main themes of the main session. So it's certainly our intention to make most possible use of what comes in in a bottom-up way.

Wolf: [cuts out] ...thanks a lot, Markus.



I think we now have to continue with our regular agenda again. I have the pleasure now to welcome Mr. David Giza, who is Senior Director, Contractual Compliance, and he will help us to talk about current ICANN policy issues. Can you please introduce yourself again with a few more words?

David: I will. And then I do have a presentation on my data stick... [overtalking 27:22]

Sébastien?: I can put it on the [inaudible].

David: Yeah.

Wolf: Can you arrange for this, Lutz?

Lutz?: I'll try it.

David?: [overtalking]

Wolf: And you take please my place.

Adam?: [The food's taking] [inaudible].

Male: [inaudible]

Wolf: Yeah.

Male: [inaudible]

Lutz?: [German – 27:51 to 27:58]

Male: [German]

Lutz?: So we do not have [it].

Male: The [function 8?]

Lutz?: Umm-hmm.

David: That's this one right here.

Lutz?: This one?

David: Yeah.

Male: [inaudible 28:13]

Male: I need to put on [this] [inaudible].

Male: [laughs]

Male: Umm-hmm.

Male: [inaudible 28:35]

David?: Oh, there it is. So we might just need to dim the lights over that so we can see.

Lutz?: It doesn't matter, [inaudible].

David: Thank you. Just run the slides [inaudible].

Male: [inaudible 28:49]

David: [laughs]

Male: [So it's used].

David: That's good. Thank you. Thank you. Okay. Alright.

Greetings to everyone. I am David Giza, the new Senior Director of Contractual Compliance for ICANN. I joined ICANN four months ago in this strategic role, and I want to give you a little bit of my background and then present a short presentation around the current activities that the Contractual Compliance department is engaged in.

I am a corporate attorney by training, having practiced law for almost 24 years, but in the last 10 years I have worked as an ethics and compliance professional, most recently spending approximately two to two and a half years with Hewlett-Packard in Palo Alto, California, as their Director of Global Compliance. And in that position, I was responsible for global contractual compliance with Hewlett-Packard's suppliers, with its customers as well as contracts with various government entities both in the US as well as abroad. And I believe that work along with my prior work as a chief ethics and compliance officer at Snap-on Tools... And for those of you who enjoy tools, I was there for about five years and actually constructed Snap-on's ethics and

compliance and program in order to respond to recent US laws such as Sarbanes-Oxley and other changes in the American legal system.

Joining ICANN in November, my role is really first and foremost a strategic role, and so I want to share with you...

Male: Take this one.

David: Okay.

Annette: Excuse me.

David: Umm-hmm.

Annette: I am taking minutes here and I would like first again to know your name. I didn't get it right.

David: Oh, sure.

Annette: And...

Wolf: I'll show you.

Annette: Oh, here it is.

David: Umm-hmm.

Annette: How wonderful. And I assume that we can have your presentation...

Lutz?: I already got it.

[group laughs]

David: The answer is yes.

Annette: And this is so wonderful for me because then I don't have to continue, so I will just write available. Wonderful, thank you so much.

David: There are no secrets in contractual compliance.

Male: Yeah.

David: Yes, thank you. [laughs]

Annette: [laughs] [Thank you, and 31:25] [inaudible] [tell you].

David: Good, good. Very good.

So business strategy. The Contractual Compliance program is undergoing a risk assessment review, and in this coming fiscal year we are going to examine our high, medium, and low contractual compliance risk with registrars and registries across the globe, and we're going to use that risk assessment as the principal tool that will help us build and maintain strategic collaborative relationships with registrars, with registries, with governments and others going forward. That's a fundamental piece of work. I believe it is, you know, important if you're going to have an effective contractual compliance program.

So do that, we need to adopt leading-edge technology tools, tools that are currently available in the market, to help us increase the level of data analysis, the level of reporting, and actually be in a better position to provide success metrics around our work to the global constituencies that we serve. And as a result of that, I believe that strategically what you will see going forward is a focus in our department on the contractual terms and conditions that really matter most – you know, such as building trust with registrars, registries, with this group and with other constituencies, building trust around our contractual compliance work. So that when we say we're going to do something, we will do it, and that when you bring an issue to us, that we will investigate it and that with your help and with your feedback, we will build a stronger and I think an improved contractual compliance program for the benefit not just of ICANN but for all constituencies that we serve. And that starts with trust.

From there, moving into the actual contract terms and conditions, there are certain contract terms and conditions that tend to be more problematic and tend to generally result in more investigative work by our department, and so we want to focus in those areas such as Whois, data accuracy, we want to focus our efforts around privacy and proxy registration services. We want to focus our efforts in the audit areas that matter most to registrants, that matter most to the users of the internet, because we serve that principal constituency first and foremost.

So here is a short summary of our responsibilities, and we do manage the compliance side of contractual relationships with 950-plus accredited registrars and 16 registries. And I have to tell you we only have a team of five people – myself and four others, and three of those four work with me in California, and we have a fifth member of our team currently in Washington, DC. Now our plan for the coming fiscal year is to deploy a compliance professional in our Brussels office and to deploy a compliance professional in Asia – perhaps Beijing, Hong Kong, Tokyo – and to establish a physical presence for contractual compliance in those regions. Because there is a lot of work to do and, quite frankly, because we're a global business, we need to have a global footprint to our compliance work. And so it's time to make those changes.

We enforce our contracts principally through audits. And if you've had the opportunity to look at our most recent Contractual Compliance Semi-Annual Report, which was posted on our website, you will see that the kind of audit work that we engage in is the principal tool that we use to get the job done. And those audits typically result in situations where we need to notify registrars that they are in breach of their agreement, and then the registrars have a defined period of time in which to cure their breach, and if they fail to cure their breach then we're in a position to terminate that registrar for noncompliance. And we have an enormous amount of work to do in those areas, and so that's why ICANN management has taken the initiative to invest in contractual compliance and that's why you see me here today, as well as William McKelligott, the auditor in our Washington, DC office. And I suspect you will see more work being performed inside of Contractual Compliance by the use of additional, again, compliance tools and people to get the job done.

We manage a consumer complaint intake system, which I believe many of you may be familiar with if you've navigated through our website, but that tool is particularly relevant as it applies to Whois data and the ongoing discussion and debate around the accuracy of Whois data. And so this past December, we initiated some enhancements to the Whois Data Problem Reporting System in order to collect and literally then use a more robust dataset for purposes of identifying Whois-related complaints that should be directed to registrars, and then registrars under the terms of their Registrar Accreditation Agreement are obligated to contact registrants in an effort to update Whois data inaccuracies. And we're installing in that system an additional

enhancement that would then require the registrar to report back to Contractual Compliance and essentially explain to us what they did or didn't do to address that Whois inaccuracy claim. We think that that's a good way to close that communication loop with the registrar and then be able to report back to the community with respect to those activities.

And then finally, as we develop new business processes to contractual compliance, we think that taking a business approach and bringing the kind of focus and discipline that's required to produce strong contractual compliance results will be of benefit not just to ICANN but to all constituencies. And so you'll see me talking quite a bit about the business tools and the business processes and the business approach to compliance as the path forward to a stronger and better contractual arrangement with registrars and registries, and I'll give you some details about that as we go forward.

So here are three key activities: Improved Whois enforcement. If you have the opportunity to look at our Semi-Annual Report that's posted, you will see that one of the changes we made to the system now is to perform these compliance checks with registrars. We actually have a process that allows us to follow up with registrars more efficiently, to have a dialogue and then determine what actions they've taken with respect to the Whois inaccuracy claims that we've presented to them. We don't yet have the system in place to get that feedback from all registrars with regard to the action taken, but that's a future enhancement that is under construction, and we're actually deploying that right now in sort of beta test with some registrars as a way to make sure that it works correctly.

Outreach is a key piece. We did hold, as many of you know, workshops in Korea, Paris, and Rome at previous ICANN meetings, and we've done that not only to increase awareness of the RAA obligations but also to listen to the communities about your concerns regarding contractual compliance and what we can do to address those concerns. And we intend to continue doing more of that and I would really welcome the opportunity to hold, Wolf, another workshop in Europe in the coming fiscal year. In my budget for the coming fiscal year, I have allocated funds for a European, an American, and an Asian workshop to actually spend more time outreaching and taking you deeper and wider into the activities of our Contractual Compliance group. And so with the

help of this group, perhaps we could coordinate that meeting in the coming fiscal year and construct an agenda that would be useful again to this group.

And then of course I was hired four months ago and hit the ground running Day 1 and haven't stopped running, and William McKelligott, our newest auditor, he's been with us about the same amount of time.

So the key things that you'll hear this week. You'll hear more information about our Whois Data Accuracy Study. And for those of you who don't know what that is, ICANN is working with the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago to develop an accuracy study that will help us understand essentially what percentage or amount of Whois information is accurate.

And so the first thing we needed to do is develop a definition of accuracy. How do you define "accurate Whois information"? That's quite an undertaking considering that there has been discussion on that point for probably over 10 years, and so we've developed a preliminary set of definitions that we are going to be sharing this week with some of the constituencies to get their input and feedback on those definitions to see if those definitions make sense and, you know, have we and are we approaching it correctly? And I'd be happy to share those definitions with this group as well to get your constructive feedback.

Our intent there is then to deploy an accuracy study later this year with a preliminary report on our work and findings at the Sydney ICANN meeting 35 in Australia at the end of June, and then a final report being presented to all constituencies at the Seoul, Korea ICANN 36 meeting at the end of October. And we think that the benefit of that study will be to lay the foundation for future contemplated Whois studies in an effort then to increase the overall accuracy of Whois data by taking specific actions or steps that we believe will be identified in the work product coming out of that study.

Privacy and Proxy Registration Services. That's a study that our team has undertaken principally just to identify the percentage of registrars who currently offer privacy and proxy registration services to registrants. That is the sole and single purpose at the moment. When that study is completed and communicated to our constituencies in Sydney, we'll then be in a position

to decide what we need to do next with that information in order to address many of the privacy and proxy registration concerns that have been voiced by registrants and others around the world.

The New gTLD Compliance Action Plan. Our team wants to be prepared to address contractual compliance issues as they arise with the launch of the new gTLDs, and so we'll be building a plan and then executing that plan over the next six months in an effort to identify again the high-risk areas, our risk mitigation strategies, and then ultimately developing we hope the tools to help us manage the extraordinarily high number of new registries and registrars that we will be working with in the future. We do believe that we can manage that very successfully again using some automated tools that allow our team to work more efficiently and I think more deliberately with our registrar liaisons and with registrars going forward. But the first step is develop the plan and then present that plan for feedback, and then once that plan is approved, then we can begin to execute on that plan and align our work with the work of our services team in this area.

Domain Name Transfer Policy Audit. I think many of you are familiar with that. It's very well described on ICANN's website. We continue to initiate audit activities around domain name transfer in an effort to protect registrants in every instance where we can. And we'll actually be sharing more information about that tomorrow in the E-Crime Workshop, and perhaps even this afternoon, later today in a similar discussion.

And then finally the Compliance Program Risk Assessment is the overall tool that allows us to step back and look at our work over the last two years and determine where we can improve, what we need to do to improve, and what actions need to be taken over the coming fiscal year or years in order to strengthen contractual compliance work at ICANN. And I can tell you that one area in which we will be focussed on are our enforcement tools – you know, what enforcement tools are presently available to us in our Registrar Accreditation Agreement, what enforcement tools would be provided to us through the potential adoption of the registrar accreditation amendments, and what future enforcement tools, you know, should be considered either as amendments to the RAA or as policy decisions that then become amendments to those contractual agreements in an effort to improve the



overall quality and performance of registrars around their obligations under those contracts.

That is our goal and we believe we will accomplish that goal, but we will need your help to do that. And one way that you can help us is by examining our Fiscal Year 2010 Operating Plan and Budget. It's posted on our website. We do want your feedback there and you will notice that the Contractual Compliance team has been very aggressive in putting forth a plan and a budget that results in about a 30% increase over prior year in an effort to acquire the sufficient resources and tools to get the job done. And where you can support that and help us get that budget approved, we appreciate that because it's what we need again to get this mission accomplished.

And that's our team, the five of us, and again we're accessible to you through e-mail and through phone. And four of the five members are here at this conference – Stacy Burnette, William McKelligott, Khalil and I are presenting today to the At-Large organizations, and we're presenting later today to the Registrar Constituency group and to the IPC. And so I think you can see from the slides that, you know, we're beginning an effort that requires greater communication with the At-Large community, and I think that communication needs to occur in my view through a liaison with your community, someone from our staff who can again work more closely with you. Now that may be me at the moment, quite frankly, because there's no one else to do the job, but in the future when we have a physical presence, Contractual Compliance physical presence in Europe, we would expect that that individual would work very closely with you and be essentially aligned around your issues and our issues so that we have constant collaboration and communication exchanges to that we work literally again for the best interests of the registrants.

At this point, if there are particular questions or particular topics that you would like to discuss in more detail, I'd be happy to do that. I think I have about another 20 minutes more or less, but I'll let Wolf decide how much time I have and then I'll be happy to take questions.

Wolf: Okay. Thank you very much, David, for your introduction and presentation so far. I noted already at least five questions on my list. I have first Sébastien, then I have Wolfgang, then I noted Vittorio, Patrick, and Rudi.

Please, Sébastien.

Male: [inaudible 47:58]

Annette: Yeah.

[group laughs]

Annette: I agree.

Sébastien: Well, I hope that my colleagues will be less rough than me, but frankly speaking, you must be prepared to who you are speaking to. You are speaking to us, you have plenty of money, and we are just people who came here to help the overall community to work with no payment. We are not paid to do that, we are volunteer. And one day it's insane to show us the amount of money you spend and the difficulty we have to get for example this event organized. If you want to be compliant with us, one day you need to think that the budget, we don't have 30% increase of budget even if we will have 30% of increase of participation on members. Then it's... I am very upset with that.

The second point is when you are speaking about ICANN and you say, "ICANN and the community" or "the stakeholders" or whatever, we are ICANN. You are not ICANN. You are just one part of ICANN, as we are. And maybe we are more ICANN than the staff is. And when I talk to "you," it's not you personally, and I don't want you to mistake what I am saying here, because you are the one coming here and it's unfortunately that you are the one, but...

[group laughs]

Sébastien: ...but... When it's too much, it's too much, you know? We spent all here yesterday working from 7 o'clock to 8 o'clock, and... Okay.

The second point is I want to take one point positively. You say you have budget to organize a meeting in Europe. Then I am sure that we will be very happy to be... that you will take care of us, plane, train, and hotel to come to your meeting, and like that we will be able to have a EURALO meeting also at the same time, because when we talk about the budget for a meeting, you need to have in your budget the capability for end users and for ALSes to come to be taken care of.

The other point I wanted to say, when you say, "It's on our website," great. But the website, it's a mess, first, and if we have to read all everything published by all the staff of ICANN, we are dead. We can't do that. Then if you think that there are important points we need to read, you have to tell us. Not to say "You will find it in a website." Yes, we know we can find everything, but first it's in English, and second point it's absolutely impossible for people like us to spend all our night to read all the website of ICANN.

My last point is about when you talk about Whois, it's just funny because you say, "We are an international organization," and then name of the company in charge of doing the study, it's "the National" something, I heard. That's... And it's from US. That's great, but we need... That's just because you choose one company with the name "National," but we need international organization to take care of those questions.

Once again, sorry to be so rude, but I think sometime it's necessary to tell what I think, it's important today. Thank you very much. And sorry for my colleagues.

David: And no apology required. I understand that there is frustration. And my role here at ICANN is to try and, you know, do the right thing with contractual compliance for the benefit for all of us. Because you're right, ICANN is all of us, and I wasn't intending to imply that it was me or our staff. It is all of us and we are trained to do the right thing, to serve the global interests of registrants. So where we're not doing that, please point that out and let's work together to change those things.

Wolf: Okay, the next one on the list is Wolfgang.

Wolfgang: Yeah, just a very brief comment at what Sébastien has said, and then I have two questions.

I think here we again see, you know, that we have lived since years with misunderstanding of the role between the staff and the community and who has to serve whom. And I think what we see is a growing, growing staff. I was involved in ICANN when ICANN had the staff of 10 people sitting in Marina del Rey and a budget of... it was just, you know, 1 million per year. And some people gave their warning that "Keep this low, otherwise ICANN becomes like an ITU." ITU has 800 million Swiss franc and around 1,000 people. And I'm

really afraid that ICANN moves in this direction. So it has nothing to do with you personally and your very specific task, which I think is important – contractual compliance is an important point – but, you know, more or less you are pulled into a process which has to be basically questioned, and with our recommendation we give to the Board, advice we give to the Board to think about the transparency of [the last mile 54:16] and the general accountability and transparency issue here which is discussed in this ICANN meeting and other ICANN meetings. I think this is a really important point and I'm very thankful that you offer a lot of transparency so that we know what you are doing. But on the other hand, I think Sébastien's questions are really serious questions, and in particular the At-Large community, which represents more or less the individual users, you know, have some concerns. It's not only frustrations, it's really serious concerns.

My two questions is, you know, we have, the RALOs have a Memorandum of Understanding with ICANN. This is not a formal contract, otherwise... An MoU is seen in the eyes of a lawyer also as a contract. That means are the MoUs also subject of your work, or the MoUs between ICANN and RALOs subject of your work or not?

And my second question is – it goes also [two ways 55:10] – you said, you know, in compliance with the contractual arrangements [and the data things]. In the Articles of Incorporation of ICANN, in paragraph 4 it said that ICANN has to operate “in conformity with relevant principles of international law and applicable international conventions and local law.” My question is how do you study the compliance of the Whois issue with national data legislation? For instance, I'm from Germany, you know, and I think there's a huge conflict between national legislation in Germany with regard to data protection and ICANN practices and ICANN contracts. And I'm interested [here what is about 55:51] your position. It's not enough to hire an American firm to analyze that, you should hire a German firm to analyze it from a German point of view.

Male: [laughs] [applauds]

Annette: [Wonderful, I hear].

David: Yes. Yes. Thank you for the comment. Let me start first with the second question.

We do recognize the differences globally in various privacy laws, and the Whois Accuracy Study, this is the first step. Working with the National Opinion Research Center, it's a first step to begin to identify the future actions that need to be taken in order to improve the accuracy of Whois data. I am not going to confine our organization to just the US. We have every intent to look globally to other organizations that can contribute to the discussion and the work involved in the next phase or phases of the Whois Accuracy Study. So the fact that the National Opinion Research Center was selected in Chicago was not a US-driven decision. It was driven on the basis of their qualifications and their underlying accomplishments to help us with this first phase of the study. And as we move into phase 2 with the help of this organization and others, we're very open to working with other global organizations that can contribute, you know, to our work in that regard. And I hope that answers the question.

On the first question, I'm very sensitive to not only the frustrations but also the concerns. And what we are trying to in the global... in the contractual compliance space is to be as global and as open and as connected to you as we can be, you know, to address your needs. And where we can improve, please tell us. I'm open to that constructive feedback. Having been here four months now, I don't honestly know all of the history around our relationships with the ALAC, nor do I know all of the opportunities that exist to improve our work with you. But I am willing to do so and my colleagues are willing to do so, and if you will take the time to instruct us in that regard, we will listen and take action.

Wolfgang: What about the MoU?

David: At the moment, the MoU contractual enforcement is not in our domain.

Wolfgang: Okay, thank you.

Wolf: Okay, thanks a lot. We are running a bit short of time, therefore I would like to ask the following intervenients, Vittorio, Patrick, Rudi, and Annette, to be short and precise.

Vittorio: Yeah. Well, welcome to ICANN [again. He was talking to 58:32] appreciate the complexity, which is... I don't know about your background, but this is several orders of magnitude culturally more complex than anything you might

have seen before. So I just wanted to give you one small piece of advice in history.

Historically there has never been such a strong compliance activity on Whois accuracy. That's because there's a sort of implicit I'd say deal between the European internet community and ICANN that yes, ICANN policies that go against the common sense of the laws and whatever in terms of privacy for European registrants of domain names, but... So ICANN is not changing them because there are some political sensitivities in the US, in the US business constituency, but still is not also applying them very hardly because otherwise you would get a lot of uproar in Europe. So if ICANN ever started to be serious about that and to turn off domain names because of people omitted or change their information because there is no privacy protection from Europe, you would get serious political problems from the European Union, serious, very serious, up to the point of risking to break up the domain system. So it's a bit hard for me to imagine that you can have a serious compliance program on Whois accuracy data... of the data without first changing your policies and diversifying them by Europe or maybe other countries and the US. So beware.

David: Excellent feedback. Thank you. Thank you.

Patrick: Yes. Well, just to say that I agreed with what Sébastien, Wolfgang, and Vittorio just said previously, so I won't repeat that again, but be sure that they are not the only ones thinking that way.

What I wanted to ask is that you're starting studies on the Whois. How does that fit within the studies that the GNSO will request, because some of the issues...? Are these parallel studies with the GNSO or are these integrated within the studies that will be requested by the GNSO? That's the first question.

The second question is, is it worth studying the Whois anymore when we hear that it's going to be replaced on the medium term by another system – IRIS in this case?

And a third question is when you study Whois data accuracy, are you studying the volume of inaccuracies or you studying the reasons why the data is inaccurate? I think that's a major factor because if you come to the

conclusion that 50% or maybe more of the data is inaccurate, I think it's quite logical to ask yourself why are the people submitting inaccurate data? Thank you.

David: Yes. So for the first question, the current Whois Accuracy Study will be integrated into any future proposed and approved GNSO Council studies. We are anticipating that we'll be directed to investigate the feasibility and cost of various Whois-related studies that will be approved by the GNSO Council shortly. And so our work is not being performed in a vacuum. It's actually being performed as a foundational piece to contribute to that future Whois study work.

Secondly, we... I'm not really in a position to address whether IRIS will replace Whois or not. I don't have enough information to know if that is true. But we do believe that there is value today to continue to study and to continue to work collaboratively with all communities to address the Whois inaccuracy problems.

And to your third question, I absolutely agree that what we're doing here is to focus on the reasons why Whois information is inaccurate. We will get some sense through our sample set of the percentage of inaccuracies, but beyond that, we really want to go deeper and actually understand why the data is inaccurate. Is it a name inaccuracy? Is it a postal address inaccuracy? And if so, why is it inaccurate? And I think with that information in hand, we may be able to help, you know, the discussion and hopefully help address some of the future changes that will be required, you know, to improve the quality of Whois data, if that is the system that we continue to use in the future.

So I hope that answered the questions.

Wolf: Okay. I've three last. Please be precise, and I would like, David, let's collect the three of them and give a last answer to it. It's first Rudi, then it's Annette, and then it's Bogdan. But very short, please.

Rudi: I will be very short. I'm speaking in personal name as I'm afraid otherwise I'm going to have a lot of enemies in this room. I'm very happy that we see a structure popping up that at least wants to focus on issues where the patrimonium of ICANN and the public is damaged by the abuse by registries and registrars. And I think that it is the first step in the process which we all

have to go through, whatever budget we have. And a sample of that is that we are going to make a thematic session this evening showcasing that there is a big need for this kind of structure in ICANN, and the reason why there is an e-crime tomorrow is also stating that we need this kind of operation. So I'm closing [over there 1:04:44] my comment.

Annette: I make it short. It has all been said by Vittorio and Patrick, and I think it would be helpful... It was a little bit disturbing that you're in a EURALO meeting and just, you know, dealing with the accuracy issue of Whois like this. I think there is one issue civil society and government in Europe are really hand-in-hand working and trying, trying hard to enforce this privacy issue, and this is really for us extremely annoying.

Bogdan: Okay. Ov-...

Annette: Excuse me, this is... [cuts out] ...[inaudible 1:05:26]. And it is as an international... it's supposed to be international organization, it is really hard... You know, what Wolfgang just said. Why don't you just take a German law firm or English law firm or whatever law firm? You know, it would be fun for us to see the results.

Bogdan: A short question. From your presentation, I understood that it's merely related to the gTLDs' contractual compliance. Does that also go to the ccTLDs' contracts or Memorandum of Understandings between the ICANN and the ccTLDs, and if not, if that will be a part of your mandate in the future?

David: At the moment, we're focussed on gTLDs, but there will be as part of our plan going forward work done with respect to the ccTLDs in the future.

And to the previous comment, we fully understand the global nature of our work. And, you know, again, my apologies if it appears that it has been US-centric. That is not our intent.

Annette?: [It's just a fact 1:05:28].

David: It is. You know, and having worked at HP, Hewlett-Packard, you know, I was very sensitive to the various privacy laws around the globe, particularly as we created a data privacy structure at HP to respect the differences in Germany and Italian and Spanish privacy laws that really take into account the



differences that are important for their citizens in their countries versus what's conducted here in the US. So we won't be insensitive to that issue inside of Contractual Compliance and I will raise those issues with our legal team and others in an attempt, you know, to do what's right here and to make sure that those issues are address going forward in a European-based way. So I will raise those issues and have that dialogue with my colleagues, and please stay in touch with me so that we can communicate on that issue and continue, you know, to do constructive work on that. Thank you.

Annette: On this issue, I would like to ask the other way around. Could you stay in touch with us?

David: I'd be happy to. Just let me know what the best way in which it is to do that, and whether that's through Wolf or through others, just let me know how you prefer to have that communication, and we'll do that.

And so I want to thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to be here this morning and I appreciate the candidness and the openness of the discussion. I need to hear that as the newest member of the Contractual Compliance team and we need to take that... you know, everything that you've suggested today, take that to heart and begin to make sure that we internalize that and then address that as we work together going forward. So thanks for your time and hope to see you tomorrow at the E-Crime Forum.

Wolf: Okay. Thanks a lot for coming in.

[group applause]

Wolf: Alright. I just realized that this is a bit getting difficult, and...

Annette: Wolf, may I...?

Wolf: Yeah.

Annette: Oops. May I say sorry, for this, taking notes was absolutely impossible.

Wolf: Yeah, of course.

Annette: I will just say, "Okay, yes, Whois, the issue was important to us," okay?

Wolf: Yeah, please.

Annette: [laughs]

Wolf: Annette, as far as I understood – I could have clarified or specified this before – I am not expecting you writing a book about today's General Assembly...

[group laughs]

Wolf: ...so if you have the essentials in it...

Man: [Someone 1:09:18]... [overtalking]

Wolf: ...we will be pleased and satisfied.

I'm asking myself whether these briefing issues are necessarily very relevant for our community or for our General Assembly. We still have another short briefing, but I told Heidi already maximum is five minutes, but I will grant for another staff briefing on whatsoever.

I would like now to continue with a more important to point to me, which is still point 7, which is "Discussion and Approval of the EURALO Working Programme and Projects." I think most of these points we stressed already, and what was submitted to you today is nothing but an updated version of what we had already in Paris. And I don't know if you remember, we said probably the best way of organizing Board work and organizing EURALO's work is to choose responsibilities, preferences, and subjects, and then trying to work as a team or network and with different specializations and concentrations.

And I think probably compared with Paris, we are today a little bit forward because if I see that the bullet points listed on this list, today I could easily add names to it. As I would suggest of course for IPv6, as is mentioned before, Olivier. For DNSSEC, it's Lutz and Patrick – it's your domain and you did already a great job on it. For the gTLD process, I realize that Bill Drake and Heike are in the working group. And we should simply update this listing now with names and more or less the commitments.

Another important element is for me for the working program is the outreach activities, but outreach has to do somehow necessarily with operational funding – whether we have to pay as we did over the last years this out of our own pocket or whether we get the institutional support, operational support by

ICANN. And therefore these two papers, the EURALO Draft Working Programme and the Budget Proposal are interrelated. And therefore I think the best is probably to discuss the two papers together, please.

Any comments? Any...

Adam: Sort of a meta-comment about budget is that it seems to me to be entirely unclear what is available to the ALAC generally, how we're allowed to spend it, how we're allowed to, you know, allocate generally. I just don't know. I know there's a standing committee on budget, but it doesn't seem to do anything. We don't seem to...

Female: Oh...

Adam: At this time, it hasn't done anything because the list is dead and the wiki page is dead. I'm not saying that that's anyone's fault, it just seems to be the whole nature of budget. I'm not sure that we have a final budget figure for the summit, do we? I don't know.

It's really difficult to understand this concept of budget and then to see a number that's actually written there. [laughs] It's... You know? And actually from my own point of view, you know, I don't expect to be included in outreach and so on – I think that would be an unacceptable expense, so forget me for that particular cost. I will do my best to participate.

Wolf: Before I hand over to Annette, of course this was from a starting point. It's a standing procedure that we decided last year already. Even if ICANN cannot properly provide, the figures say spend real for any ALAC activities, and if this still is a secret, I think we really started from a bottom-up approach simply asking, "If you want us to be active, if you want us to increase our activities, we need some means for it." And therefore this is a... You can say it's stupid it because it's running into nowhere, but it's for us the best way to say, "Okay, this is our scope and this is our working program for the next year and this would be the costs implicated with it."

Annette and Sébastien.

Annette: Adam, I'm short before exploding regarding this issue because it was the first thing when I became the Chair of ALAC, saying I want to have transparency

about the budget and I want to have a clear procedure, and we formed a budget committee and we worked so hard over years and years. And also in the EURALO we worked extremely hard and we tried to find out what is actually the ALAC budget, the RALO budget, the At-Large budget. There is no such thing. And I think it's a totally ridiculous way of dealing with money and project managing, but that's the way it is right now in ICANN. And the result of this I think absolutely intransparent and really, really bad procedures. I mean, in Germany we would close down an NGO dealing with budgets like this. It's really amazing. So as ALAC as well as EURALO, we worked extremely precise on budget, on proposals, on asking what the procedures are, what are the allocation procedures, what is the amount itself, and so on and so on. The only thing we've really found out is there is no clear procedure and what we are asked for is to hand in a proposal in time before the budget will be planned. So the way they do it here, somehow, is you hand something in and then it will be discussed by who knows and a decision will be taken by who knows and in the end you have a chance that, especially as this is such an extremely small amount of money which is almost unbelievable to be able to work on with... So there is a good chance that if you hand in this proposal with precise data and so on that you actually could get the money. But the whole procedure behind that is a disaster.

Sébastien: A question, because if it's 2009-2010 Budget, it's up from June, then it's not now. Then don't we need to put a GA next year?

Wolf: Well...

Annette: Between June and June.

Sébastien: Between June and June 2009 and 2010, and that means that it will be the European meeting somewhere sometime in 2010, the six first months of 2010 if it's happened to be in Europe.

Wolf: This was also my consideration last year. In last year's budget, as the first General Assembly was in combination with the Paris meeting, so we were invited to the Paris meeting. Therefore it was so to say for me, from my point... EURALO point, it was cost-neutral because it was covered in combination with... This year's General Assembly, Mexico, is covered via the summit. Next year will probably be a meeting in... The autumn meeting is

supposed to be I think somewhere in Europe. So I guess the next General Assembly after Mexico will be autumn 2010 in Europe some-... Am I wrong?

Wolfgang: October 2010 in Europe, yeah.

Wolf: October 2-...

Wolfgang: But not yet defined really.

Wolf: Not yet defined, but in Europe...

Male: In Europe.

Wolf: ...and therefore it will be the 2010 General Assembly will be in combination with another ICANN meeting in Europe, and thereby covered again. And therefore the General Assembly... The point is now, Sébastien, or the question would be would we like to have in between before the autumn 2010 General Assembly an earlier one? This is a question and this should then be considered here, you are right.

Sébastien: Yes, but if you say that... I was thinking that the European meeting will be, was supposed to be in February, because it was supposed to be the one in end of this year and then it was postponed because we have two meetings in Asia Pacific then.

Patrick?: Yes, and [Seoul would base as the 1:19:56] European meeting that was foreseen in October.

Sébastien: And then the European one is supposed to be just after.

Patrick?: Yeah.

Wolf: [Not] in October.

Sébastien: Okay. But then... Nevertheless, what I would like to suggest is that we include this in our budget, because... I have two thinking here. The first is that if we don't include in the budget a General Assembly, even if it's a European meeting, we may have some trouble to get even if it's in Europe, because you know the discussion today about the budget, knowing if all the ALAC people will be paid to travel to each and any ICANN meeting or not, and if... And so

on and so forth. Then I think we need to have a bottom-up process and that we need to include in the budget. That's the first idea.

The second, it's more a question and we don't need to deal with it today, but I am sure that one day and very soon will come, if we want to have another summit in two years, from the budget perspective I'm not sure that we will be able to get from the ICANN budget a General Assembly and a summit. Then maybe we will have to make a choice. I am not saying that we need to make it today, but we have to think about that. If we have to make a choice, which choice we prefer – to have a General Assembly with the European meeting or to have a summit somewhere during one ICANN meeting in two years' time for example. It's just for us to think about these two questions. Thank you, sorry.

Wolf: Adam.

Adam: Just a sort of observation. I mean absolutely no disrespect in the questions I just asked about, you know, whether the summit budget or all the other things. I know the struggles that you've gone through in all of these budgetary aspects. But what I think I would like us to try and do is identify what our needs are, what tasks we feel... We have volunteered to perform various duties for ICANN essentially, for the community, and what budget do we need to fulfill those duties? And that is a sort of starting point that I would like, you know, to talk about. Perhaps it's actually an ALAC general issue and not just a EURALO issue. But, you know, the frustration of being asked to leave on Thursday would be one example. But it's just this idea of what do we feel we should be doing to fulfill what we've volunteered to do? And that's what budget we need.

Wolf: Yeah. Wolfgang?

Wolfgang: I think Adam's intervention brings us back to the issue, you know, which we stopped to discuss before the coffee break. And I think what we really have to have is a work plan, you know, where we have some practical tasks, you know, which has to be produced by At-Large Structures or other invited or not invited volunteers. And a work plan, what the RALO can do includes I think two categories: one is issue papers or studies or something, you know, where we analyze a certain problem which is of interest for our community and our

constituency; and the second thing is meetings. And there are two categories of meetings. One is the outreach meeting where we explain to people who are not yet involved so that they become involved. So that means that should be done in places where we have low representation so far – for instance in Central and Eastern Europe. This would be an opportunity. We missed two Studienkreis meetings in Prague and Warsaw, we could have done this, but it's history. Now we have to look forward. And the second one is a thematic workshop where we discuss the issues based on an issue paper. And what I want to see is that we probably, you know, within the next couple of weeks generate a work plan for the period 2009 and 2010 and then we can, you know, from the work plan identify how much this costs, how much the study is costing, how much a workshop is costing and things like that, and then we have a basis for the workshop. And also, you know, I think [insofar 1:24:32] EURALO could be a pioneer in doing this. I don't know what the other RALOs are doing, but I think this is one of our duties.

And if I [have the word], I also want to add another point which I wanted to comment on, Adam, before the coffee break. We discuss here also accountability and transparency, and I think this is not only that we ask for transparency and accountability for the Board and for staff but also for ourselves. And what I would, you know, put for discussion is we have a procedure of recognizing At-Large Structures, and after you're recognized by the At-Large Advisory Committee, there is no formal interaction anymore. We should think about to introduce a process of reporting so that At-Large Structures should report on an annual basis or biannual basis to at least their RALO, the EURALO, and we should also a procedure in place if there is no reporting that we take away the recognition as an At-Large Structure. That means there is no need to have, you know, At-Large Structures which do not work just for the sake that we have a high number of members. It's just for discussion, though.

Wolf: Okay. I think it's a touchy point, Wolfgang. The next one is Bogdan and Adam again.

Bogdan: Well, [since Wolf raised the ball 1:26:02], I would like to comment. I think it's a very good point and in presenting the first [report] of EURALO, I started thinking, "Okay, what does EURALO mean? Is it just the activities of the Board of EURALO or the activities of each EURALO member ALS that has

done some activity in the field of internet... in the ICANN?" I mean, we had some events where we promoted ICANN and what ICANN does toward the users, so that can be included also if we think in this sense. I mean, I don't know if we should go that far to say that if one member did nothing in one year, they should be withdrawn. Maybe we need to have a more complicated procedure so to know them, to put them a warning or something like that.

Wolfgang?: A yellow card.

Bogdan: Sorry?

Wolfgang?: A yellow card.

Wolf: Yellow card.

Bogdan: Yeah, a yellow card. And then an orange card if you see that FIFA wants to change the rules.

But coming back to the budget proposal, I think that we definitely should look... should be more ambitious than the current proposal just by... I mean, as far as I understood, or I should better say I did not understand how the budget works because apparently nobody understands exactly how the budget is approved. And then probably we should go directly at the more ambitious level, and then we see what happens.

And just as a very direct proposal as far as it regards the outreach that can be done by any ALSes, I think it would be difficult at this point to estimate what we'll do in the next year or more or less, but we can ask for a lump sum and every ALS member in EURALO or in ALAC can go and bid for that money in order to do some outreach at the national or regional level.

Wolf: [cuts out] ...this would be an idea. To say it again, it's a trial and error, huh? So we have to start on a certain point and then we have to develop it.

Adam and Annette.

Adam: Very quickly on compliance, which is essentially what Wolfgang was talking about in terms of, you know, yellow carding or what have you, I was surprised that it wasn't mentioned with the gentlemen who was here, is that the ALAC Review contains a comment about compliance and, you know, is he going to



be responsible for some notion of compliance of what an ALS is doing or not doing? But I didn't want to add to that discussion, but it's something we should take up in the future.

And I think it's something we should probably ask for a call for, is with the financial officers and actually start to actually understand what this budget is. My understanding of the importance of the At-Large and the public interest in ICANN – and this is again something we might check – is that without it, this is just an industry association that is self-regulating itself, and that will fail every antitrust law in the world. We might want to get a lawyer to test my lack of legal knowledge, but, you know, we have to exist, and if we don't exist then ICANN is in big trouble. So they have to pay some respects, perhaps a little bit more than we feel they're paying at this moment.

Wolf: Okay. Annette?

Annette: I think the proposal from Bogdan was very good. We could have one bullet point for budget saying this is a certain amount we just say is important, and of course then you have to hand in ad hoc proposals. The issue is, whatever we don't know about the procedure, we do know that we have to hand in the proposals before and a certain amount, otherwise it is definitely not available. If you say something like, for example, "Outreach activities likely in Eastern Europe," for example, then this would be just an open... [German – 1:30:16]? A certain...

Wolf: [German – 1:30:18]

Annette: [German – 1:30:20]?

Female: Expenses.

Annette: Expenses?

Female: [inaudible]

Male: Yeah.

Annette: [German – 1:30:24]

Wolf: [German – 1:30:26]

Max?: Item.

Annette: An item.

Wolf: A budget post. A budget item.

Annette: An item. No, it would be... Yeah, it would be an extra budget item. And it would not be clearly defined with a date or so, but it would clear the use we would like to make of would be that purpose, and I think we could try that.

Wolf: Okay, Rudi?

Rudi: Yeah, just a more general aspect of our agenda. It's 10 before 1 o'clock. We have a lot of other tasks to fulfill, especially in the working groups. I'm in a working group, we have a lot of work to do. I'd like to know when are we going to try to finish this meeting.

Wolf: I... [cuts out] I would like to close this meeting at 1 o'clock. Therefore I'm now making a pragmatic suggestion. We have here two working documents. We adopt it by this General Assembly as working documents. They have to be overworked by the Board and whoever at EURALO wants to join us in this. I think they should be a subject of every monthly call conference of EURALO, a standing item where we progressively work on this. And this is not just a document, this should be understood as a process.

Can we accept it like this and adopt it like this, so that I can close this point, point 7? Annette?

Annette: I would actually go a little further and say yes, this is our proposal. We have the budget proposal, it's here. We have three issues there and I would add the fourth issue as Bogdan had said, just saying...

Wolf: This I have added already. I have added what Sébastien said and [Bogdan 1:32:18] to include... I have included what Bogdan suggested.

Annette: Well, wonderful. So you also put a number behind and said the amount?

Wolf: Well...

Annette: It's a 5,000 for example outreach?

Wolf: For Sébastien's point, it would go into an existing number, 2, which would be... I don't know, it's difficult to estimate. It would be a 5,000. And Bogdan was for national outreach activities for ALSes, this would be another 3- to 5,000.

Annette: So we have an additional... So you give it to me later then?

Wolf: Yes, later.

Annette: Okay.

Wolf: And we will round up this continuously at our next EURALO monthly phone conference.

Annette: Yeah, but the budget, it makes sense to have it right here, so this is helpful.

Wolf: Let's take this as a basis.

Annette: Mmm?

Wolf: Yeah?

Annette: Okay.

Wolf: Okay. And it will be worked on continuously over the next month.

Can I now approve agenda item 7?

Then I would now come back to point 6 again. We have now Cheryl and Vanda in the room, which will make a short presentation.

Cheryl: Comments.

Wolf: Or some comments. And then after this point, I will go immediately back to agenda item 8.

Wolfgang?: Back to 8.

Wolf: Okay, back to 8.

Cheryl: Thank you very much, Wolf, and I can assure you this is going to be a very short advert-... I don't know whether it's an advertorial, advomercial, or

whatever. I also want to make sure it's actually a perfect segue because I noted you were looking at your regional budget and outreach requirements. And what Vanda and I are here to do is a total sell on why it's incredibly important that not only the region but each and every individual At-Large Structure look at the current ICANN Fiscal Year 2010 Budget Proposal and make comments into it.

Let's go over what we've gone over with each and every other Regional At-Large Organization. No, we do not have the breakdown numbers of what it costs us to be here here. We still ask for it. Wendy asks for it. Lots of people outside of the ALAC are asking for it. We'll get it eventually. We'll just keep asking for it. But let's work with what we've got, let's make the problem an opportunity. Let's see where requests from the regions, from the ALAC, and from the individual ALSes – or clusters of ALSes for something subregional – can fit into the way this thing is broken up. Okay? And Vanda will talk to a few very specific points on that.

17 May deadline. Public comment period's open. Sitting around this table, you've got to fit into the public comment period. The only people who can't fit into the... don't have to fit in – we can fit into the public comment period – who don't have to fit into the public comment period is the ALAC, because it advises the Board. Alright? So it can give advice to the Board outside of public comments, and if we need to, we will. But post-At-Large Summit, how much more follow-up, how much more good message will be sent to ICANN senior staff and indeed the ICANN Board if a plethora of comments come in from each of your ALSes, some meaningful "ICANN should" lists. Alright? "We would like to"/"Where will this fit" lists. And do it regionally, and of course your representatives should be bringing it to the ALAC and forming it as part of the ALAC advice to the Board on the matter.

Heaps to do, small amount of time to do it. Vanda, a couple of key points from you.

Vanda: Well, just some... We just got these papers in the same time you got, so we just come to some points. That one thing, that it's easy to see, it's very clear that [all 1:36:44] the budget is divided in programs and there are many proposals in those programs. And I would like you to pay a little attention on page 17, point 9, where the program is "Global Engagements and Increased

International Participation.” The [most acronym 1:37:08] that you get here is GAC, so there is no reference for ALAC. So let’s put our programs here. I believe that the outcome...

Male: [inaudible]

Female: [inaudible]

Vanda: 17. Sorry. 17. Item 9.

Wolf: No, 12.

Cheryl: I think there’s some...

Vanda: 17.

Cheryl: There might be some differences in the document.

Male: 17’s [a table 1:37:33].

Vanda: Yeah, well...

Wolfgang?: 12. Page 12.

Cheryl: Okay. Then it’s try page 12 then.

Wolf: Page 12 is point 9.

Vanda: [inaudible]. Sorry, I’m reading the date.

Cheryl: [laughs] 29, okay.

Vanda: 29 is... 27. 27 to 28. Point 9. Here, over there. “Global...” So...

Wolf: Yeah. “Global Engagement and Increasing International Participation.”

Vanda: Yeah. Take a look, you’re going to see a lot of GAC, GAC, GAC, GAC. Support to the GAC, diversity to the GAC, and so on and so on. So...

Sébastien: Maybe after the summit we are blow up, no problem.

Vanda: ...I believe the outcomes of all our groups certainly can be translated into clear programs that could be add to things like that. Yeah? For instance, for a

program, a working group one, we have a lot of proposals that could be add, and as a consequence we can have some budget addressed to those programs. Nothing is done in the budget without some program to address to.

So let's ask for the community and get this feedback, but let's use the summit and the conclusion of the summit to translate them into programs and have them into this budget.

Cheryl: And that's hugely important, as I say. Thank you to all for spending some of your valuable time with us on this matter. It is valuable time that we all need to realize, it's part of a bigger picture. I know you've got your own interest in budgets and matters to deal with, but just let me give you an example of why this preparatory stuff is so important. In the current budget, the one that we're currently suffering under – notice my terminology, please, it is deliberate – under travel support, we agree, we ask, we in fact want to have absolute equitable travel support between all the Support Organizations and the Advisory Committees. We were part of the group that's been asking for it from the very beginning. But what did they do? They didn't use the 15-person ALAC as the lowest common denominator. No, the math works like this: Take 50% of your committee and they can get travel support. Add travel support for your Nominating Committee people, and that then means that for the ALAC, we have to decide which two members can't ever go to any of our meetings. Oh, we got to get it right for 2010.

Okay? So this is why this is not to be overlooked. It's not glossy, but post-summit, we have real ways forward, real programs, real projects, real spaces to put them. And thank you so much for giving us your time.

Vanda: Okay.

Wolf: Okay, thank you very much.

Vanda: Wolf, just one point. Just remember that the new gTLD is not included in that budget. So maybe 1 or 2% of they increase this budget could come in the next semester from the fiscal year, starting in January. Okay?

Wolf: Okay.

Vanda: Thank you.

Wolf: Okay, thank you very much. Yeah, but very quickly, Adam.

Adam: Very quickly. I looked through this and my thought on Global Engagement, and this is relevant to Cheryl and Vanda, is that that looks very much to me like the Global Partners budget and not the policy budget, and that was what made me think, "Well, where are we?" And that, it's almost like a... didn't they submit? Because [Theresa 1:41:18] has, because she does the GAC and the fellowships.

Cheryl: And can I just say we... And I do apologize, this is the fourth or fifth one of these run-throughs, I think I dropped part of the script. We will be... And I did drop part of the script, my humblest apologies. See, you should have got me when I was here earlier, I was fresher. We will be organizing with Kevin Wilson and with Doug Brent the opportunity for a single-purpose, "We will only be talking about this budget" call. We can do it one great, big macro one, which I'm certainly happy to do, and I'll also do regional ones as requested. But what I don't want that to be is going through this document. I want response to specific questions, and it's exactly that question, we'd be happy to put them to him and Kevin on notice, so he comes armed with the proper answers.

So that's perfect. If you can gather those comments, criticisms, and questions – and there's plenty of them – then we can have purposeful... not slides of "This is what the graphs look like that we got on paper anyway, but real dialogue. So thanks for that, Adam – you picked up on the fact that I totally missed that part. Thanks a lot.

Wolf: Okay, thank you very much for your briefing and...

Cheryl: And my brief retreat. [laughs]

Wolf: Okay.

Wolfgang?: It's scandalous. [inaudible 1:42:29].

Wolf: Bye.

Annette: It's a scandal... [inaudible]

Wolfgang?: Unbelievable.

Wolf: I think we... Do you want to make this part of an official discussion? I think it's simply scandalous and there should be other opportunity to deal with this.

Yes, shortly. We don't ha-...

Annette: [cuts out] ...-t a discussion, we should make a statement on it right now, here.

Male: It's too early.

Annette: No, there's nothing too early. It's clear that what Cheryl has said...

Wolf: Sébastien?

Sébastien: I suggest that in the conclusion of the summit, we add a sentence. In the document we are trying to write now, you write in a sentence "Don't forget the At-Large in the budget."

Wolf: Yeah. Wolfgang?

Wolfgang: I'm asking myself whether the ICANN leadership plays just lip service when they come to the At-Large Summit, because, you know, in these three pages on the Operating Plan Framework, everything is mentioned but there is no single mentioning of At-Large.

Male: [overtalking 1:43:37]

Wolfgang: So that means people who are drafting this... Sorry?

Lutz?: [The] [inaudible] [is on the...?]

Wolf: Page 27, I think.

Wolfgang: Yeah.

Lutz?: Page 30.

Wolf: Or page 30.

Wolfgang: Yeah. So... And I think to really people drafting the budget, you know, for them it's outside of the [world], what we are doing, and this cannot be accepted. And we should [offer] comment individually because this is a draft for comment, and if we are silent as At-Large Structures then we are stupid.



Wolf: Yeah. May I make a suggestion? We already behind the time. I feel a little bit under pressure. As far as I understood, the deadline for this public comment period is 17th May. Can we just make a statement, a position from EURALO in the [sharpness 1:44:31] as Wolfgang suggested? Who is volunteering to do this statement as soon as possible and that we can submit it before the 17th May?

Annette: Before this Friday. It has to be included in the report of the summit, of the user summit, and it has to be included in this. It is a two-sentence something. You know, what just Wolfgang said.

Male: Yeah, if Wolfgang could write... [overtalking 1:45:03]

Annette: Wolfgang, could you write these two lines down together with Vittorio?

Wolfgang: Or if you just [get a] start to draft it [then I can]...

Wolf: Okay. So just... Yeah.

Bogdan: A very quick point. Just looking at this. So the "Global Engagement and Increasing International..." it's in a budget of 6 millions for ICANN and we said that we will look for 5,000, just...

Wolf: Yeah, yeah. Okay.

Male: [German – 1:45:29]

Wolf: It's Lutz and Wolfgang who's doing this statement on behalf of EURALO, okay?

Male: [inaudible]

Wolf: Okay.

Male: [inaudible] [on the list] [inaudible].

Wolf: Now we have...

Male: [inaudible]

Wolf: Now we have to hurry to our last agenda point we will and can treat today – it's agenda point 8, "Chair, Secretariat, Board Re-election." You have got in

the coffee break three documents on this. I didn't get any reactions. I didn't know whether I'm in charge of doing what I know and also doing what I don't know, so overnight I simply prepared these three. Let me shortly explain. The four-pages document is the review of voting for 2007 leadership positions – this was the first Board voting. These are results, this is a kind of a reference paper. The second one was the paper we had for Paris – Board candidates 2008-2009. What is actually now valid is EURALO Board positions due for re-election, this one page. And here I checked this and the other papers. Chair was elected and Secretariat was elected in May 2007 for a two years' term. As you may remember, Jeanette Hofmann, she resigned from the Co-Chair in October last year, so I was assuming both positions in the time between.

Then we are now... Elected in May 2007 was Paco, for two years – he's at the end of his term now. I must here say he never, ever, not even one mail, participated in anything. This is really something I don't want to see happening any more at EURALO Board. This is really ridiculous. And we talked about it in Paris and somebody spoke with Paco and he promised he will... But nothing happened.

So the other position is now Desiree. I have no reaction from Desiree whether she would be interested in continuing or whatsoever.

Elected from Paris was Rudi, Bill, and Annette. They are not at this position at the moment. So we have the following candidates. By informal contacts, it was suggested Lutz Donnerhacke, Dragoslava, and it was Olivier Crepin-Leblond – he was here already and I asked him, he would be interested if he would be elected he would accept.

So to say we now... Also seeing the state of time, I suggest we now complete the nominations today. We can make as we did in Paris afterwards a voting recommendation. A voting recommendation according to me should be posted on the list, on the EURALO list immediately after Mexico with a deadline to the 15th of March for confirmation. It's the same procedure we made after the Paris meeting, it worked perfectly and I think we should do it the same way.

Vittorio: I just wanted to clarify my own position.

Wolf: Yes, please.

Vittorio: [laughs] Now, well, definitely I've not been active enough for the reasons I've told you – partly for lack of commitment, partly of because of [discretion 1:50:08]. So I'm open to whatever solution. I'd be happy to continue and possibly like to put more commitment. I'm also happy if there are newer people that have the enthusiasm and want to join. So I was expecting to see whether we have nomination. At the moment it seems to me that at least we have to replace Jeanette, Paco, and Desiree, and at the moment we have three candidates. So for the moment I think I'd better continue, unless there another, a fourth candidate that really wants to enter. But it's up to you. I'm happy to stand again.

Wolf: Thanks, Vittorio. I would welcome your interest to continue because you are really an old hand, you have a lot of experience, and I think this would be very useful for the Board. So I take you as a nomination for re-election.

Sébastien: Second.

Annette?: Second.

Male: Third!

[group laughs]

Wolf: Then I... Rudi, did...

Rudi: No, no.

Wolf: No.

Annette: Can I?

Wolf: Yeah.

Annette: I'm a little bit in a hurry here and this is why I can't get the right information in the right place, but the two of us are sure there are nine Board members in whole and there's one missing here, and we just have to figure out something. So if you would just... [overtalking 1:51:28]

Wolf: After Paris, we only had eight.

Annette: Oh yeah, there was one vacant place...

Wolf: Yeah, yeah.

Annette: ...after Veronica left.

Wolf: Yeah, yeah.

Annette: Okay, so...

Male: [inaudible]

Annette: Yeah, n-...

Wolf: No, she was never...

Annette: Yeah. No, no, but the whole thing... Yeah, whatever. Yeah. But okay, there was a vacant place, th-... [cuts out]

Wolf: Yeah. Yes, Sébastien?

Sébastien: Just to say that you have three non-voting members in addition to those ones, that the three ALAC members from Europe – that's...

Wolf: You, Patrick, and...

Sébastien: ...Patrick and...

Wolf: ...Adam.

Sébastien: ...Adam. And I would like as just member of this EURALO say that these four candidates, I think it's great and we must ask them to be... or we must elect them to be on the Board of EURALO. Thank you.

Wolf: So I think we can drop Paco.

Sébastien?: Yeah.

Wolf: And as I have no response, should we drop Desiree?

Sébastien?: Yes.

Wolf: I've no...

Sébastien?: If she wants, she didn't list it.

Wolf: She must...

Sébastien: She didn't participate to...

Wolf: Yeah, yeah.

Rudi: Sorry, did we ask her by mail?

Wolf: She's part of the Board and there were so many mailings over the last weeks, so she could have expressed interest or informally told me, "Listen, I would be interested to continue." I think at a [certain 1:53:11] level, I'm getting tired running behind people.

Sébastien?: Thank you.

Wolf: Yeah. Okay. So what is still open is Chair and Secretariat.

Sébastien: Chair is not open. [laughs]

Wolf: Yes, I...

Sébastien?: Yes, yes, yes. We know, we know.

Male: [inaudible 1:53:35]

Sébastien: May I nominate Wolf to be Chair? May I find a second, please?

[group applause]

Male: [inaudible]

Annette: Any objections?

Male: Only... [overtalking]

Wolf: Uh, yes, please.

Wolfgang: Yeah, I have an additional comment. We started, you know, with co-chairs with Jeanette and a secretariat and sharing. I think it's better, you know, because we are such a small community still to have it one hand. So a secretariat and chair. And a second point is while we I would say acknowledge that ICANN has secretarial support via its staff, we would need

to have a special EURALO Secretariat and some financial support for the independent EURALO Secretariat. And insofar I think this should be part of our discussions with the Board, and if we agree then we would enable Wolf to talk to via Nick and to say, you know, whether we could establish something like a EURALO Secretariat which is financed by ICANN, and not that ICANN hires another staff member which doesn't understand the inner work of the At-Large Structure.

Wolf: Sébastien?

Sébastien: I have no problem to ask Wolf to do both seats, but I would like just to take off record, but even if it's recorded, sometime ICANN pay...

Annette: Turn it off.

Sébastien: ...both Chair and Secretariat to participate in one meeting. And it's therefore why Jeanette was not able to come when Wolf was coming, because we have two co-chairs. If we have one chair and one secretariat, it could have been able to do that together. Then I would like to ask you to put one name and that's it, even if he or she doesn't do nothing, she will be able to come to the meeting maybe if the secretariat is paid to come to the meeting.

Wolf: Thanks. My intervention would go in the same direction. I think it's also for the case I'm not available for an ICANN conference, etc., there should be another one filling up and going. And therefore I would like to suggest or ask Rudi whether Rudi would be interested to share with me for the Secretariat?

Rudi?: [inaudible 1:56:16]

[group applause]

Annette: [overtalking] ...[there's a hand, you]. Sébastien.

Sébastien: Yeah. You know, once again, he's liaison to the ccNSO. Then I don't know if liaison will be paid to come to ICANN meetings, but just even if it's him who makes the job, I have no problem with that. I would like you to think about putting another name, just because the money flow, it's not going so easily, then we need to have more than one weapon.

Annette: [Is there 1:57:03] someone volunteer.

Male: [inaudible]. [laughs]

Wolf: So do I hear any other suggestion?

Sébastien: I have a suggestion but I don't know if she wants to do it.

Wolf: Suggest.

Sébastien: Frankly, the question it's not really to do something, it's to be sure that we will have somebody and eventually that will be p-... Then I would like to ask if Dessi, if she agrees to put her name in this place. Thank you.

Wolf: [inaudible 1:57:51]

Dragoslava: Thank you very much for the nomination. I would like to ask you to give me just a little bit of time to think about it because I'm in a position in which I don't know where I'm going to live in two months, so I have many other issues in which I have to think about before accepting any kind of responsibilities.

Wolf: Okay. I think we should take this serious, so would until the end of the week be enough, or...?

Dragoslava: Yeah, just a day or two would be enough [to just do... 1:58:28]

Wolf: Okay. Okay. That with finalization of the Mexico meetings, that we have the list complete to be confirmed on the EURALO list.

Dragoslava: Yes, of course. Sure.

Sébastien: Thank you.

Wolf: So I have then Lutz, Olivier, Vittorio, huh? [pause] Dessi goes in here.

Sébastien: Dessi as Board member, but maybe as Secretariat.

Wolf: Yeah. Dessi as Board member and maybe a Secretariat. And then there is, yeah, Olivier and Lutz.

Okay, this is a listing of the candidates so far. And if you agree as I suggested, we take this a recommendation from the General Assembly to be confirmed via the list until the 15th of March. Can we take this as a decision? Are there any objections? Abstentions? Annette, you...?

Annette: No, it's just for a minute. I now have you are anonymously supported as Chair. We have two nominations for Secretariat.

Wolf: For Secretariat, yes.

Annette: That is Rudi...

Wolf: Rudi and...

Annette: ...and Dessi?

Wolf: ...and Dessi.

Annette: And there will be... Yeah, well, what?

Wolf: We must know until the end of the Mexico meeting whether Dessi will do it really, or due to her personal...

Annette: Would be willing to do it...

Wolf: Willing to do it, yeah.

Annette: ...because then we would have to make a decision.

Wolf: Yeah, yeah.

Annette: That's... Yeah. So there is a procedure that we come together then and then say one of them, or how do we do it?

Wolf: That's a good question.

Sébastien: [inaudible 2:00:43] [before].

Rudi: May I?

Wolf: Yeah.

Rudi: If Dessi wants to take the place, I step down.

Annette: Okay.

Male: [It's easier to vote then].



Annette: No, we could...

Wolf: [Yeah, I say...]

Annette: ...could agree on that. We could agree on that.

Rudi?: [inaudible]

Annette: Yeah.

Rudi?: [If she can do the job, she has it]... [overtalking]

Sébastien: But for the moment she is not Board member, then we need to first elect her to be Board member.

Wolf: Yeah, it's a little bit more complicated because when you come to the Secretariat, you have to be so to say replaced. Therefore the question as far as I understand is as such: If Dessi goes for the Secretariat, she will be elected for Secretariat for two years, so she's in the Board. If she says, "Well, Secretariat is too much regarding my circumstances, but I would be interested being part of the Board," which would be quite legitimate, therefore this would be valid as well. So... But... Let's probably by pragmatic approach do it that way. Dessi, if you decide in the next two days, "Yes, I will go for the Secretariat"...

Dragoslava: I will inform you very shortly. Just give me a couple of hours, a day to evaluate it.

Annette: Hey, hey, it's easy.

Wolf: Can we...

Annette: It's easy. May I just read something? I just... Okay, I just tried to write it down. I said we have two candidates for Secretariat – Dessi if she agrees to in the next two days. If not, we all agree that we will have Rudi as Secretariat. Full stop. So there is nothing more we have to do, it's just you posting "I'm willing" or "I'm not willing." And if you are not willing to do the Secretariat – now this is the second thing – you will be on the Board still. So... And Rudi, do we have to re-... No. You're ongoing anyhow, so that's no problem at all.

Wolf: Yeah, but the slight difference is if Rudi is on the Secretariat, he will be elected for two years.

Male: [laughs]

Wolf: Chairs and Secretariats are elected for a two years' term.

Annette: Ah! Okay, yeah.

Sébastien: Yeah, but I think we need to elect the Board members and then elect the Chair and the Secretariat. Even if we elect you already, but normally we have to have a vote, a complete Board and the Board elects the two ones. Then we are doing a little bit quicker here, but I don't think it's any trouble.

Wolf: Yeah. But I guess all the people we have on our list will be accepted, because I'm very happy to have them on board, to be honest. Therefore I cannot imagine any disapproval to the candidates we have. Huh?

Annette: Okay. I think that's very easy now. Wolf is Chair. Lutz, Olivier, and Dessi are elected for the Board. And...

Wolf?: [inaudible 2:04:03]

Annette: Huh?

Wolf?: [...would be], well, Vittorio.

Annette: And Vittorio, excuse me. Vittorio we agreed on before.

Vittorio?: [We] actually just nominated [and then] [inaudible].

Annette: Okay, I will say Vittorio – wait – Vittorio, Lutz, Olivier, and Dessi are nominated, as we have the final within the next bah-bah-bah days. Nominated for the Board. We have two candidates for the Secretariat – Dessi if she agrees to, if not we all agree that we will have Rudi as Secretariat. And then of course these times are changing and slipping and moving. Is that fine?

Wolf: Yes.

Male: Yes.

Wolf: I will take your wording, Annette, as a basis for the mailing at the end of [inaudible 2:04:47] and then we will have the certainty however to continue.

I would now like to close this point as we are already more than 20 minutes over the schedule. First of all, I would like to thank you very much for your confidence and for broad approval for the re-election. Thank you very much and I'm looking forward to work another two years with you, and if it's going to be as encouraging as it was one year [after CSSO 2:05:21], I think in another two years it just can be great. Thank you very much.

[group applause]

Wolf: Just for the formalities, we had an agenda point 9 on the... This is an old story, modification of the bylaws to strengthen position of individual users. This I suggest will be running work for the Board to further develop via the monthly phone conference.

"Call for Nomination and Introduction of EURALO ALAC Candidates," I see only I think Patrick's position was a one-year term which will be due next year, but this we can...

Male: [inaudible 2:06:14]

Wolf: June next year.

Male: [inaudible]

Wolf: We don't have to discuss it. Huh?

Male: [inaudible]

Male: When are they expired?

Sébastien: He's up to the end of this year. To the end of this, 2009.

Patrick: Ah. I thought it was until June 2009.

Wolf: No.

Sébastien: And the end of the year.

Wolf: Cairo.

Sébastien: End of the year.

Male: [inaudible 2:06:36]

Wolf: Yeah.

Sébastien: So because you were elected for more than one year, because you came on board before...

Annette: Right.

Sébastien: ...it was a two-year term. You take the plus of...

Annette: Plus. Veronica.

Sébastien: And then it was... Yeah. Then...

Male: [overtalking]

Sébastien: ...it's a question [who could we open 2:06:57], but it's a little bit too early, I guess.

Annette: Yeah.

Wolf: Okay.

Annette: And it postponed the individual users thing.

Wolf: Yeah. That these are the points that can be easily postponed. Is there any other point under miscellaneous? I think there are plenty of miscellaneous but these we can talk, discuss during the next days.

Then I think we are at the end of our agenda of our second General Assembly. I would like to thank all of you for you active and...

Male: [inaudible 2:07:41]

Wolf: Yeah?

Male: The video people.

Male: [inaudible]

Wolf: Yes, we had the video people, right?

Heidi?: You've got four minutes.

Wolf: In about four minutes, so nobody is running away. We make the countdown now. But we are through with all the important relevant points. I'm happy to have another two-three days with some of you for further discussions.

We have still a lot of work in front of us, and there will be another housekeeping announcement. We are over time now. There is no lunch offered officially, so lunch is on our own. And we are asked to return to our working group sessions at 2 o'clock. This will be here in the same building, in the Meliá. I think they will be signed out.

Male: It's [inaudible 2:08:41].

Annette?: [inaudible]

Wolf: Heidi, is...

Heidi: We're ready, but you just need to pick three people.

Sébastien: It's the same room that your working group on Sunday.

Wolf: Okay. Okay. So we have to be back for the working group sessions and then we have some exciting thematic sessions in the afternoon. And it was mentioned already today, I'm personally very proud that among these thematic sessions there are so many offered organized by EURALO people. Thank you very much everybody.

[group applause]

Adam: Can I ask a question, please? It doesn't need the mic. When is the ALAC meeting?

Sébastien: Tonight.

Adam: It seems to have dropped off [any 2:09:28] [inaudible] schedule.

Wolf: Who are the video people?

Male: [inaudible]

Annette: Wait.

Wolf: [inaudible]

Annette: Could you just answer Adam's question? At what time, because if it's slipped off...

Adam: Sorry, it's not on the ICANN schedule, on the main full schedule anymore.

Male: [inaudible]

Heidi?: Yeah, 1830 to 20.

Adam: Okay. [It's somewhere...]

Wolfgang?: ALAC and NCUC?

Male: No, no, no.

Sébastien: No, it was yesterday.

Annette: If we are not in the operational planning, we don't need to be on the agenda anyhow.

Sébastien?: Yes. And where is this meeting happening?

Rudi?: We don't know yet.

Male: [inaudible 2:10:03]

Sébastien: Where is the ALAC meeting?

Heidi: According to the schedule, it's Alameda 4 and 5.

Male: Yeah.

Sébastien: Then it's...

Male: It's here.

Sébastien: ...it's here. Yeah, it's here. So...

Male: [inaudible]

Wolf: Who are the three candidates for the videos?

Lutz?: I apply for the video for the working group 5, so if you need somebody here for EURALO, not a face.

Bogdan: I can be one of those. I don't mind.

Wolf: Yeah. Okay. Bogdan, great. Bogdan is one of them.

Annette: [I want to say something] [inaudible].

Wolf: Yes, Annette, very good.

Sébastien: Anyone? No?

Male: No.

Male: No.

Wolfgang: [inaudible]

Male: [inaudible]

Wolfgang: And raise the budget issue.

[group laughs]

Wolf: Okay. [laughs]

Sébastien?: You don't have, but it's [inaudible]. [laughs]

Wolf: Okay. Thank you very much.

Sébastien: Thank you, thank you...

**[End of Audio]**