

Gisella Gruber:

On today's call on Tuesday, the 21st of August we have Wolf Ludwig, Siranush Vardanyan, Oksana Prykhodko, Adela Danciu, Sandra Hoferichter, Rudi Vansnick, Narine Khachatryan, Yrjö Länispuro, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Christopher Wilkinson. Apologies noted from Bill Drake, Sebastien Bachollet and Heidi Ullrich.

From staff today we have Silvia Vivanco, Matt Ashtiani and myself, Gisella Gruber. If I can also please just remind you all to state your names when speaking for transcript purposes, and if you are on the audio bridge, on the telephone bridge as well as the Adobe Connect please do mute your computer speakers. Over to you, Wolf, and we will help you and let you know when anyone raises their hand in the Adobe Connect room. Thank you.

Wolf Ludwig:

Okay, thanks a lot, Gisella, for this update on the participants and the apologies received. Let's continue with the second agenda item, the list of action items from the last call on 17th of July. And as you can see on the side page there are three action items: to post candidates for the Review Group on the EURALO list and to note that Yrjö's nomination received strong support; and finalization of the candidature will be Monday, 23rd of July. I think there are two different issues: another nomination for the Review Group, and we had the ongoing nominations for the ALAC position and for the NomCom nominations, but we will come back to this point on a later agenda item.

The next EURALO meeting the ALSes will be divided among approximately five members. We've said that okay, for the time being Rudi will start with ISOC members and I will have a look at the rest of the members and we will deal with this issue later again. Are there any questions and comments from your side? If this is not the case let me just continue with the next agenda item. Now, I suddenly have problems with Skype as well – I don't know what's wrong with my computer tonight.

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

The next agenda item we have Point #3, Briefing on Current ALAC Consultations and Initiatives. This part #3 was updated by At-Large staff – thanks – and it’s now as usual the turn of Olivier. And Olivier, you have the floor, please.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Wolf, it’s Olivier for the transcript and I’m going to try to look at the right page... Okay, here we go. So I invite you all to look at the agenda, and I suppose that it has been updated. So we have a number of recently-approved ALAC statements. We’re not going to go through all of them. I invite you all to look at them in your own time. What is great is that we have had so many statements submitted to the different public comment periods, and I thank all the people who have been drafting those statements. And of course the votes have all strongly supported [the community] statements.

There are currently two statements being either voted on or reviewed by the ALAC. The first one is Request for Community Input on SAC054, the Domain Name Registration Data Model. There is a process by which... It’s quite a technical paper, the SAC054, but there’s a process by which all members of At-Large are asked to be able to comment on this. And so there is a Wiki page which has been put there. We’ve only got a couple of days more so you’re all invited to comment on this, and then Julie Hammer will very kindly put all of the comments together and we will submit this as a statement.

Then there’s also an ALAC reply to the comments on the draft statements of ICANN’s role and remit in the Security, Stability and Resiliency of the Internet’s Unique Identifier System. That’s a reply with a closing date of the 31st of August. It’s a reply because the ALAC has already submitted a first statement, but then as you know there is a possibility these days of sending a first statement and then being able to comment on the other comments and statements that other communities have submitted. And this is specifically comments on input which was submitted by the ISP – Internet Service Provider

– Community in the GNSO. So I invite you to read through this; the text is already there.

There are a number of policy forums that are coming up and well, that are currently open actually. In most of them we have decided not to have a statement, like Proposed Modifications to GNSO Operating Procedures. It's really a GNSO thing. The .name Registry Agreement Renewal; again, it's just a renewal basically of a registry agreement. We have commented in the past on the .net and on the .com agreement renewals. The .name one, well first it's a smaller top-level domain so it might not be seen as having the same importance; but also the modifications related to that are not as great for the ALAC to spend time on.

Locking of a Domain Name Subject to UDRP Proceedings – at the moment there hasn't been a choice as to whether the ALAC should draft a statement. The good thing is that the period, the reply period has been extended until the 24th of September. I have, reading through the list I have seen some interest by some people to draft something so we might see something coming up. And Matt, by the way, [I don't know if you've looked at this very closely but] (inaudible)...

Matt Ashtiani: Olivier? Hi, this is Matt. Olivier, we can't really hear you. We've asked Adigo to look into it but you're cutting in and out.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That's very strange. (Inaudible)

Matt Ashtiani: One moment please.

Silvia Vivanco: Can you dial in again? We cannot hear you at all, Olivier.

Wolf Ludwig: I have difficulties to follow Olivier because there is a staccato on the line and I only understand 20% of what Olivier is saying.

Rudi Vansnick: I think it is for everybody the same. His connection seems to be quite bad.

Wolf Ludwig: Well, it's a disaster. I never had these kinds of transmission problems during a call. It normally can happen on Skype calls but not on... Olivier, can you make another sound check or... Yeah, your voice is completely broken when transmitted.

Yrjö Länsipuro: Perhaps Olivier could dial in again.

Wolf Ludwig: Yes please, it would be the best. I can clearly hear Yrjö, I can hear Rudi but I cannot understand any word from Olivier anymore.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Can you hear me now?

Wolf Ludwig: Yes. Yes, now it's okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I'm going to move on to the phone so one moment...

Wolf Ludwig: Okay, that would be nice. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I thought I was going to move on to the phone and now they've just put the phone down. So if you can hear me now that's fine.

Wolf Ludwig: Yes, it's perfect. Now it's clear again.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, I'm on the Adobe Connect now; it was the phone line that wasn't working for me correctly. So just to let you know that statements currently being reviewed or voted by ALAC, the Request for Community Inputs on SAC054, we are accepting comments until the 23rd of August which is in a couple of days' time. It's a technical subject because it looks at the Domain Name Registration Data Model but for anyone who is interested in technical things, please send your comments about the data model. The SSAC themselves have been asking us for that information and there is material they've provided us with to explain what they mean; and of course the actual document, SAC054, is there.

The ALAC reply to comments on the Draft Statement of the ICANN Role and Remit in Security and Stability of the Internet Unique Identifier System – the ALAC has already submitted a statement in the initial comment period. This is a reply to comments which were made by other communities including the Internet Service Provider Constituency in the GNSO. So the reply period closes on the 31st of August and I think there is a statement that is already there, a proposed statement that is there and I invite you all to have a look at it.

The open policy forums, the first one is the Proposed Modifications to GNSO Operating Procedures. This really is a GNSO matter and Alan Greenberg who is our GNSO Liaison has told us that it wouldn't be something that we would need to comment on. The .name Registry Agreement Renewal, the same thing as well – it really is, well as it says a registry renewal with nothing that really touches on the ALAC and on internet users directly. The next one: the Locking of a Domain Name Subject to UDRP Proceedings – at the moment no choice has

been made as to whether there should be or should not be a statement on this. There has been an extension for the commenting up to the 3rd of September and there is a reply period which has been extended till the 24th of September. So we still have time to look at this and it might be of interest. I know that in some other RALOs some people are already looking at this and will hopefully be producing a statement pretty soon for everyone to look at.

The Preliminary Issue Report on Uniformity of Contracts to Address Registration Abuse – Alan Greenberg has indicated that the ALAC should not submit a statement to this public comment period. It's again very [complex] with the contract law, etc., and I think that this is already taken up in hand very much by other parts of ICANN. And finally, the DSSA Working Group Phase I Report – the comment period closes on the [30th of September]. Several people from At-Large have been working in this Working Group. The DSSA is the DNS Security and Stability Analysis, and I guess I might be biased in this as I was one of those people in the Working Group.

The report itself provides full details of suggestions as to what metrics should be taken to find out if the launch of the new gTLDs is a success or a failure, both technically speaking but also on a commercial basis to look at whether the system has actually made... Well sorry, mostly just a technical basis, and I'm making a mistake with another working group that's also working at the same time. Basically this one is to do with just the DNS stability and it looks at a method to be able to analyze the stability of the internet domain name system.

There is a question at the moment as to how it will integrate with the wider [forward] Risk Committee Work which is also taking place simultaneously but I invite you all to read through this. I'm not sure whether there will be any comment from the At-Large, from ALAC but this will no doubt be discussed in the next few weeks. And I'm sorry to have taken more time than was expected on this; I was somehow a little bit disconcerted by the technical problems. So thanks very much, back to you, Wolf.

Wolf Ludwig: Okay, thanks for that, Olivier. I think it was perfect due to the circumstances, so don't worry. And we had announced 15 minutes for this briefing on current ALAC consultations and initiatives. Are there any questions or comments? As I don't have access to the Adobe Connect you have to orally raise your hand and you have to tell me whether you would like to make a comment or whether you have a question. Any questions, comments, to agenda item-

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, Wolf – Rudi Vansnick for the transcript, and I have a first question in fact from reports that are produced after the comment period: would there be any possibility to have a redline version because it's not always easy to find [backup] (inaudible) by other constituencies in order to see what changed between this one and the last version. So like for instance, we had the documents on the New gTLDs – the redline versions. It makes it quite easy to understand what has been taken from the parts.

That was the first question, and then secondly with regards to the Trademark Clearinghouse there was yesterday and today a two-day session in Brussels. There were very interesting discussions, and then following this afternoon of discussions I discovered something and I put it in a mail in the At-Large list already – something that really struck me as an internet user where I see that the costs for the use of the Trademark Clearinghouse by registries would be between \$7000 and \$10,000 per TLD registry whereby for the trademark owners it's only \$150 per submission. So if the end user is going to pay the bill for the protection of a trademark, I'm just wondering as I heard today that there will be a quite sure discussion period and comments on this debate if from ALAC we are going to [support] all this.

Wolf Ludwig: Thanks, Rudi, for these questions. I have not seen the issue so far so can Olivier or anybody else on the call make some comments on this? Olivier, please?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Wolf, it's Olivier, thank you. Right, well with regards to the Trademark Clearinghouse this is something which has come up again and again and again. There have been pushes by the intellectual property people that a Trademark Clearinghouse should be set up, and it was pushed back a number of times; and whatever solution that gets proposed in the end seems always not enough for the trademark owners who wish to have stronger trademark protection than what they've had so far. The implementation, because it's even the concept and the actual design of it all was all done by the community but the implementation is done by staff, and as I understand it came out that the costs for running such a Clearinghouse, such a database were particularly expensive.

And as far as the share of who pays is concerned, I haven't actually seen the numbers which Rudi has mentioned here since of course it's a very new thing. But no doubt that if this matter comes to a public comment period it would be definitely something we would need to address, because of course the industries that are actually going to use this, the registries and registrars that will use this will pass on the costs over to the internet user if they have to pay so much for it and if they have to fund it so much. I think that originally in the working group we had said or we had agreed that it should be shared among the various communities and in a more even way than having the brunt of it being paid for by the registrars and the registries – at least that's my vague memory of it.

And I'm sorry, Rudi, I forgot the first one, and this is when I should really write down the first question.

Wolf Ludwig:

Rudi, can you repeat the first question, please?

Rudi Vansnick:

Yes, sorry Olivier. The first question was about when reports are reproduced after the comment period if there would be a redline version available – that would be very nice.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Yes, thank you, Rudi. That's a very good point. I know that the way that a review takes place, is each one of those working groups that are sending out a comment period will then have staff that will collect all of the statements that everyone has made and will make a summary of them. There will be one summary that will be published and actually also sent to the forum itself so that everyone is able to read through that. The second report that will be drafted by staff is one where a table gets put together with each one of the issues that are raised. They are put together on a per-issue basis and they often are put alongside the text which they refer to in the report.

This really is a working document. It is sometimes quite difficult to understand, but certainly a redline version of the original document with the revised document is something that is good to suggest. I know that each working group [works differently], though, so what we can do is take this as an action item and take it via Heidi to find out the way to actually suggest to all working groups that a redline version gets published. I know it's actually a simple thing to do; it's not a matter of adding a lot more work, so that's why I think it's an excellent idea and probably it would not face any opposition from staff or from working groups since it doesn't produce that much more work.

Wolf Ludwig:

Okay, thanks Olivier, thanks for the proposal and I guess staff will note this on the action items to be followed up. And is this doable to follow up on this, Rudi, to you? Rudi?

Rudi Vansnick:

Yes, Wolf, thanks. That's interesting. I'm looking forward to have this opportunity to have the redline version as when you jump from one work group to another work group you end up having to just follow the working group's methodology. And when you use the redline version also you immediately will be able to see what others have been bringing in that you have not seen.

Wolf Ludwig:

Okay. I think this is not only helpful or useful for this issue but for other comparable consultations and comment issues. And by the way, I agree to your concern on this that upcoming costs for whatsoever requirements should not always be on the backs of internet users but there could be more justified or more intelligent ways to distribute necessary costs; and I think it's a good idea to follow up on this. Are there any further questions regarding agenda Items #4 and #4?

Please tell me now, otherwise I will continue with Agenda Item #4, that is the recent EURALO nominations regarding ALAC and our elected representation and a EURALO representative from the NomCom. As you can see from the link under agenda Item #4 regarding EURALO elections and appointments 2012 – there were repeated calls on our mailing lists, and in July the first nominations started: one for the electoral representative, and I nominated Sandra to continue her work for a second term. And this nomination was supported by five people as I can see on the workspace side – by Oksana, by Adela, Yrjö, Bill Drake and [Mathieu].

And as Sandra is the single candidate from EURALO for this function, for this position I think we could decide now on this call or approve at this call that there is no further action needed and we can confirm Sandra to continue her work at ALAC. This would be my suggestion. Are there any objections or does anybody see a need to ask for final confirmation via the list? I don't see the necessity because as I said before she was the only candidate nominated with decent support and I think we could formally approve this in the context of our monthly call.

Christopher Wilkinson:

Wolf, Christopher here. I would second that so I support your proposal.

Wolf Ludwig: Yes, thanks a lot, Christopher, for your support. And I'm almost certain due to my ongoing experience, if there was no objection or alternative nomination raised so far there wouldn't be anything further if we would do another formal communication. There were repeated communications on this on the list over the last weeks and I think we can afford to choose what is the quickest way and just approve this formally tonight. And Yrjö, I would thank you for your approval and I would congratulate Sandra for being approved as a second term – that I think is great and Sandra really did a great job in her first term. She entered and had some need for orientation but at a certain moment after the first three months she picked up. She launched a program for the ICANN Academy and I really think she did a great job and her contribution to At-Large is broadly appreciated. So all the best, Sandra, for your second term.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Wolf, it's Olivier.

Wolf Ludwig:: Yes please, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Wolf, yes, of course you're not on the Adobe Connect. I just wanted to put into the record that whilst you were speaking there was a unanimous support from everyone on the call, everyone having put a green tick. So well done, Sandra.

Wolf Ludwig: Okay. I would like to ask At-Large staff to put a note on this important point into the record or the brief notes from tonight's call, that we could formally approve this. This was once again anticipated as to a call when you cannot use the highly-appreciated tool of the Adobe Connect room when you have an overview and you have a very special way and means to chair a meeting.

Okay, this point I think can be regarded as [so]. The second one is ALAC voting a delegate to the NomCom for 2013. As a matter of fact we had to learn that our incumbent, Yrjö Länispuro who did two terms as our original delegate at the NomCom and who did an excellent job which was broadly appreciated by various NomCom members as I was informally told – Yrjö could not be nominated for a third term without an interruption due to particular regulations in the ICANN Bylaws; and therefore we had to look for another candidate.

And I suggested Veronica Cretu who was a former ALAC member, and Veronica has accepted her nomination and there was no second nomination up to the nomination deadline. So she is a single candidate, a single nominee from EURALO for this NomCom 2013 function. But in this case our nomination only has the character of a recommendation, and it's finally not on us as I have learned to decide. It's finally ALAC who will do the final choice on the suggested candidates from the regions. And therefore I guess okay, Veronica is our single candidate which was forwarded last week to Olivier and now it's up on the ALAC to make that choice. I guess this is correct, Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

That's correct, Wolf – it's Olivier here for the transcript. The ALAC will ratify or choose. It's not a done deal; the ALAC might have someone else in mind and it has managed to choose [whoever it wanted to] in the past, it has done so in some cases but I thank the region very much for their recommendation of Veronica. Rudi has his hand up as well.

Wolf Ludwig:

Okay, Rudi, you have the floor please.

Rudi Vansnick:

Thank you, Wolf – Rudi Vansnick for the transcript. I would like to suggest in the future when we nominate candidates for representation on any function, whatever – the NomCom and ALAC representation – that we choose people who are really also active in working groups; that they have illustrated that they

can join us as a team and in a team and that we don't have to fall back always for the more let's say unpleasant work of following conference calls and work groups and so on for several nights; that the selection of candidates would be done also based on the activity of the members of the RALO in general.

Wolf Ludwig:

Okay, I think this is a good point we can keep in mind for further selection procedures, that we may consider this in our monthly calls earlier. This just came up; it was not in my mind at our last monthly calls in July. It came up afterwards and I think that a better solution would have had this point discussed during our last monthly calls and would raise some of the questions you have just mentioned, Rudi – to what extent a member is involved in the regular activities, etc. I have informally received some mail suggesting other members and my spontaneous response was by saying “Okay, these might be valuable candidates but if a candidate never so far had anything to do with EURALO at all it may be difficult for the community to select a candidate who is not even known to the majority of our community.”

And therefore for the time being Veronica was the only candidate due to her record having been a previous At-Large candidate, and on her previous performance I could imagine that she could be an acceptable candidate for this function now; but I agree in principle to your remarks, to your points, Rudi, that we could choose better selection mechanisms for the future. Any further comments or questions on this, on agenda Item #4? If this is not the case, I hear no hand raised....

Rudi Vansnick:

Oksana has her hand raised.

Wolf Ludwig:

Okay, please Oksana, go ahead. Oksana, you have the floor.

Oksana Prykhodko: Hello, do you hear me?

Wolf Ludwig: Yes, we can hear you.

Oksana Prykhodko: I'm ready to support Veronica's nomination. I know Veronica and I think she would be a very good candidate for this work.

Wolf Ludwig: Okay, thanks a lot. By the way, there was one more support expressed on the EURALO list by Adela which was not updated on the particular workspace. So now we have two support messages, and as I said before we can only forward this as our regional recommendation and it will be ALAC who will make the choice on the regional nominations. And as you can see from the timetable below the nomination list this choice will be taken in the next two weeks.

If there are no further questions regarding agenda Item #4 let me suggest we continue with point #5: a short briefing on the last European Summer School on Internet Governance in Meissen. There were three of us who were present there – Sandra is the organizer of course, Olivier was there and I was there, and to me it was just another very successful edition of EuroDIG. But Sandra, you have the floor to add some more comments and conclusions, please.

Sandra Hoferichter: Thank you, Wolf, can you all hear me?

Wolf Ludwig: Yes, we hear you very well, thank you. Go ahead.

Sandra Hoferichter: You missed to mention Wolfgang – he was there as well on the EURALO side.

Wolf Ludwig: Okay, I failed to mention him; I was referring to the people present tonight on this call, but of course Wolfgang must have been there.

Sandra Hoferichter: Okay. Due to the time constraints I will be very brief. We had 100 applications again from 25 countries. We chose out of these applications 25 students, most of them were supported by a fellowship program but some of them were also able to pay for this course. We have a report which [goes through the details] of our tele-school and I just pasted the link to this report on the Adobe chat room. It's not very long and I recommend everybody who is interested in our program just to read this brief report, maybe go through the pictures which are also shown. I will finish with that, thank you.

Wolf Ludwig: Okay, thanks a lot, Sandra, for the brief. And as you said, there is a summary report on the website of EuroDIG highlighting more or less the achievements of this last edition, and I think it is a great initiative which was started by Wolfgang together with Sandra and implemented now for the seventh time. And it's a great opportunity to advance capacity building and also to have a chance to participate in this Summer School may confirm how valuable and useful it is, etc. And I could wish that some more of our members would have the opportunity.

For Europeans it's mostly more difficult than for people from abroad to get a sponsorship for it but theoretically it would be possible, and I think there's still a chance for the next edition in Summer 2013. If there are no questions, comments regarding this agenda item let me suggest we continue with a short briefing on the upcoming ICANN-Studienkreis meeting this week in Oslo. And Sandra, again, you have the floor.

Sandra Hoferichter:

Thank you, Wolf. The ICANN-Studienkreis is taking place from Thursday to Friday, August 23rd to 24th in Stockholm. The ICANN-Studienkreis is the twelfth meeting. It was funded over 13 years ago; I was not joining this organization from its first beginning. And we will have two more meetings, next year in Amsterdam and then probably the last one in [Meissen] again where we also had the first meeting. And so everybody who's interested and still in a position to travel over to Oslo at the end of this week is invited.

We have a very interesting program which somehow reflects the discussions around the current issues, around the current projects within ICANN which is of course the New gTLD Program – we will have a very long session on this and discussing the consequences for business, the applicants and their plans and prospective conflicts, new business opportunities, and public policy implementation. We have a pretty good participation also from ICANN. Olof Nordling will be there as well as Nigel Hickson, the Vice President for Europe. Also we have [Keith Drasek], Stefan van Gelder, Martin Boyle, Thomas (Inaudible). So actually somehow the same usual suspects but the beauty of the ICANN-Studienkreis is that you can discuss this issue in a rather relaxed and very intense atmosphere.

It's a little bit different than an ICANN meeting because you are not so under stress; you are just there following the lectures and have time to discuss these issues at length. I just placed a link to our website in the Adobe chat room and everybody is invited to have a look at the really interesting program which will be updated by tomorrow. Still the old version which is still online will give you a good idea about what's going on, but the update will be online by tomorrow.

[Norid] is our local partner. They are inviting us for dinner this night and they are taking care in getting the University of Oslo for the venue and all the [things around], the procedure that we are having a local partner with to somehow support the event well. And next year we meet in Amsterdam, I'm going on to next year already. That's it for my side.

Wolf Ludwig:

Okay, thanks a lot, Sandra, for this update. As some of you may remember with our suggestion for this year's ICANN fiscal year we suggested also as one project participation, support, sponsoring for three to five of our members to participate in the Studienkreis meetings this year in Oslo – this was unfortunately not approved by ICANN with a strange remark that this project wouldn't be ICANN-related. But I still can't understand it as a reasoning for not approving this because ICANN-Studienkreis in its history really stands for a long-term commitment to ICANN issues. And I myself this year can't make it to Oslo the day after tomorrow but I agree with Sandra that it's always a very exciting event and one of the best opportunities to discuss about various points in detail.

Any further questions regarding agenda Item #6 or comments? If that's not the case let's continue to our last agenda Item #7: EURALO planning for 2012, a continued discussion. As you may recall, so far for most of this year it's a standing issue, it's a standing agenda item where we discussed preparation of the Stockholm General Assembly, where we discussed the ICANN ALAC Anniversary Event, etc. And now in our this year's planning with EuroDIG and the ICANN-Studienkreis most of the regional highlights are over and it was time to start our discussions regarding the pending issues.

And one of the discussions was, as you can see from the sub line the discussion on how to deal with nonresponsive members. There have been inputs the last two weeks on our mailing list – this is a suggestion from Rudi with comments from [Alberto], with a further comment from Christopher, from one of our German member ALSes and two comments from my side. Just to underline that this is an ongoing discussion also at the ALAC level when we had repeated discussions during our last Secretariats' meeting at the ICANN meeting, and I circulated a proposal with how we can deal with these potential problem cases.

There was also a question about the condition because in the early discussions the term was used talking about 'non-active' members, and as I pointed out I

think the term ‘non-active’ member is quite biased, etc., and does not reflect the circumstances of why members may be active at the EURALO level or not. I also stressed the aspects of incentives, etc. I’ve had a detailed remark on this and I think we should continue this discussion on the list because it also points to come consideration of principles, not only regarding EURALO but the whole ALS system in general and it was made clear by the last exchanges I had with [Alberto Guittano] on this, etc. And I consider this as the beginning of a debate, of a critical debate on this and I don’t think there is any perfect solution on this but we need to keep this in mind.

I was just informed that Oksana has raised her hand. Yes, Oksana, please?

Oksana Prykhodko:

Thank you very much, Wolf – it’s Oksana Prykhodko for the record. Talking about sleeping or inactive ALSes, I [name] the Ukrainian Internet Association. The Ukrainian Internet Association changed twice their leadership and the new leaders have no information about, I am not sure about ICANN as a whole but about EURALO for sure. That is why we need the concept of new leadership, and maybe we have some tools to deal with that situation; for example, to demand all ALSes to put on their website some obligations before EURALO and ALAC to inform ordinary members. I know that ordinary members are not satisfied with the situation with the new leadership but we have no tools to deal with it. Thank you.

Wolf Ludwig:

Yes, okay, thanks for this hint, Oksana. I think this is also a more general problem that was also raised in my assessment. There are particular cases I know from other members where there was a change in personnel over the years, and the people that applied at the time that the organization became ALAC-certified, that these people may have left the organization and the successors do not know about the issue or do not care about the issue. I think it’s time now to start these kinds of questions and perhaps research about the situation in some of the problem cases; and as we discussed on our last call we

will start now to contact members directly – this is I still think the most effective way. And Rudi offered to contact members at the ISOC level and I promised to contact members at the non-ISOC level, and I've started with that partly already as far as I can reach them.

The summer moment is not the most appropriate moment because many people are still on holidays but this is something we have to deal with over the next couple of weeks. And Rudi also first has prepared a document when he made an assessment on the participation of our members at the monthly calls and participation at General Assemblies. Participation at General Assemblies was always, the last three times at least a question of financial capacity as well. The last regional assemblies were not supported; they were not funded by ICANN so it was up on the members themselves. And therefore I believe, having had around eight to ten members present at the General Assembly was a reasonable and impressive quorum already because you cannot expect a full house at a General Assembly like we had in 2000 in Paris, like we had in 2009 in Mexico City. These were the only two General Assemblies which were fully funded and supported by ICANN and we had a high quorum of participation at those two, and a rather modest one during the last three which were not funded.

But I think it makes a lot of sense to go into such details and to have this kind of assessment, and I would like to thank Rudi for his document he has prepared: the EURALO ALS Participation Report that you can see on the website and that refers to the first agenda item, not the second one but what is an important working instrument. And I think we have to continue these discussions over the next calls. Are there any comments, questions from your side?

Rudi Vansnick:

If I may, Wolf – Rudi here?

Wolf Ludwig:

Yes, please.

Rudi Vansnick:

Yes, Rudi Vansnick for the transcript – thank you, Wolf. I would like to add to the first report because I was [troubled more in conducting the report]. It takes a lot of time to go through it. I've tried first to see how many have participated in the monthly calls but what I'm more interested in and what we should really work on is a greater diversity in the participation in working groups. When I look at the working groups in which I'm participating, we are almost always two people from EURALO. We are from separate RALOs four or five participants. It's quite difficult to be present on every call of the working groups especially when they are quite active, and I would like, I would really like to have more people available for the working groups.

I have to be honest, and I've been talking to Olivier already – I have been hesitating to stepping down from EURALO because I am not interested in working like a donkey day and night when I see that I'm the only one or there are just two in working groups being proactive. EURALO should be active in every aspect of work the At-Large is doing, and if I don't see any changes I will definitely reconsider my decision and will step down from EURALO. That's what I wanted to add.

Wolf Ludwig:

Okay, thanks for this comment, Rudi. I think this is really a point that we have to consider further on and I've seen this problem as well. But for the time being I must agree – I can only concentrate on existing problems in various working groups where EURALO is not present. It's a question of capacity. We cannot force ordinary members to become a member of working groups, etc. There were only a few people in the past like you and partly it was Lutz for security-related working groups, but otherwise there was a very low representation from our side. This is an existing problem, I agree, and I think we have to continue this discussion over the next weeks.

Any further questions, comments? Let me suggest we take this agenda Item #7 as a start of a structural discussion. This is not so much related to events like on the last five calls we had where it is always easier when you can focus on an

upcoming event. This is now going in-depth into some structural problems, etc., and they are on the table and I think they need to be covered again. I'm informed that Olivier has raised his hand. Please, Olivier, you have the floor.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thanks very much, Wolf – it's Olivier for the transcript. I was just going to say I wholeheartedly agree with both of you, actually, with both Rudi and you. Yes, it is important that ALSes take a more active part in what ICANN is doing and that some members go and take part in working groups, and what I mean by 'take part in working groups' is if they have very little time on their hands at least subscribe to the mailing lists and actually take part by email in what's going on. There's nothing worse than having a lot of At-Large Structures listed but having absolutely no input whatsoever from those At-Large Structures, and then hearing criticism later on from the community in newspapers, etc., saying ICANN takes decisions without asking anyone about those decisions.

The ALSes, the At-Large Structures are ICANN's local connection to internet users out there and it's really, really important to note that this needs to work well if the multi-stakeholder model is going to work at all. If it doesn't work well then I think we can all just go home and say "You know what? This multi-stakeholder thing doesn't work" and just give it all up to government and let the government run the internet. And I'm sorry to be a little bit shocking on this, but if we're going to say we want to be in a multi-stakeholder model we're going to actually do some work in it. That's all, thank you.

Wolf Ludwig:

Okay, thanks a lot, Olivier, for this additional comment and I entirely agree with your point. And the goal we have set ourselves is a couple of years, but being involved in politics for quite a long time I have learned that having a good idea and to implement good ideas or good concepts, implementation is a rather more difficult and complex issue. And we are still on the learning side, etc. Don't forget that the RALO ALS model now is in its fifth year more or less, etc., so perhaps [half] the lifetime of the ICANN model, etc. And sometimes I hesitate

to expect full implementation on the spot. My usual thinking is it would be ideal, it would be perfect if it always would work like we think it should work; but sometimes due to different circumstances it doesn't always work on the spot and I think it's still a very important element in this discussion, in this context we should never forget.

If you deal with volunteer communities you cannot expect the same level of performance as when you deal with professionals – professionals who do this in their daily work, etc., like in the Commercial Constituencies, etc., and At-Large highly depends on volunteers' inputs. And this is and will be a question of our capacities, etc. But I agree that there is a problem and we have to continue our discussion on this. As we discussed at the last General Assembly in Stockholm we also have the phenomenon of demotivation at EURALO. There was a higher motivation to my memory two, three years ago and there was a downgrading over the last two years; and I see really a link from not having had the opportunity to assemble our members face-to-face more regularly. And I still have some hope for next year when we got finally, after three years, approved that we will have a face-to-face General Assembly next year, most probably in summer in Lisbon. And then I think we should need the time in between to raise relevant questions to ask ourselves what are the handicaps, what are the discouraging factors, what can be encouraging factors, etc.

This is a very sophisticated discussion and debate we have to pursue, etc., and I think we can learn a lot out of it. Are there any further questions? I just realized we are 17 minutes behind our schedule, and as was said before this is the start of an in-depth discussion. I would wish to have some more comments on the mailing list as well, not only the usual subjects. I think I have outlined my points of view already in detail on the mailing list and I would also appreciate more contributions from other members and participants on the call.

If there are no further questions, remarks on this issue the next point s pending next steps to organize individual members, creation of a specific ALS. I would like to suggest to postpone this to the next call because I would prefer to discuss this in-depth with the individual members on the call. And I see other than

Siranush there are no individual members at our call so we have to mobilize them again to participate in the monthly call and to focus on this agenda item because this is pending for more than a year now and there could be a lot of next steps taken, etc. But as I announced before I will do not the work for them; they must do the work by themselves.

Further questions? I have no information, no input anymore via Skype so let me thank all of you for your time, and all during a lovely summer evening. And I wish you a splendid summer evening and hope to read you and to hear you over the next couple of weeks. Thanks again and goodbye, goodnight.

[End of Transcript]