

CHAIR: Okay. We are already five minutes behind time. Let me welcome everybody and all of you to, in my memory, the second EURALO Board call. Before we go to our Agenda I will give the floor to you, Yuliya, for the usual roll call regarding participants and apologies.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Wolf, Yuliya is in apologies so I'll do the roll call for you. Welcome everyone to the EURALO Board meeting on Wednesday, 16th of October 2013 at 20:00 UTC. On the call today we have Wolf Ludwig, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Oksana Prykhodko, Sandra Hoferichter, Yrjö Länsipuro, Jordi Iparraguirre, Sebastien Bachollet, Lutz Donnerhacke, Olivier Crépin-Leblond. We have apologies from Bill Drake and Yuliya Morenets. From Staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco any myself, Julia Charvolen.

May I please remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you and over to you Wolf.

CHAIR: Thanks a lot Julia for that roll call and for the confirmation of the attendees. Before we get into tonight's Agenda let me make two prior remarks. First of all, I think we need to add an important Agenda Item to tonight's Agenda and it's what we've discussed already, yesterday, not in detail but we have informed the call participants about this. This is an important issue because the nominations will end by the end of the

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.

week. We need for the Board Member Selection Process Committee – for the BMSPC – and the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee – the BCEC – we need to nominate urgently regional candidates. And this is a really urgent issue we have to add to our Agenda.

Let me suggest to add it among the first point; to get a decision on that. There are of course other issues but this is really according to the timeline. We have time until Friday the 18th and we need some more nominations. This is the first point I would like to add to the Agenda before we talk about the self-organization work. So that's official point one.

There is a second point I would like to make from my side. I was asking myself whether it's really my job or my task to Chair the Board calls; whether they're monthly or bi-monthly – we'll discuss those details later – but it's a question of principle and I do not personally see the necessity that I need to Chair these calls, so it's my suggestion that we may have a solution or discuss a solution that we introduce a rotating system that call after call other Board Members take over drafting Agendas for the Board call in coordination with my or Yuliya and will do the Chairing or moderation of the call.

This is just a suggestion from my side of what I think would be useful and suitable to get the Board more empowered or give it the function he deserves, etc., and I think the Chairing or moderation of the calls are not always needed from my side. I can do it if nobody else wants to do it, but as a best practice I think it would be a better solution if we had a rotating system. I see approval from Jordi on the Adobe Connect.

So we can discuss this in detail later on the Agenda on point three or a new point for functioning and distribution of tasks to release the EURALO Leadership. But let me start first with newly suggested and adopted points for tonight's Agenda. This is the selection of EURALO candidates for the BMCPC and the BCEC. These are the usual annoying acronyms.

And for this purpose, as we had a short briefing on this yesterday on our monthly call, I would like to give the floor to Olivier to shortly explain to us again what it's all about. It's about the selection procedure of the next ALAC Board candidate and selection for [Suite 15? 00:07:05], which is at the moment held by Sebastien Bachollet. Of course the procedure is a very complex and difficult one, which needs a lot of serious consideration and input from the community. It was a difficult procedure last time and it will be a challenging procedure next time, and for this reason these Committees were created.

Olivier can explain to you some more details on this. Olivier, if you are ready I would hand over to you for a briefing from your side.

OLIVIER MJ CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Wolf. Can you hear me? That's great. The first Committee is the Board Member Selection Process Committee. As I mentioned yesterday it's the Committee that will look at the process by which the At-Large Committee will select its next Board Member and it basically will review the process that's been used so far and it will note whether there needs to be any amendments. At the same time it will

also set some of the timings. It's basically concerned primarily with the process by which the At-Large Committee selects a Board Member.

The second Committee is the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee. That's a Committee which is going to create a shortlist of candidates that will be voted on by the ALAC and Regional Leaders. What might happen is there might be ten candidates or more that might wish to go for the position. Having an open vote for all of the candidates would require several rounds and as we know, the more rounds you get the more difficult it is to get the response and not only that – it just complicates matters a great deal.

So there is a way to basically have a first filter in order to select the best candidates that would run for the selection and that's the Committee – the BCEC is the Committee that would do this. Interestingly the Committee would be, I think on this occasion now, would be composed entirely of non-ALAC Members, since the ALAC Members are the ones who are voting and anybody who would be in the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee is not allowed to vote afterward.

Now, there might be some ALAC Members that decide to go on the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee, in which case, according to the new Rules of Procedure, they would actually have to give their voting power to someone else to vote; whether it's voting on their behalf or voting by themselves that's a different thing. So effectively I don't expect many ALAC Members to be on either of these two Committees, primarily because of the uptakes. There might be some who might be on there but it's really something where we have an opportunity to get

our Community Members and people at the edge to be on the Committees.

How much work is involved? Well, on the Selection Process Committee I think it's not going to be a huge amount of work. The process went rather well the first time around. The only thing is that the work of the BMSPC starts today, effectively, and will end after the selection process is over, since it also has to do a debriefing at the end of the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee Members and has to come up with recommendations for the next round that will be in a few years time.

As far as the BCEC is concerned, well, as in any Committee that has to go through CVs and evaluate peoples' skills and experience and so on, there is a time when there's a lot of work; specifically at the time of selection. So we are looking at a few weeks of hard work looking through the CVs. Now, it's not like being in the Nominating Committee where you have hundreds of people applying, but you're still to have, I would say, maybe a dozen of CVs that need to be looked through. Then of course there are the discussions, which sometimes are very tough discussions, as to who is going to be in the shortlist.

And there are times when it's not an easy task at all. It's not a case of not having enough candidates – sometimes it's a case of having too many excellent candidates and having to make some very tough choices. So that's the position. I think both are very exciting because it really is part of the core multi-stakeholder process as to how does a multi-stakeholder model choose its leadership? And it's pretty exciting and of

course it will result in having a Board Member a Member of the ICANN Board, so it's a very, very important process indeed. Back to you Wolf.

CHAIR:

Thanks a lot Olivier for this detailed elaborations to make the relevance of this issue understood. It was outlined on the ALAC and messages sent to the EURALO list. It would be desirable – I don't know whether it's of utmost importance in the final criteria – if the candidates we will nominate and suggest for one of these two Committees would have some experience or expertise from the previous round two and half years ago.

At the time, as far as I can recall, there were only three people from our side closely involved. It was Sebastien, who had partly to abstain because he was directly concerned, but on the level of advice he was very supportive and helpful. It was Olivier and it was me who have been closely involved and it was partly [00:14:30] at the time and I would like to have some more people now more closely involved from our side. Let me just recapitulate from yesterday's call that there is already an official suggestion for the Chairs of the two Committees.

The first one, the BMSPC, will be a suggestion that it's chaired by Tijani from AFRALO and the second one, for the BCEC, the suggestion goes for Roberto Gaetano, who is a Member of EURALO. So we are already represented in one of the two Committees in a very high and prominent function. But I've seen some emails, it was [00:15:48] asked to nominate from each region at least two additional candidates and now I

thought this is a perfect issue where I think the EURALO Board is demanded, so if there are no other nominations I would volunteer for one of the Committees, but I would also like to have nominations from your side.

We should put them on the table today so I have the chance to forward to At-Large Staff the regional list for our candidates for the two Committees until Friday. So the floor is open to you and, well... Suggestions? Yes, Jordi, you have the floor.

JORDI IPARRAGUIRRE:

Thank you. Just a question Wolf, are you selecting candidates right now to fulfill those two roles, or are they to present themselves as candidates? Or are you asking us to look for people and then get the feedback from these people and present them to you?

CHAIR:

The procedure is we have to nominate them before Friday. Therefore the easiest thing would be if we could find four candidates – two for each of the Committees – tonight. I launched the call yesterday. It's a monthly call and I haven't seen any response so far, therefore I think we have to do it – we should do it – tonight, or we will have a grace period until tomorrow or Friday at lunchtime. But lunchtime will be the final time to allow me to make this listing to be sent to At-Large Staff. So we are under the pressure of time to... Yeah. It would be preferable if we could do it now. Olivier?

OLIVIER MJ CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: A couple of more things. I heard you mention earlier that you were thinking about being on one of the Committees. The concern is that anyone on either of the Committees...

CHAIR: May I interrupt you Olivier? The only thing where I was thinking of being a potential candidate was useful to the criteria that people we select for this should have some prior experience in the past procedure, etc., and I was closely involved in the past procedure. This was the only thing that may qualify me for taking such a role this time. But it was only in case nobody else stands up and will do the job. If we find enough candidates I see no need or desire from my side to be part of it.

OLIVIER MJ CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, that's fine Wolf. So it was just basically to remind you that if you were on the BCEC you would not be able to vote. As the Chair of EURALO you have the EURALO vote and you would not be able to vote. I'm not sure how that would work, whether you would have to get someone else to vote on behalf of EURALO? That's just a thing to remember.

Now, with regards to nominations you might... Some of you may have seen the email I've sent to the ALAC list where I made a suggestion for Roberto Guatano to be the Chair of the BCEC, and the suggestion for him was because he has been a Board Member so he knows exactly what it's

like to be one and he would no doubt be able to provide much information and basically lead the BCEC as to what makes good Board Members and how they work, and share his experience to the BCEC of what's required of Board Members. That was one thought.

I've also received informal notification from a few people – and I will mention the names here. There's been an informal suggestion that Jordi Iparraguirre be one person. I don't know for which one of the two Committees. The other name that's been sent to be is Rudi Vansnick as well. I think Rudi was more for the BMSPC, since he has some knowledge of the process the first time around. As you know, we need more than one or two nominations. There are two Committees and I would say we need a couple of people for each, if not more.

CHAIR:

Thank you Olivier for your explanation. So far I've noted as potential names Rudi – I forgot to mention him before because I remember he was actively involved in the previous procedure. As a potential and very good candidate who has active experience on the Board would be of course Jean-Jacques. So I took down his name and I see that Jordi has declared his willingness to serve on the BCEC.

Olivier, you are right, this was a small detail I have overlooked so far, in case I would stand for one of the functions. It wouldn't be wise to be part of the BCEC because in that case I wouldn't qualify for the voting any longer and this is a very important aspect that decides three ALAC Members of our region in this process. The Board of each RALO also has

the voting rights, but would be a directed voting right in our case, and I would really like to have this opportunity again to assume this right, therefore the only chance – if at all – for me would be for the BMSPC.

But we have three names already. If we get a fourth one I do not even have to stand up for one of the two. Oh, I just see Jean-Jacques say, “I’m not a candidate for either Committee,” so I have to put off Jean-Jacques. It was a proposal I’d seen before. He would lose his vote as well so we have, whether we like it or not, to find other candidates. Olivier, you have the floor.

OLIVIER MJ CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I gave a couple of names before as well. I also think that... Other people who I think are more than qualified to be able to take an active part in this would be Yrjö, of course – he has plenty of knowledge in both the procedures and also the selection of Members –, and then another person I was going to suggest was Veronica Cretu, who has also been involved with procedural work and also selection of people. They’re quite interesting possibilities.

Has anybody asked them? I know that some people will be nominating others but of course if they’re nominating people they really need to ask them before they nominate them, because the next thing is we think we have a line-up and then the people who were nominated will just say, “I’m busy,” or, “I’m not able to do it,” or whatever. So those are the two other names as well. I see Yrjö’s put his hand up. Thanks Wolf.

CHAIR: Thanks Olivier. As Yrjö was mentioned by you – I thought about him too –, but as he’s on the call I would like to have his personal opinion on this. Yrjö, you have the floor.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Thank you very much Olivier for nominating me, and Wolf. The only thing is that I’m going to be the Associate Chair of the ICANN Nominating Committee 2014 and I think that it’s better that I’m not involved in any capacity in selecting other Board Members, except those selected by NomCom. Thank you.

CHAIR: Okay. We have heard... I realize that you are still a call member of the Chairs of the NomCom, besides Cheryl and somebody else I forget at the moment, and I think it’s a sound position to avoid any assumption of a potential conflict of interest, etc., otherwise of course, as you know, you would have been one of my favorite choices. But I definitely understand your argument.

So we’re back to the three, who will be Rudi – I haven’t talked to Rudi so far – Jordi has expressed his willingness so far and it would be the other suggestion from Olivier, which is Veronica, who I can perfectly see in such a role. Therefore we still need a fourth person to be contacted tomorrow to submit a list of four candidates from our region before Friday. The floor is still open. Any further ideas or suggestions? Olivier?

OLIVIER MJ CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Wolf. I'm sorry to be taking the floor repeatedly and I hope I'm not interfering with the whole process but I'm just trying to rake my mind as to whom within our community we can call upon, and who has been active in the past. Raking my mind, I recall that we had someone from the European Media Platform, a gentleman by the name of Alexander [Conduras? 00:29:41], who was busy dealing with the At-Large objections process.

I don't know if he might be interested in either of the positions but he has done some conference calls, etc., and that certainly is good to have someone from Eastern Europe. I'll think of another name afterwards as well. Oh, of course, Manuel Schneider – he's quite eager to do things and I thought on the procedure side of things, on the BMSPC, he might be interested. Otherwise we could also look – with regards to the BCEC – we could look at our past NomCom Representatives, because they've certainly gone through selections of people so they've got experience of that as well. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you Olivier. Past NomCom Members... There is of course [Kleinmichter? 00:31:05], he simply has too many things to do already, therefore I do not even dare to ask him due to his overflow of other activities etc. The other one was Adam Peake. We could put Adam on the list. I could ask him. We could just now nominate him on the list.

That means we have now a list... Let me repeat it again. We have the following potential candidates: Rudi; Jordi, who is already confirmed;

Veronica; you mentioned Alexander [Conduras? 00:31:55]; Manuel Schneider and Adam Peake. Let me suggest I will forward an urgent mail to them asking them whether they would be interested and prepared to step in. And hopefully among the six I've mentioned just now four will confirm and we will have a final listing by Friday.

I see Jean-Jacques approval to this suggestion. I see Yrjö would be a good choice. Yes, I agree. Also from my point of view Adam would be an excellent choice. He's a very experienced and knowledgeable person who is very well aware about any related procedures and political issues. Let's try it. Yes. I see Olivier's only concern is that this list is not quite gender-balanced because we have only one lady.

Okay, I would also have Annette Mühlberg in mind as a good potential candidate and a knowledgeable person, but I guess she wouldn't have the capacities for doing and following up on this, because I remember from last time that this is quite work-intensive and you need to be available for a lot of calls, etc., and I tend to suggest to ask and nominate people from whom we know that they might fulfill the expectations and functions.

I see Oksana was also saying Alexander is abroad just now. Well, at least we could try and ask him. Olivier says Alex cannot receive any messages from you until Friday. Would Oksana be interested? Direct question. For regional and gender-balance. Oksana is typing. "It's a great chance to me." Okay. So I see we have a second confirmed candidate: Oksana. So an updated listing is Rudi to be confirmed. Oksana confirmed. Jordi

already confirmed. Veronica to be confirmed. Manuel Schneider and Adam Peake to be confirmed.

Okay. I think this is a big step forward. I will do a mailing tonight or latest tomorrow morning and I hope we can get the final confirmation of at least two further candidates by Friday lunchtime so that I can submit this listing to At-Large Staff that we fulfilled our obligation in time. I apologise for the time we took over this, but it was a perfect example for the kind of business that EURALO Board calls can be about. They are extremely useful.

As we know there are regularly these kind of jobs and demands etc. asked of our region where we have to respond within a few days or a few weeks. And so far I had to figure this out bilaterally, etc., and do this and it's much appreciated and welcome to have this support and backup from a functioning EURALO Board.

That brings us to the next Agenda Item, which is the self-organization of the EURALO Board and meeting. [vote is called? 00:37:24] intervals – whether, as we discussed in Lisbon it could be a monthly call before the regular monthly call of our whole community. It could be bimonthly. And then we have to decide on a preferred date and time. I would like to ask for any ideas and suggestions from your side. What would be your ideas and preference for the meeting intervals etc? You have the floor.

I see from Jordi, in his opinion, monthly, just before the general EURALO meetings. Okay. Any time after 7:00 am. So the option would be the

day before or the week before. The week before would be the second Tuesday of the month. I think if we fix it... I see approval from Oksana, plus one... I see Olivier's hand raised. Olivier?

OLIVIER MJ CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I have no preference on the timings. Just to let you know of my experience on the ALAC and the ALAC Executive Committee, which I gather is pretty much the same sort of thing as the EURALO call, the general EURALO call and then the EURALO Board call... We sometimes have an Executive Committee meeting. We used to have it immediately attached to the ALAC call and that made the afternoon an absolute nightmare because of the amount of time that we would spend on the phone, and the Executive Committee call was quite unproductive.

Then we moved this to a couple of days after the ALAC call and giving this added couple of days gave people a bit of time to breath and look back at what we'd discussed a couple of days before, without people completely forgetting what had been discussed, and then being able to set some AIs an look forward with things. So that was one solution.

Now, if you want to do it the other way around and have the Board call the week before, that's also something that would be good because it's a time to have a look at the AIs of the EURALO call and find out just a few days before the next call if there are any AIs that need to be completed. So these are the advantages of either way. Thanks.

CHAIR:

Thanks a lot for this information. My considerations are going the same direction. There might be situations or circumstances where we have a lot of things to discuss and decide in a short period, where a call before the monthly meeting could be useful, but as we see today it could also be the other way around, to have the call after the monthly meeting to see what we cannot discuss, what we cannot figure out, what we cannot decide at the monthly call – and it would be handed over to the EURALO Board.

In my opinion this would make a lot of sense. This would be a troubleshooting kind of thing that I think could be important. I'm not too much in favor of two straightaway calls, because be aware that having it monthly it may be very challenging because it's just another hour. You are volunteers. If you're willing to do it, if you're willing to risk it you're very welcome. You would have my support.

But from my experience I could see a more pragmatic approach to have it at least every second month and depending on urgencies and emergencies then we could do it monthly in-between. There are moments that are rather calm, where there are not a lot of urgent issues, except you make up your own Agendas for it. But I think a flexible approach to start this, depending on the issues and subjects we have to decide, in my opinion, would be a better solution.

To have a call every second month, on demand and depending on urgencies would be best in my opinion. We can do it in-between on a monthly basis before or after the call. My preference would be for the orientation of the Board Members, to have a fixed date for it if we do it,

so that you can put it into your Agenda on such a date. That would be easier than sending a Doodle Poll prior to the call.

But that's just a reflection on my side. It's up to you. It's up to the Board to decide about its own intervals etc., and meeting requirements. But just reflected from a practical point of view what's important to keep in mind; not to over-demand it etc., but it may become easily tiring. Is there any decision we can take tonight? Or shall we continue this discussion on the call intervals and preferred date and time afterwards via the Board list?

I see feedback from Oksana and Jordi: "let's try to have it after and see." Well, is that the day or week after? I see Jean-Jacques hand raised. Jean-Jacques, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you Wolf. Can you hear me? Hello? I would suggest that we have to be driven or guided from what it is we actually want to achieve. I think that modeling our own meeting schedule, or the meeting schedule of EURALO with the ALAC schedule is of course common sense. On the other hand, it may not be all that necessary to just follow that model. Can you give us an idea as to what your own feeling is as Chair? What are the types of problems or items for discussion that you think really require EURALO-wide discussion before?

After, I think, presents less interest because things have been prepared by the Executive Committee and then discussed by the full ALAC. So I

feel that more before, but I'd still prefer our Agenda to be driven by necessity rather than by some other motivation. Thanks.

CHAIR:

Thank you Jean-Jacques. This is by the way leading onto our next Agenda Item, which is two particular issues the Board wants to discuss and decide on. One option is to have a routine type of Board meeting, which could be, from time to time, difficult. And the other option would be to have these Board meetings based on requirements. According to my experience from now and [00:47:42], I can confirm that there are a lot of current issues which trickle down from ALAC.

Monthly calls, either there are new Working Group, Sub-Committees, etc., like we just had today with the BMSPC and the BCEC. We always have, over the last few years, been asked for nominations for NomCom delegates, etc. There are so many current affairs from ALAC that are afterwards forwarded to the RALOs. We should discuss and decide if this was my dilemma [over the years? 00:48:35] for not having a functioning Board.

I tried to follow these kinds of issues and very often deadlines as well as I could, and to respond in time to the questions and jobs we were asked for. But I very often felt very alone because I did it in a bilateral way. I consulted Sebastien, I consulted Olivier, I consulted [little? 00:49:11] Board Members, I consulted Yrjö, etc., but this bilateral thing I think is not the best way to do it. Therefore I would be happy to have a

functional Board in my bag who could advice and assist me with these kinds of things.

Therefore I would really tend to suggest let's be pragmatic. Let's organize Board meetings in line with certain requirements. There are a lot of requirements at the moment. It makes sense to have monthly Board meetings. There are moments where it is rather quiet. Okay, we could discuss other issues, etc., but bi-monthly I think would be necessary to really discuss topics in substance or other topics like Oksana mentioned before.

She made a suggestion as an outcome from the last Ukrainian IGF there was a proposal sent to the list. I didn't push to answer to it because I wanted to have other reaction and responses beforehand. There was no response so far but this is also a typical issue. If a Board Member comes up with an idea and if there is no response on the list, I think this should come to the EURALO Board and be dealt and discussed at this level.

Okay, this is my point of view – to make it clear it depends in my opinion on issues, urgencies and things we have to decide on a short-term or a broader level. Any other opinion on this? I'm sure we are not running short on issues to be discussed and to be decided on. I just want to recall that there is a major project in the pipeline that has started already: the At-Large Survey.

I do not know at the moment how many people have filled in the questionnaire already. There is a deadline in about ten days; I think a week on Friday, where we need the vast majority of our Members to

respond to the questionnaire. So far it's always been me – if people didn't respond I had to chase them on my side sometimes to remind them three, four or up to five times that it was necessary, etc.

I would really appreciate to have some more support in this direction from Board Members taking over people they know quite well or people in their country etc. This is a very concrete and current challenge. We have to make sure that most of our Members do this job before the end of next week, and [since/send? 00:53:40] the Summit itself, the Sub-Committees, the whole organizational procedure demands a lot of input from our side.

Just to be clear, it will be a Summit in our region and I therefore think – or it would be sort of my expectation – that particularly at the Summit in our region I would like to have EURALO involved as much as possible; in the Sub-Working Group and in the shaping and the whole process of the next Summit, ATLAS II, in June in London. Therefore there are plenty of challenges ahead. This leads to next month and a functioning Board could be a huge asset and a huge support to fulfill this diverse responsibility.

What was already also my point of view for the forthcoming functioning and distribution of tasks; to release a EURALO Leadership, but it's a very important point combined with point two: particular issues about which to discuss and decide. The Board is willing to decide you are free to do so. The more support I will have from your side the better, but I think we have to make a start in this direction.

So far the previous Board, to be very honest with you, was more or less useless. Whenever I made mailings to the previous Board I had hardly every any response. There was a lot of frustration involved, but I had the feeling in Lisbon, at our GA, when we made a voted on a re-composition of the current Board there was a lot of willingness and interest expressed to make it better now and in the future, and I think it offers a great chance to start now with that.

Any comments? Questions? I think it's a perfect example why I shouldn't moderate Board calls; because I tend to be having the load of experience from the past six years. I tend to be too dominant for such a Board call. I think Board Members should become more empowered and therefore I would like to note for the AIs that we should try and start with a rotating system for the chairing and the moderation, including the preparation of the Board calls. I see it was already noted under point one.

I see Jean-Jacques's hand raised. Jean-Jacques, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Wolf. I don't have any strong feeling about frequency. I can see the logic both for before the general meeting, but also I see the point you made, Wolf, about having the EURALO meeting after. What I'd like to suggest is maybe, as a subsidiary of the ALAC, if I may call it that, EURALO and any other regional representation should actually go forward guided by an Agenda.

In the chat just now I see that someone's suggested that the Summit – that was to you Wolf – has to be the most important issue in the next half-year. So I would suggest that we have already a sense of what we think, what you think, Wolf, what would be really important points for the next three and if possible for the next six months. And guided by this sense of urgency and what is important then you can decide or we can help you decide on the frequency, and also if it has to be before or after.

The point I'm raising is of course both about the Agenda Item on organization frequency and all that, but also on the Summit, which is important. Thanks.

CHAIR:

Thank you for this advice Jean-Jacques. Well, I entirely agree with you and if I understood you rightly, Jean-Jacques, from my political experience, not only at the EURALO and ICANN level but many other comparable experience in dealing particularly volunteer communities, we have to avoid bureaucracy, we have to avoid any type of routine meetings etc. We have so many calls that are announced by ALAC. I have difficulty following many of them.

Being present in ALAC Working Groups and Sub-Committees is a huge challenge and I would like to have more support from the Board in this direction. Being present at many of the regular calls, not only the monthly ALAC call but also the Sub-Committee calls and now particularly

we will have Summit calls over Summit calls from the different Sub-Groups. I can promise two or three every month.

So if we could, regarding the distribution of tasks, at least agree that we have firm commitment from Board Members to be part of one of the different Sub-Groups etc., this would already be a big step forward and we could do on demand or at least every second month a coordination call of the EURALO Board to discuss urgent issues that come up immediately and where we need a decision, or – as I follow on the chat on the Adobe Connect – we should discuss issues like the one brought up by Oksana.

I've had a look at the draft which was sent by Oksana. It makes no sense as a monthly call or as a Board call. Almost nobody has had a detailed look at this so we have to find a better way to deal with these things. It would be, as an example, an opportunity that we put this on the Agenda for a Board call that Oksana make a short introduction, etc., and that we will have a discussion on this.

Then after 15 or 20 minutes we come up with a decision of the EURALO Board on whether we support such an initiative or whether there would be good reasons for abstaining or not supporting, etc., with actions and concrete examples. And I think we have to develop and find out way to better deal with such issues. It shouldn't be like it was often in the past, where it was more or less a [one-two mention? 01:03:33] where two people cared about most of the workload.

And I would really like that we have it placed on more shoulders and more Board participation. Jean-Jacques, you have the floor again.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Wolf. Two points. The first is on workload. I can completely understand your point that you for instance have been at it for so many years and you think there could be better distribution. Agreed. The second point is actually similar to a point I had made as a guest in Executive Committee of ALAC at the end of the Costa Rica meeting, where I suggested that perhaps it would be a good idea to have on the ALAC specific functions distributed to certain Members of the ALAC, which, by the way, runs alongside an idea that's gaining traction in ICANN right now.

The idea is that we need more of a topic or issue-oriented culture, rather than a silo or constituency-related culture. So rather than having six distributions, for instance when we identify one important subject that would remain important for at least three months or something, then you call for candidates; for someone who would be the focal point on that particular issue. Thanks.

CHAIR: Thank you Jean-Jacques. I was just typing that I perfectly agree with you on this. It should be really subject and content-oriented and really depending on challenges and requirements in order to be functional and to become fruitful. Any further comments? I see Olivier's hand raised. Olivier?

OLIVIER MJ CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: In the ALAC and in At-Large, in order to be able to be more efficient and topic-oriented, we have developed the Working Groups a great deal and have of course had the Working Group Chairs being the champions for each one of those subjects. Now, some of the RALOs have also developed their own Working Groups or at least have identified their own subject leaders who then are able to – when there’s a question regarding the subject – are able to take action and be the people that are driving the subject in the region.

And it might be something that you might wish to consider on the EURALO Board. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thanks a lot Olivier. I just once again can agree with what you said. We are running short on time. We’re already ten minutes behind our schedule and therefore let me suggest... I think we all agree there is a lot of work, there are a lot of challenges ahead. The EURALO Board has to find its role, its way and its self-defined functioning. It’s not to me to hand over jobs and expectations, etc. I think it should be an equal-based process.

We should discuss, we should exchange, we should sort and find out how we can support each other in our mutual or respective roles. The major challenges ahead, in my opinion, the next big challenge is the ATLAS II in London, where EURALO is required. I’m not a friend of spending hours on procedures.

I perfectly agree with what Olivier and Jean-Jacques indicated: it should be subject and content-based and I think based on subject and content you afterwards find out how these things can be dealt with in an appropriate way, and then we can decide about procedures. This is a better way around it than to start with procedures and then months later you discuss about content.

What was a key nightmare in EURALO in the beginning, in 2007... I think Sebastien and also [Sue? 01:09:30] had been present at EURALO at the time can tell stories about that. Let's be pragmatic, let's concentrate on issues and on content and on requirement. And in this direction I think we will after the next and the third call we will find out proper ways to do it and to organize this EURALO Board.

If there are no comments or questions or suggestions for today's Agenda let me suggest to finalize this call for today we can exchange on the Board list, we can exchange on the public list whoever wants to bring up another issue. For Oksana I would simply like to suggest please resend the suggestion you made two and half weeks ago. I said before I've seen it, I've taken a look at it, but I didn't want to be first to comment on it.

It may happen that there are a lot of mails at the moment. Just resend it and let's wait. There will be some responses. If there are no responses I can tell you from my own experience that it's a lot of frustration. I've made so many suggestions on the EURALO list over the last couple of years. I can recall many situations where there was not a single response and I took it as: "okay, it's not understood as a key priority or it's not seen to be as relevant as I may have understood it to be."

These are situations and frustrations that I think we have to live with. We are a volunteer community and I think we have to again and again be realistic about our limited capacities. That's all I can say or advise for the moment. It's a pleasure for me having had this call with you and I hope we will have some more calls after the EURALO Board has perhaps some more participants. We had some apologies for today.

Thanks again. I wish all of you an excellent night. Bye-bye.

[general goodbyes]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]