

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you, Wolf – Gisella here. I'd like to welcome everyone on today's EURALO call on Tuesday the 22nd of January at 19:00 UTC. On today's call we have Wolf Ludwig, Yuliya Morenets, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Siranush Vardanyan, Roberto Gaetano, Dirk Kalkman, Oksana Prykhodko, Avri Doria, Vladimir Kukovsky, Adela Danciu, Yrjö Länispuro, Narine Khachatryan, Sebastien Bachollet. We have apologies noted from Sandra Hoferichter.

From staff we have Silvia Vivanco, Heidi Ullrich, and myself, Gisella Gruber. If I could please also remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes and also that a transcript of the call will be posted within 48 hours and staff will be taking note of action items, so please do state them clearly. Thank you, over to you Wolf.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay, thanks a lot Gisella and once again, welcome to our first monthly call of this year. As you may have seen on tonight's agenda the next agenda item is a review of the action items from our last call, from the 18th of December. And if you click on it there are some action items mentioned. I have to wait until it opens... Yes, now it's open.

Just give me the opportunity to recall what we have noted as action items during our last call: Lisbon GA planning drafted by Wolf was adopted and focal points for the mobilization of member ALSes were confirmed – those listed in the Master Plan. The Master Plan you can see under our main agenda item for tonight, which is the discussion on the preparations of the Lisbon GA.

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.

Wolf to send the first circular mail with GA announcement to the list, followed up by him and the focal points – the first circular announcement was sent. I think it was around 20th of December with some few responders, and the first reminder to the first announcement was sent in the first half of January where we'll get some more responses and some more registrations for the Lisbon GA.

The third point: during the January and February calls we need to verify responses received and where further follow-ups or even pushes are needed. Last point: the registration process for the Lisbon GA should be accomplished by middle or end of February latest to allow time and opportunities for cheap flight bookings. I will come back to most of these points at a later stage. So far all of the action items there are accomplished.

Let me now go back to the agenda. My computer is rather slow tonight... Yes, here we are again. The next point on our agenda is as usual the briefing on current ALAC consultations and initiatives, and this is again the part of Olivier. Olivier, please, you have the floor.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Wolf, and it's Olivier for the transcript record. And it feels like déjà vu for me since just a couple of hours ago I went through exactly the same list with the ALAC itself.

WOLF LUDWIG: I remember.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: But it's good because we have a good timing, because we actually have answers to the questions that are being asked here, so I will go through those and whilst things are still fresh in our minds. I invite you all to look at the Policy Advice Development Page which is one of the several pages which I really recommend all of our members basically save in their bookmarks, because these pages really provide you with – especially this page, if you scroll down you see “Open Statements” and then you've got “Closed Statements” underneath there, and you have various columns on the page.

And that provides you with full details of where we are at with any statement that the ALAC or At-Large is currently working on. And it tells you when the vote is going to open, when the calls for comments are opening, closing, etc., and what's coming up as well which is I think really, really helpful. I must say I look at this page at least twice if not three times a week, sometimes even more often when we are close to statements changing. But it also provides you with a good background of all the statements that have been drafted in the past.

So in the recent ALAC statements that have been drafted: the first one is the Trademark Clearinghouse Strawman Solution. To give you an idea on the background quickly, what's happened was the Trademark Clearinghouse was discussed and a solution for the Trademark Clearinghouse had been put together by a cross-community working group. During the implementation phase it was found that a few changes needed to be done, and so the CEO of ICANN asked for several parties to come together including some people from At-Large and to basically put together a solution, a Strawman Solution.

And the statement that we have made, that the ALAC has made is one which reasserts what our position is with regards to some of these points. And if you read the statement you'll find that we agree with some of the findings of the Strawman Solution, but also we do criticize some of the ways in which this was done, the work was done because it was more top-down and because the At-Large community could not – doesn't have the funding, I guess, to go and be part of the discussions in person. One part of the discussion took place in Brussels and one part took place in Los Angeles, and neither of the meetings had anybody from At-Large being there physically in person. And as we know, being there in person is usually better than being at the end of a phone line.

So that's the first statement. The next one is on the International Governmental Organizations and International Nongovernmental Organizations. If some of you are tracking this you might remember that there was a discussion about the Red Cross and the International Olympic Committee wishing to have some special provisions for their domains not to be available in the round of new gTLDs. And the Board came up with a protection... Anyway, our advice in the past was that there needed to be a policy development process with a working group from the GNSO working on this and finding out what kinds of protections if any should be given to those identifiers, and how one would choose whether protection was going to be provided or not.

This really is an extension of all the copyright, the trademark issues, some of the issues that have plagued the New gTLD Process for a very long time, bringing a lot of criticism to ICANN as well because it's very costly for an organization that has a brand to register in all of the new gTLDs that will be created. The INGO/NGO Statement was in response

to a question, a set of questions from that working group in the GNSO so it was another ability for our community to comment and to bring its input, and that was really good, really positive. And we've also, the two main people who were drafting the statement were also helped by Jovan Kurbalija whom some of you might know from the DiploFoundation. He is very knowledgeable about IGOs and INGOs in Geneva so he basically helped a lot on what was being said. And it's interesting because his findings were the same as the findings of the ALAC. So that was the second statement adopted.

The third one was ALAC Demarche to ICANN and this one was just a correspondence over to the Chair of the Board, Steve Crocker, regarding the huge problem that some people face in going to Toronto due to the inability of them to obtain a visa in time. So the statement was actually originally drafted by Yrjö Länispuro from EURALO. This is an excellent example of a region raising a point that was particularly important; this being brought over to the ALAC's attention, and finally the point being supported fully by the ALAC; and the letter, the correspondence being sent to the Chair of the Board with a copy to the CEO and a copy to the Chair of the Public Participation Committee.

There has not been an official reply yet to this piece of correspondence but we were told during the ALAC call by the Chair of the Public Participation Committee that the matter will be looked at by their Committee at the end of the month. So the Board will be looking at this at the end of this month and it's a matter that is being taken very seriously thanks to the statement that we've made today, so another positive thing.

Next, the statements being currently developed, reviewed or voted on by the ALAC: there are four of them at the moment. Two of them, the IDN – sorry, IDN is International Domain Name – Variant Top-Level Domain Program: Procedure to Develop and Maintain the Label Generation Rules for the Root Zone in Respect to IDNA Labels, second public comment draft. Now, we have an Internationalized Domain Name Working Group that has worked on this. We have several experts in here and they have drafted a note, a statement which the ALAC is voting on at the moment.

The next one is the Statement on the World Conference on International Telecommunications. That's the meeting that took place in Dubai in December. I am the person to draft the statement. I'm afraid I'm a little delayed on this but I will draft a statement. The first thing that I will do is to draft and finish the drafting of a large report of what happened over in Dubai last month and from there, a statement which will make some recommendations to ICANN as a whole as to what should be done to bridge the gap between those countries or those participants that understand the multi-stakeholder model and those that don't, or those that have not had any participation in the multi-stakeholder model.

There's a lot of work that our At-Large Structures can do locally. I know that in Europe and in other Regional At-Large Organizations the At-Large Structures have been working very hard to convince their government to do the right thing, but also to convince their local population and get them involved in the bottom-up input multi-stakeholder model that ICANN and the IETF and the World Wide Web Consortium are built on.

Next, the Report on the GNSO Working Group on the Consumer Trust, Consumer Choice, and Competition – the work of the Working Group on Consumer Trust was finished about six months ago. A number of people from At-Large took part in this work. Evan Leibovitch has drafted a statement and I'm going to work with Evan to finalize a short statement providing support for some of the findings, but also pointing out some of the shortfalls of the work of that Working Group. And that statement will soon go to voting by the ALAC.

After that, the Thick WHOIS PDP Working Group: PDP means policy development process - the Thick WHOIS Policy Development Process Working Group. There are two types of WHOIS. WHOIS is a service which provides the details of the owner of a domain name, so the registration records of a domain name. For some, WHOIS records are based on the thick model. The thick model means that the registry holds all of the information relating to that domain name. The thin model means that the registrar, and sometimes there are many registrars for one top-level domain – the registrars themselves hold the bit of information that relates to their own customer and not to everything else outside.

So it's been a question for a very long time which model should be pursued, the thick or thin, and how much information should be on there, etc. We have made a statement, the ALAC has made a statement about the Working Group's work at the moment. One thing which was decided during the ALAC conference call a couple of hours ago was that we should have a webinar about WHOIS; maybe a webinar with a discussion of all the different issues concerning WHOIS. And that's something which might be of great interest to our community because

it involves not only the technical side of WHOIS but there are huge privacy issues, international law issue, law enforcement, freedom of speech issues which are attached to WHOIS. And so I think that we will organize this within the next few weeks.

Currently open public comments: currently, there are several of which we've decided there will be no statement. So for example, the Consultation on the IANA Secure Notification Process is a sort of technical process by which notification is sent to sort of respondents – no statement on this.

The At-Large Whitepaper on the Future Challenges entitled “Making ICANN Relevant, Responsive, and Respected” – this is a whitepaper which was developed by the Future Challenges Working Group. It was called the R3 Paper for a while. The comment period closed on the 1th of January. The reply period will close on the 1st of February. This is really not something that we will be responding to, “we” as in the ALAC or At-Large will be responding to, but the Work Group will take all of the comments that come from other parts of ICANN and will be incorporating them into their final reports. And these reports will likely be used for a session that will take place in Beijing. I believe, is it a 90-minute session I think, a face-to-face session? Heidi, am I correct?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm sorry, which meeting?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The R3 Paper discussion, Future Challenges.

HEIDI ULLRICH: In Beijing, yes, 90 minutes on Monday mid-morning.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, perfect. So 90 minutes of discussion about this, so no statement for this.

The .cat Cross-Ownership Removal Request – no statement on that either. .cat is one of the top-level domains that has been created for Catalonia, a region of Spain, and it basically asks for the removal of some restrictions within their top-level domain.

The next one is the Amendments to the Article VI Section 2.3 of the ICANN Bylaws – DNS Root Server Advisory Committee, RSSAC. Now, that’s one of the Advisory Committees just like the ALAC is. The view here is to align some of its methods and some of its bylaws with the current bylaws and methods of the SSAC, which is the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. And the SSAC functions very well indeed so after a brief discussion today on the ALAC call we’ve decided not to make a statement on this, and we’re happy that the RSSAC is doing work to improve themselves.

Next, the Preliminary Issue Report on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information – no statement necessary on this one either. It’s a preliminary issue report so we really are looking at very, very early days and we will have plenty of time to comment in the future. That said, if you’re interested in these things you would have to read the report now and perhaps you would be able to comment in the future.

Next, the Consultation on gTLD Delegation and Redelegation Performance Standards, and the Consultation on the ccTLD Delegation and Redelegation Performance Standards – now, these two have actually been put together because one deals with generic top-level domains and one with country code top-level domains. And the issue of delegation and redelegation in effect is when let's say a country code, .aa – I don't even think that there is such a thing – but country code .aa has to be redelegated because the current registry has disappeared or is unable to assume the role of a registry, there are no real set performance standards. And so it might happen in a month, it might happen in ten years.

It's been a real sore in ICANN's foot for a very long time and so there are consultations on both the gTLD Redelegation and the ccTLD Redelegation. Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Alan Greenberg, who are respectively our ccNSO Liaison and our GNSO Liaison, will draft a joint statement because we have in the past said on many occasions that we believe, because some ccTLDs are used as gTLDs we believe there needs to be a common set of standards with regards to running those top-level domains.

And then the IDN Variant TLD Program, Internationalized Domain Names again – the IDN Working Group will be looking at the draft Final Report Examining the User Experience Implications of Active Variant TLDs. Now, the user experience is very close to At-Large's heart since we are internet users. The IDN Working Group will be looking, and it's currently making a choice on whether they will comment or not on this. The comment period is open until the 8th of February and the reply

period closes on the 1st of March so there is still plenty of time for them to make a decision.

And I open the floor for questions. I saw Sebastien had put his hand up a long time ago already and I apologize, Sebastien, for making you wait for so long.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay, thanks a lot, Olivier, for the briefing. First of all and as you said, I've noted that Sebastien had raised his hand but he may be muted. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yeah, I am not anymore muted but this time I unmuted at the correct time. Yeah, it was when Oliver was speaking about the WHOIS – I just want to be sure that you get this information. There is all the work done about WHOIS that will be carried on, but the Board decided to appoint a second track. We want to call that not anymore WHOIS but Directory Services that we can do and want to do with the Directory Services in the future for gTLDs, and there will be a parallel or another way on working on that issue. Then there is what is done for thick WHOIS and thin WHOIS – there is a Review Team recommendation that will be taken into account and put into application. And there will be a second work open with Directory Services for the gTLDs in general. It's to try to get rid of the history and to take a new view on the situation and hopefully it will be easier to find an agreement on what to do in the future. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay, thanks a lot Sebastien, for these additional comments. Are there any further questions or comments regarding this agenda Item #3 on current At-Large consultations? I see no hand raised anymore so no further questions and comments.

Please let me continue with the next agenda item on our agenda, which is Point #4 – Briefing on EuroDIG 2013 Preparation Process. As some of you may have realized, we had a call for proposals from the IGF in Baku until the end of year, and from the call period until the 31st of December we received around 55 proposals on topics. It was made clear this year that we didn't ask for session proposals but for upcoming issues on the European agenda. In the time between the EuroDIG Secretariat which I am part of it, we roughly reviewed, listed and compiled those proposals, providing a basis for our upcoming open planning meeting on the 29th of January in Lisbon.

I think more details on this you can find on the EuroDIG website, which is linked here, mentioned here. And out of the Lisbon discussion at the end of the month we will draft a first outline for the next EuroDIG program. And there will be an ongoing consultation on the first outline until the end of February, when we will meet [online] for the next IGF consultations in Paris. And at that opportunity we will decide on a first draft program for the EuroDIG in June. Up until then it will be a very open, bottom-up planning and programming process; after that we have to get together with the focal points for the prospective sessions and to organize a program in detail. Are there any questions from your side regarding the EuroDIG planning process?

I noted with pleasure that several of you, starting with Adela, Avri, Narine, Oksana, Sebastien, and Yulia submitted proposals. It's a pleasure for me to state that there is a considerable input from the EURALO side and as stated before, I think that EURALO became a key player in the whole EuroDIG process by now. Thanks to all of you who have helped, who have contributed and submitted proposals and I think we will stay in touch for any further processing.

Let me continue with the next agenda item, which is Point #5-

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Wolf?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: I'm sorry Wolf, this is Desiree. I have a question if I may? Yes, thank you for that update about the EuroDIG. You have mentioned something, the next preparatory meeting in Paris – is that during the WYSIS 10+ meeting or the Open MAG Consultations in Paris?

WOLF LUDWIG: The Open MAG Consultations. It will be most probably... We are in the moment in direct discussion with IGF's Secretariat but approximately our second open planning meeting in Paris will be on the 1st of March which will be in line with the MAG IGF Open Consultations and after the WYSIS +10 meeting at UNESCO.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, you're welcome. If there are no further questions on this issue let me continue with agenda Item #5: Call for Applications for EuroDIG 2013. EuroDIG stands for European Summer School on Internet Governance. As some of you may have noted, on the list yesterday we sent around a call for applications for the Seventh EuroDIG in the beginning of August this year. And the call for applications is open until April, and anybody from your side or somebody you know who may be interested, please forward this call for applications and encourage people to apply for this year's EuroDIG because it's one of the best opportunities I know in Europe besides the Diplo courses, providing a very intensive and excellent opportunity for internet governance upgrades.

Any questions regarding this agenda item? I see no hand raised. Any comments? If this is not the case let me continue with the subsequent agenda item, which is Update on the ICANN Academy Follow-Up and Survey. As you may recall from our last monthly call in December, Sandra gave a short overview on the process from now until Beijing. In the time between there was a survey launched to the community and I don't know yet whether the survey was completed. As Sandra couldn't join us for today's call – she is at the prep meeting for the next German IGF in Berlin – may I ask Heidi whether there is any news on this subject, the process for the ICANN Academy which is supposed to happen in Beijing?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. On the survey, the staff are currently working with Sandra on getting the right type of report. The Survey Monkey which was the technology used is able to offer several different types of report so we're working with her to get the right detail on that. In terms of the Academy I'm quite sure that it was agreed it would take place at an AGM, not in Beijing. So perhaps Olivier has an update on that. And I'm aware that since Filiz is no longer with ICANN that the Academy activity will be the responsibility of the Global Stakeholder Engagement Department. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, thanks a lot, Heidi, for this additional information. Olivier, is there anything from your side you would like to add?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Wolf, it's Olivier for the transcript record. I am not aware 100% about all the latest information on the Academy side of things. What I do know though is that the Working Group has decided that the AGM is a better time to hold the Academy rather than holding it in Beijing, because the first thing they have done is to put together a survey where they have asked various Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, Stakeholder Groups, but also the different Regional At-Large Organizations. And I think that EURALO must have received a questionnaire as well.

They sent a questionnaire out as to how much capacity building and how much work is done locally to support the community, and I think

that the next thing that the Working Group will be doing will be to analyze the results of the survey. As I understand a lot of surveys have been completed and beyond that, once they have identified what the needs are then they will be able to build a curriculum – and “they” as in the cross-community working group that Sandra is [Chairing]. Thanks.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay, thanks Olivier for this complementary info on the agenda item for the ICANN Academy. I think it was for some of us clear from the beginning that most probably the next AGM would be the better opportunity to have this project launched. Some of you may recall that we intended this for Toronto already but for reasons of broader community involvement it was a good idea to postpone the project and to extend the procedure. And it will provide in any case more time for in-depth discussion and to probably launch a more consolidated project at a later stage.

I see Sebastien’s hand raised?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes please, it’s Sebastien Bachollet, just to give you some update also from my side. It will be one of the topics of the next Public Participation Committee meeting that will be taking place the 31st of January in Los Angeles during the next Board retreat and I will give you updates at the next EURALO call on where we are and where staff and the Board is on that project. And it will be interesting to see how the community is doing and what we are doing, too. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay, thanks Sebastien for this additional information. Are there any further questions or comments regarding this agenda item, ICANN Academy, follow-up, etc.? I think in our next call in February Sandra will be on the call again and can give you some more details on the process and the project.

Before I go to our next agenda item, Point #7 on tonight's agenda it's a pleasure for me, I would like to take the opportunity to especially welcome Carolin Silbernagl who represents our new arrival at EURALO – the recently-certified new ALS, .HIV based in Berlin. And it's a special pleasure that Carolin has joined our first monthly call after certification. Welcome here and we hope to have you at many other calls with EURALO over the next time, Carolin.

So next is the main agenda item for tonight, Point #7 – EURALO Planning 2013. As you may recall, we had some first discussions on the draft Master Plan on our December call already. As you may recall from the action items for tonight we had some decisions taken on our last call. We agreed on the focal points for further outreach. And to mobilize our members for the Lisbon GA is a kind of challenge I think for all of us because we really need a re-mobilization of our existing, particularly older members.

As you may recall, I have circulated a first announcement the end of last month, roughly describing that it will be the first face-to-face meeting since the last face-to-face GA in Mexico City in 2009; that this time all of our members are invited to come to Lisbon and that this time we are funded by ICANN. On my first announcement and my first reminder we received already some registrations, and please give me now the

opportunity to give you an update because I listed the incoming registrations already. We have registered so far Wolf. As I do not need any travel funding from ICANN because I'm funded by EuroDIG I offered my travel slot to Olivier as the Chair of ALAC and I think his presence at our next General Assembly is somehow indispensable.

And confirmed is Wolfgang Kleinwächter from Medienstadt Leipzig, Yulia Morenets, Oksana , Adela, Sebastien, Lutz Donnerhacke, Werner Hülsmann, Rudi Vansnick, Dick Kalkman for ISOC Netherlands; Manuel Schneider – preliminarily for Wikimedia Austria and Wikimedia Switzerland; Annette Mühlberg, Stefan Hügel, Greta Jeske from .HIV and Vladimir.

So to my counting we have 15 to 16 members confirmed, registered so far but there are still some members missing. I'm now going to those members who have not registered so far. I know that Yrjö is on the call tonight – I'm still awaiting your registration. I'm still waiting for confirmation from Monique Epstein of E-Seniors but I'm in direct consultation with them as Sebastien's issue. We have no reaction, no response from Vittorio or ISOC Italy and as far as I can recall, Sebastien told us at the last call that he may help to mobilize ISOC Italy because he's also a member of this ISOC chapter.

I'm still waiting for Patrick Vande Walle who was a very active member over years, an ALAC representative and it's getting rather quiet around him. But I still hope and count on him, that he may join us in Lisbon. We still have no response from ISOC Bulgaria and ISOC Catalan. We are also waiting for Christopher Wilkinson and we need further responses from CLUSIT Italy, the Committee for Democratic UN Germany and

Terre des Femmes; the Slovenian Consumer Association; KEPKA – the Greece Consumer Association. There's still Yinternet.org on the list which I do not count on any response from their side, and the last one on my list will be the next ALS who may be certified over the next two weeks, which is uniBIT Bulgaria. This is the latest arrival at EURALO and I do hope that we may also have a representative from their side.

So to make it short let me say we have half of our members who have done their job and who registered already after the first announcement and the first reminder. This is now a point for the action items: Wolf will send a second still friendly reminder, so to say, to the list again. And I will also follow up with direct emails to the people to push and encourage them to register as soon as possible. It would be my wish to accomplish the confirmation and registration process for the General Assembly by the end of the month.

In my older days I've become more and more a realist and I think we may have some latecomers until early February, but by the middle of February I really want to have the registration accomplished because as stated before, the sooner we have all the participants we can forward the information to ICANN Constituency Travel via assistance of At-Large staff to do travel booking at a very early stage – around half a year before the event. We'll have a good chance to get some very reasonable airfares and really to invite and finance as many members as possible.

Are there any questions from your side so far? I see no hand raised so let me ask a question from my side. As agreed during the last call we fixed some focal points, and I do remember that mobilizing ISOC

chapters I may count on the support of Yrjö, who may reach out to the still-missing ISOC chapters in coordination with Sebastien. The still-missing chapters are Luxembourg, ISOC Wallonia, ISOC Catalan and ISOC Italy. May I count on this additional support?

YRJÖ LÄNISPURO: Yeah, it's Yrjö coming in.

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, Yrjö, please.

YRJÖ LÄNISPURO: Yes, it's Yrjö Länispuro for the transcript record. I'm sorry I haven't been too active on this but now when we come to the last meters so to say. So I promise to try to be more active in activating these chapters that are in my domain. As far as myself is concerned, the date as I told you before is a real problem for me. So I'm still trying but it's almost like going away for Christmas Eve if you leave your place for mid-summer. But this only applies of course for Scandinavians, thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, thanks a lot Yrjö. And as I told you bilaterally already I have full understanding. I was also not in favor of changing the dates for the 2013 EuroDIG from the beginning of June to the middle of June but I still do hope that some of the Scandinavians may make it possible for the 19th and the 20th at least, and then leaving on the 20th in the evening to arrive just in time back to your countries again and to profit from the summer celebration.

So I would be very grateful if I could have some information or confirmation on this; also for your support, Yrjö, for reminding other ISOC fellows, ISOC people who are members of EURALO. According to my experience, if people are directly reminded by one or two or even three other members they feel more obliged to respond and to say “Yes” or “No.”

Just in case, as we did for previous General Assemblies, if people who are the contact point for an ALS are not possible to come for professional or for any other reasons they can nominate a replacement person. So before they do not show up at all it's always preferable to nominate somebody else from the organization or somebody who knows the organization very well and they can trust that he may represent this ALS at our next General Assembly. I have two offers for such replacements on my list already and once we know who can show up and who cannot show up we'll have a clearer picture already and we can discuss more details already. But at least I want to have one reply from each ALS whether they come or whether they cannot have, or they have to apologize, etc. What I will not accept is no response at all.

And as we discussed at length on previous monthly calls, etc., I will really consider to initiate a decertification procedure or those ALSes who are not responding again this time at all. And we have as you may recall already three to four candidates already on our list and this is from my side, so to say, the last grace period we can offer to them; and who has not responded until March may risk to let's say get in trouble. Are there any questions, suggestions from your side so far? Any objections to my last comments on consequences for non-responding members?

I see no hands raised, no questions, no objections. Just let me continue with the registration procedure for the General Assembly. Another point is it's my wish to get the individual members organized until Lisbon. As we decided in Belgrade after the modifications of our Bylaws, we have the opportunity to better integrate individual members – I'm particularly now speaking in the direction of Avri, Bill, Olivier, Roberto, Siranush. And the best opportunity would be to create an [Own Home ALS] for our individual members.

This is a pending issue since Belgrade and it's not a big deal to do; it's just to draft some very basic bylaws for such an ALS which was suggested from my side, done and submitted to the individual members. And if they just roughly agree to some basic bylaws they can submit an application to become an official ALS for individuals and I think it would be sort of a formality for ALAC to get certified. And I think it would be a great idea to have this done until the Lisbon GA, to have the opportunity to get an official representative of the Individuals' ALS to be funded for Lisbon.

And others I have on my list already, as I bilaterally communicated some of our individuals have assumed replacement functions for other ALSes so far and I think this was a rather good practice, and we will consider it for the Lisbon GA again. Questions on this, comments? If this is not the case... Yes, I see a hand raised – Olivier, you have the floor.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Wolf, it's Olivier for the transcript record. I just wanted to welcome this initiative by EURALO to move forward on this. For as long as I've been a member of EURALO I have seen discussions,

then of course the General Assembly had a vote to move forward with this with having individual members. And I think that the solution that has been retained is absolutely great. It's a good compromise. It's something, if I swap hats quickly I'd like to see this in all the regions as well but first things first – being on a EURALO call, I really hope that our independent members, individual members will be able to take the opportunity to create this ASAP.

I'm in a somehow tricky position as being Chair of the ALAC as well. I'm not quite sure if it would be proper for me to be one of the driving forces for it, although I would be a member of it – I'd be very happy to be a member of it. If you think that it's not a problem I'm ready to drive it forward but I don't think I should assume any specific position there, especially when it comes down to voting and things like that. It just makes things a little bit more complicated. That's all, thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay, thanks for this comment, Olivier. To be honest I was not looking at all in your direction when I was talking about this, I just more or less mentioned you as one of these floating individual members. You are already an ALAC member. There was always a long discussion at EURALO whether individual members are discriminated, whether they do have equal rights, etc.

And it was clear from the beginning, just to say it once again, that we had no voting rights or no option for voting rights for individual members until the Bylaws modification in Belgrade. But from the beginning individual members could be on the EURALO Board and have been on the EURALO Board from the very beginning, and we always

considered individual members to be nominated for ALAC positions, etc. So it would be just a last formality to line up with NARALO, and NARALO and EURALO would be among all the RALOs – the two forerunners – to offer utmost opportunities for being inclusive for individual members as well.

But I see Bill on my list – Bill, you have the floor. Welcome to the call. Bill, can you hear me? Hi Bill. Maybe he’s muted? I’ll write him a message... Bill, you have the floor.

BILL DRAKE: Yes, but you can’t hear me?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, we can hear you.

BILL DRAKE: Oh you can hear me?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yeah, okay, go ahead.

BILL DRAKE: Oh great, I was about to (inaudible). I had to hang up on my other call.

WOLF LUDWIG: Please speak closer to the mic, Bill.

BILL DRAKE: Thanks, sorry. This has been an ongoing issue from the beginning of EURALO. Any other [area has coalitions of members involved, individuals]. We have (inaudible) and a few such as the one we have for the [OECD] or we're supposed to have full status but it's kind of ambiguous.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Bill, this is Heidi. Sorry, but people are not hearing you. Can you speak a little closer to the microphone please?

BILL DRAKE: Give me one second, I will switch systems. Sorry.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, switch the systems please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: It's much better now. What you just did, it's much better now.

BILL DRAKE: Yeah, let's see...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, that's much better already.

BILL DRAKE: Can you hear me now?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, excellent.

BILL DRAKE: Alright, I am sorry about that. So what I was saying is there's always been an issue from the beginning and I know that in the, when I was first [elected] to the Board back in 2008 I was told by staff that I would not be supported to go to the ICANN Meeting in Paris because I was not a member of an ALS. And I thought that that was very strange given that number one, I was elected to the Board and I was supposed to be doing work; and secondly, of course ALSes can vary in size and so on.

But in any event, be that as it may it's been an ongoing issue. I don't particularly think the solution of having one ALS for all individuals is a terribly good one but I know that it's one that people debated at great lengths, and there's a meaning in the context of, for example, travel support for the General Assembly. But how would any one individual represent a bunch of other individuals you mentioned, Wolf, all of whom are rather individualistic? So it's an ongoing issue and I think it's... I know you're settled on the notion of an ALS that can solve all the problems but I really think just giving individuals full status and having waited... In the NCUC and SVS that's what we do – organizations get a certain amount of votes based on their size, individuals get one vote. This would provide some possibilities for being more inclusive.

So anyway, but that's perhaps not for right now. If people are really keen to try to form an individual ALS in the next couple of months I guess I would be willing to do some work with somebody, but I wouldn't

prefer that... I wouldn't think that we should have to do a lot of trying to imagine [charters]. There must be something that we could build off of already in the EURALO environment or something, so perhaps staff could help with that.

So to conclude, it's an issue, I'm not terribly happy with the results but I will certainly try to help you, Wolf, because you pinged me many times before on this point.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay, thanks a lot, Bill, for this comment that is much appreciated. As we have discussed I think bilaterally there are many areas of opportunity. I fully agree with you that the options or the circumstances for participation of individual members are not ideal, and I still believe and agree with you the conditions are not ideal. What we found for the moment is let's call it a feasible interim solution that makes inclusion and participation of individuals on a formal level better than before.

It's not optimal so far but it's in my opinion a step forward already, and I think we can and we should continue to discuss better options. And we are always open to make an initiative, a demarche to ALAC to modify the whole setup like you referred to the participation conditions at the NCUC where members' representation depends on the size of an ALS which is a completely different system. So far at the RALO level, at the ALAC level we have one member, one vote; and where one member, one funding opportunity, etc. – that was over the last five years the system so far.

But I'm still open to go into other discussions and to discuss better options, etc. But I sometimes try to distinguish between the wishful and the feasible, and for me for the moment, from a pragmatic approach I think the solution we have, the solution we can offer is a good interim solution – an improvement to what we had before. It might not be the end of wisdom but let's continue with this. And I simply want to encourage, invite you again – stand up, get your interim ALS certified so you have at least the chance to have one individual member officially funded. So it would be an improvement compared to the situation before.

I see Olivier's hand raised. Olivier, you have the floor.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Wolf, it's Olivier for the transcript records. And I listened to Bill's proposals with much interest, and perhaps these are things as you say that could be discussed by EURALO at its General Assembly and during its events when EURALO meets later this year. There is one thing that one has to know, is that in other RALOs, some RALOs already have a different system where they have votes that are weighted by country. So if you have for example, one ALS in one country and two ALSes in another country, so the weight of the vote where you have one ALS in the country is twice as heavy as where you have the vote of the two ALSes in the other country. Effectively, the ALSes when there are two in a country would have a third of a vote – that just simplifies things like that.

So it's also a different way things are viewed and maybe, hopefully if we will be able one day to bring all of the ALSes together – and I'm crossing

fingers that this might happen someday soon – maybe that would be a subject that all of the At-Large Structures would wish to discuss together: whether the system one ALS, one vote, or one vote per country, or the size of the ALSes being of importance. That’s all, thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay, thanks a lot, Olivier, for your additional comment. I see in the chat room in the Adobe Connect a vivid discussion of the issue, exactly the type of discussion I would like to see more often and more regularly at our monthly calls.

I just can recapitulate what I read here in the Adobe chat... I agree, Siranush. There are individual members like you since the beginning, like Bill since the beginning who have almost ever actively participated at our monthly calls. I see, I understand your feeling of let’s say of being discriminated compared to other official ALS members who almost never show up during monthly calls, who are in the EURALO participation more or less silent or passive. I know more or less most of them do an excellent job on the ground, in their country, in their hometown, etc. but they are not getting very much involved in EURALO, ALAC or ICANN issues.

And this is a problem, I agree, and I’m aware this is a problem. And I really would like to underline what Olivier has said before or what Oksana suggested. We have discussed this point at various Secretariats’ meetings, at almost every ICANN conference over the last two to three years. There was always a lot of talk since the meeting was over; then there were two to three email exchanges in between the meetings and

then there was a recapitulation of restating the problem but there was not a real action afterwards. And I think, and I am ready to take this more serious but I somehow want that there are more regular inputs in this direction also from our individual members.

If any of you have a better idea please let me know as you may have good support for your concerns, etc. And I fought for your equal participation rights in the past and I will do this in the future. Bill, you have raised your hand again? Bill, you have the floor again. Hello?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Wolf, this is Heidi. He said that he is... I think he's put his hand down.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay, sorry, I just read it. So the list is cleared again? Okay. Anybody else who wants to raise his or her voice on this? I take this for a new start for discussion in this direction and I'm awaiting your ideas, your suggestions, etc. We can make this an agenda item for the Lisbon General Assembly again and this is what would be more or less my last remark or my last sub point on this agenda item.

Getting registered for the General Assembly is an admin, is an organizational necessity, to have members listed to start with hotel booking, to start with flight booking, etc.; to get all this done in the frame of a rather limited budget. This is the first necessity. And after we will have accomplished this one in February I think the more important points for the GA preparation is the preparation for an interesting or even exciting agenda because the content we will discuss in Lisbon in June in my eyes is much more important.

And then we can restart more or less a short open consultation procedure, this would be my suggestion. It's not me or it's not more or less the existing EURALO Board who has to decide about an agenda but it could be done in an open consultation process. And this would be my favorite idea, asking for suggestions and inputs like we do it for the EuroDIG agenda in on, let's say three to four weeks. And what we get so far we put on the agenda and we make something really interesting out of it.

Are there any comments regarding this suggestion? I would consider this as an action item. After the official registration of participating members is completed and practical steps are taken EURALO has to continue its GA preparation by preparing the Lisbon agenda in an open consultation or consultative process. This would be my agenda suggestion.

Questions, further comments? I see some approvals on the Adobe Connect for this. And we are already 22 minutes behind the timing. But I think we are almost through how to proceed to organize our next GA in June in Lisbon. We continued with the discussion of the Master Plan, status of member registrations... Okay, we discussed the further mobilization. Everybody from your side is welcome to support me and to contact in pushing other members you personally know to get registered over the next two weeks.

The budget estimation is on the website. I think we have to try our best to keep the costs in line with these estimations. And the second reminder of the registration deadline, I would like to suggest to

communicate as a last deadline for the registration the middle of February.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Wolf?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry to interrupt but [Dirk] has his hand up, Dirk from the Netherlands.

WOLF LUDWIG: I don't see it on my Adobe. Dirk, you have the floor. If you raised your hand?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh sorry, he's saying no, sorry.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. I don't see anything on my display here so but anybody who wants to comment or wants to raise a question or suggest anything is welcome. So it would be my suggestion just for the formal registration procedure to fix a deadline by the middle of February; really try our best to push every member we know directly to get registered or at least to give us a response that they can't participate for whatsoever reason or whether they may nominate a replacement, etc., but to get these

formal things done and to go over to the more exciting issues of what will be content preparation.

So any other questions?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Wolf, this is Heidi. If I can just comment that you can also start planning any social events, a reception that you would like during the GA so if you would like to invite speakers we can plan that – speakers from ICANN or from the Board.

WOLF LUDWIG: Well, does this go on our budget?

HEIDI ULLRICH: That might be additional then which might be [covered].

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, by the way we are grateful for any support, further support from ICANN's side as long as it will not be... As we said at the last calls already, what is another sub-point on the org agenda for Lisbon is at the end of the General Assembly to have this kind of outreach cocktail party or whatsoever, which I still think would be a great idea and one of the best opportunities to do outreach for EURALO at the next EuroDIG event. This is not something very complicated in my eyes that we can discuss perhaps in March when we discuss content and agenda issues but it's a good point to all of you. If you have anybody in mind from the ICANN side you wish to speak or to contribute to the General Assembly

– you’d like to see Fadi etc., or Steve Crocker or I don’t know whether Vint Cerf will be funded by ICANN. This would be a good opportunity – I would like to have Vint Cerf by the way at EuroDIG as well. So let’s think and discuss it in this direction and thanks a lot, Heidi, for the idea.

Well I think with some delay tonight we are through our agenda. I may see some of you in about one week at the Open Planning Meeting of EuroDIG in Lisbon. Otherwise we will hear each other again on our next monthly call which is the second or third Tuesday in February, and as I said before, we would like to have the formal registration procedure accomplished by then. I think we can have a final look on this and make more or less a balance what percentage of members we can mobilize for Lisbon. I still would prefer 80%; I [would not] be satisfied with about 60%, etc. so let’s try our best in between.

And thanks for all your inputs tonight. If there are no items under Any Other Business, #7, I would like to conclude our call tonight, wishing you a nice evening and looking forward to have you again on our call next month. Thanks a lot to everybody and enjoy your evening, bye-bye.

[End of Transcript]