
WOLF LUDWIG: ...already eight people in the call, let me suggest to start our first monthly call of the new year. I first call, to also, I haven't yet confirmed it even with few weeks delay, wish you all the best for 2014 and I hope it will be an exciting year for EURALO, so welcome at this monthly call of the year. And I will now give the floor to Julia for the roll call.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Thank you Wolf. On today's call we have Wolf Ludwig, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Oksana Prykhodko, Yuliya Morenets, Narine Khachatryan, Christopher Wilkinson, Siranush Vardanyan, Sandra Hoferichter, Sebastien Bachollet, Jordi Iparaguirre, and Yrjo Lansipuro.

We have apologies from Roberto Gaetano and Greta Jeske. And from staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, and myself, Julia Charvolen. May I please remind all participants to please state your names before speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you Wolf.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks a lot Julia for the roll call. I think I'm very pleased at the number of members of participants on this call. And let me go over to our next agenda item, which is, as usual, review of the action items from the December call. And this is posted in the Adobe Connect presentation, and as you can all see there was a call for additional members to be part of the finance and budget subcommittee, and for the CROP review team, and this call has been accomplished before the seasonal break when staff sent out a call, and we could find, to my

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.

memory, Oksana for the CROP review team which is now full from our side.

And for the finance and budget subcommittee, to my memory, that is Roberto, that is Yuliya, and myself and so we have assured our regional representation in these committees. If there are no questions regarding the action items from December, let me continue with our next agenda item which is point three, and as usual briefing on current elect consultations and initiatives.

You can find a long and impressive list of issues under this agenda item, and I give the floor to Olivier please.

OLIVER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Wolf. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond for the transcript record. And as we can see, the ALAC has been very busy with the blasting of quite a few statements recently, that it has sent to the Board and to public comments periods. So I invite you all to continue your good work and continue bringing your inputs into the ICANN purposes. There are three statements at the moment currently being developed, reviewed, or voted on by the ALAC.

The first one is the ICANN draft vision mission and focus on there for a five year strategic plan, and the finance and budget subcommittee of the At Large advisory committee has been involved with the developing a statement. Tijani Ben Jemaa is the pen holder and the ALAC is currently voting on it. I invite you, from the agenda you can see a link to it. I should say, have a brief read through it, it's a short paper but it just

brings forward a few points that might have been missed in the five year strategic plan.

Overall, the ALAC had mentioned that they were quite pleased with the direction that this is taking now. The next one is the draft criteria and purpose for selection of the market stakeholder [?] award pilot program. And this stems from a number of discussions that have taken place at ICANN that very often people who are on the Board, people who are chairing supportive organizations, [?], the people at the, I would really say at the top of the ICANN pyramid are often thanked for the work that they're doing.

And yet, there are people that do sometimes more work than they do at the bottom of the pyramid, or some would say in the working groups, deep in the working groups. They do the actual heavy lifting that ICANN needs, you know the drafting of documents and this sort of thing. Until now, there has been very little recognition of these people. So they have a set of policies that are listed there, what one is looking for in a potential awardee for an [?] award.

And at the moment there haven't been any public statements, public comment period. There is a request from the community for us to list... They have not listed qualities that we think should be looking at or some kind of metric that actually looking at for this award, then this is our time for us to alert them to this. Thirdly, there is a review of the trusted community representation of the roots DNS tech [?].

Now this is something I should [?] agenda at the moment in the technical issues working group ask to [?] to necessary, and actually [?]

has come up with a statement, has picked up the pen just a few hours ago, and the advantage came to the Asia Pacific region because they woke up before we did. She volunteered to pick up the pen on this, and has come up with a statement that touches on this.

The subject is essentially the fact that the DNS, the dynamic naming system which is this set of servers that translate between IP addresses and domain names, this is just like a pyramid, what they call a root server at the top which was where the main -- it's not the center of the Internet, domain name system is. And in order for all of the updates to be secured, a system of complex digital encrypted keys is now used all the way up to the top.

And of course, one key is there to vouch for another key, and at the top you need people to be able to hold on to these keys. And technically there are sweeps and digital numbers that are kept on an USB key, that is what you have. And so in order for this legitimacy to be there they have chosen some community representatives to hold these and they often hold this in a safe, and have a card that puts them into a safe, anyway.

It's rather complex system but quite intriguing and interesting. And they meet several times a year to update those keys because, as you might or might not know, if a digital key remains the same for too long, someone eventually will be able to crack it so they have to update them. And there are looking here at a new way, maybe possible new ways or improvements into selection of these people who will hold the keys.

So, long explanation but I thought it would be something interesting for you because it's something that is a bit practical as opposed to something that sometimes is just very [?] in nature. This one has a real operational use to it, which very few people know about. Anyway, I invite you all to read the ALAC statement and comment on it. There are some questions which Sella has asked on there, which are quite important.

And then one thing which has changed in the last hour, and that was during the ALAC call that took place, that finished just an hour ago. It was a three hour call, lots of discussions. One of the statements which we have marked as being no statement, and which we had said that was not going to yield any kind of statement from us, that's the At Large proposal for a specification 13 to the ICANN registry agreement, to contractually reflect certain limited aspects of [?] new gTLDs.

There was some thinking that the ALAC did not need to comment on this. And Alan Greenberg, who is our GNSO liaison and also an ALAC member, reminded us actually that the ALAC would wish to make a short statement. And his proposal is on the Wiki page in the comments at the bottom of the page, and that statement is very simple. The ALAC has no input on the [?] of specification 13 but wishes to go on record as objecting to the creation of a new category of gTLD at this point.

When earlier decisions were made to not have categories of TLDs supporting community, geographic, and other similar categories of gTLDs. Effectively, what it stands from it, the ALAC has welcomed to have categorization of generic top level domains, without being able to promote community generic top level domains, and the answer has

already been no from the Board and suddenly now when it comes down to [?], the Board is considering suddenly making categories.

And this certainly has some implications because it shows that some people, I guess, have more of a voice than others. Some communities have more of a voice than others, and that's obviously not something we would like to support. But that's really this comment, and I think it we will keep it to a very short comment period, the reply period closes on the 31st of January, so I guess I will have – will probably submit it before it gets voted on.

That's where it is. In fact, no, we have voted on, haven't we? I think I've lost my mind on this one. I see Heidi is on this call. Heidi, we have voted for this, haven't we? Maybe Heidi is not on the call.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm sorry Olivier, could you repeat the question?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Specification 13, actually any staff who was on the call earlier, and I'm sorry my mind has gone blank, but specification 13 to the ICANN registry agreement to contractually reflect certain limited aspects of [?] new gTLD. I think the ALAC has voted on that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct. I printed the statement. I've updated the policy section on the NARALO agenda, so it reflects the vote.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Sorry, then it's my fault. I should have reloaded that section. Well, so that's it basically. So there is really only three that are there, the fourth one has been dealt with in a very expedited matter. And with this, I open the floor for questions.

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, thanks a lot Olivier. I seen, but it has disappeared now that Oksana raised her hand. I don't know whether it is still valid. Any, sorry she's writing. Anybody else who wants to ask questions to the point Olivier elaborated regarding current elect consultations? There are some remarks in the chart room from Christopher Wilkinson, shall we have a briefing about ICC [?] position on [?]?

Can I forward this to you Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, actually, Wolf, it's Olivier speaking. Any questions that comes afterwards, please forward them to me and I'll follow up with it.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Do you wish me to address those questions now? [CROSSTALK]

WOLF LUDWIG: I leave it up to you Olivier, when you like or prefer to address this question.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So, Wolf, it's Olivier speaking. The question your relaying, if I guess this correctly, is from Christopher Wilkinson, regarding the ITT arbitrator's position on dot health?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I can briefly say that is a very good point indeed, Christopher. So what has happened is that the ALAC has filed three objections to the string dot health which has been applied for by four different organizations. One of those organizations, one of the four organizations, actually satisfied the At Large advisory committee and the working group that was working on these matters, that there public interest commitment was good enough for it – for the application to be pretty much in the public interest.

But the other three did not. So the ALAC filed a limited, well it was a limited objection. Basically the community objection saying that the applicants were basically not going to serve communities, and that was going to be against the public interest in some way. And basically what happened is that the objection is then looked at by the International Chamber of Commerce, that then selected an adjudicator based in the US to look at those three objections.

Consolidated them somehow together, than one of the applicants decided to drop off because the costs were way up, you were looking here at a deposit to be paid by each side, of over, I think it was about \$30,000. So they dropped off and decided to not pursue forward, but two of the applicants continued. And only a week ago, the adjudicator ruled against the At Large objection, so the objection was rejected in both cases.

One of the reasons for it to be rejected was that the At Large advisory committee did not represent a defined community as described in the applicant guidebook, because most, if not all, of the background, and all of the reasons for the adjudicator to rule against the ALAC was basically taken from the applicant guidebook itself. There are extensions to this in that some are saying in the ALAC that in some way it was impossible due to the restrictions in the guidebook, for the ALAC objection to be sustained.

Others are saying that perhaps the ALAC did not have, really did not have the standing to make the objection itself on the points. One thing is sure, there was some calls from some people to ask for a reconsideration request from the Board, but based on previous experiences and based on the track record that you have seen from other people trying to submit reconsideration requests, in general these are reviewed and the ones that are expected, actually failed to have the reconsideration happen.

Two reasons there. One, the Board will only reconsider its own decisions. This is an external process. The way it was designed, especially to have an external examiner to deal with those objections so

that ICANN cannot be accused of being judge and jury at the same time. The other thing is that the Board would only look at a reconsideration if they had not followed procedures, so there had been some kind of procedural problem of some sort, in reaching its conclusion, or if there was new information that they were not aware at the time when they were making that decision.

That as we know, the current [?] doesn't apply any of these two conclusions. So, in effect, any reconsideration request has a very, very slim chance of going through. What the ALAC has somehow agreed to do is to wait for the time being, and then take a very active task in the aftermath of the new gTLD process. The time when we are going to see how the first round went, and see if the first round went well, and at that point, I think this committee would need to voice all of its concerns because this whole objections process might be one of the problems.

There are several other problems which the ALAC has, and the At Large community in general, has pointed out with regards to the applicant guidebook with regards to some of the implementation of it. If I recall, if I could remind you, the joint applicant support, for example, the lack of publicity around the world about the ability for developing countries and applicants that required some help to be helped. The whole imbalance that you see today in the applications coming from developed and applications coming from the developing countries.

A lot of things, and I really believe that there will be a big, if you want, a big analysis of this, of all of this before round two of this process is launched. We have been told that there will be a [?] in the future, except of course if things go really wrong, but for the time being, we

were told that there would be a round two. The ALAC would be taking a very active interest in being able to point out the inadequacies of the current round.

And that's pretty much the summary. And I'm sorry for having taking so much time, but I thought it might be interesting for you to get the full picture of it all. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thanks a lot Olivier. I think this was interesting and a concern for our community that has been extensive exchange on the ALAC working list, on the issue, and there were some highly interesting comments on this ICC arbitrary position. But somehow, questions of legitimacy of ALAC as a stakeholder in the ICANN system, according to my understanding and reading, and therefore I think it will be interesting and important that ALAC is following up on this.

And I see you have raised your hand again Olivier, you have the floor.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Wolf. I just wanted to close the chapter, it's Olivier speaking. Just wanted to close this chapter by adding that the working group that had doubts with the objections, and was building the objections, has done an incredible, not only amount of work, but also an incredible quality of work.

And I must say, reading through the objections that were filed, it really is a testimony to the amount of talent that we have within our ranks. These are volunteers that have spent some time working with other

volunteers that they might not have met in person, and that they were not used to work with in such a legal field. And they've done very, very – an incredible job of being able to file those not only filing the objections, but designing a process by which they can filter out any objections that might not be something that the ALAC really wants to file, and a very fair way of filtering this.

And I really hope that there will also be an analysis of this, because it's really a testimony to the bottom up multi-stakeholder model that we have in our community. On that basis, they ensure us that it works. I have a firm belief that when At Large was given the responsibility of filing objections, there were a lot of eyes set on the At Large community to think, well how in the world are they going to do this? What was that sort of thing to build for themselves?

They have done very well. So I just wanted to put it on the record to thank the people that have been involved. They're all listed on the objections page, and thank also the people that were involved in the follow up afterwards. It's not the end. There will be more objections in the future in future rounds. But for the time being, that work is complete. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. Thanks a lot Olivier. Any further questions? Any further comments? I see no hand raised or I hear no voice. Olivier, you are through with this part with your briefing items on part three?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much Wolf. It's Olivier speaking. I'm finished. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks a lot for this brief update and briefing on current elect consultations, and all of your elaborations to the point. If, last chance, there are no further questions or comments, let me continue with our next agenda item. What is point four, international action on 11th of February the [?]. and potential EURALO support. As some of you at least may recall, I forwarded about a week ago, information on this which was launched by a number of groups from Europe.

There is [?] involved, there is an electronic [?] foundation, international and some European members. And I've seen some of you, the German EURALO members have supported this initiative already, which is more or less based on the revelations from last year, from Snowden and the follow up on the recent revelation on mass surveillance and abuses regarding Internet users.

And I thought that this was an interesting initiative. I wanted to bring to your attention. There are no immediate responses or reactions on this forward from my side, but I announce already that I will put this on the agenda of today's monthly call, and I would like to have some opinions from your side on it, or whether ICANN understands its non-reaction is sort of approval. I see here in the Adobe Connect that Jordi indicated his approval to this suggestion already.

I would like to open the floor for this. I see Sandra's hand raised, Sandra you have the floor please.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Wolf. [?]

WOLF LUDWIG: You are very far. Can you get closer to the microphone or to the, to the telephone?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: [?]

WOLF LUDWIG: You are hardly audible, Sandra.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: I'm eating [?].

WOLF LUDWIG: Oh, you are eating, so sorry to...

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: No, no. I'm eating the microphone now.

WOLF LUDWIG: Ah, you are eating the microphone. This is most probably not very delicious I can guess. Okay try to slowly go ahead, perhaps I can catch what you... Hello?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Yes. A quick question. One question I would like to know, I read that email which was [?].... but it didn't say anything about what [?] are going to be [?] how to be organized, and I want to know if anyone [?]... information on this. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. As far as I understood you, somehow you were asking what kind of concrete action they propose. And that was the question I have seen on other lists because it was also an issue on the ISOC chapter list, what type of countries... I think they leave it as, I understood it, they leave it up to the groups in the country on the local, on the national, on the regional level to either launch own initiatives or just to support, to call on the international level. This somehow reminds me a bit about the action, last year we had seen against [?], which was also a small initiative beginning what became very strong by incredible multiplications, and finally they were approaching members of the European parliament, etc. for respective sessions in the European parliament, convince them to say no.

To vote no against [actor], and as we seen at the end, there was a strong majority in the European parliament based on a very strong public opposition and refusal of [actor]. And finally, [actor] was put at [actor] at the end, and I think this action against mass surveillance, was due to the success of anti [actor] campaign at the time.

As you all know, we as EURALO we do not have much [?] to actively launch our own initiative, or our own actions from our side, but it would

indicate to our members who do have capacities, like digital courage, who was one of the creators behind this campaign. And I see it is a sort of symbolic support for those members who are already involved.

And I would like to tell them, while EURALO, you are doing good work and you're doing something very important, you are doing something very useful. And be sure that EURALO and its members are supporting you. So this is more or less I would see what we can do at this stage. I see Jordi's hand is raised. Jordi, you have the floor.

JORDI IPARAGUIRRE:

Hello, this is Jordi for the record. Thank you Wolf. I agree on the different viewpoints being expressed here. Many different ways in which we can act and work, maybe some people seem inclined more easy, or more, yeah, more easy to them to do kind of political action, so they can do [something] with the politicians, or [?], or whatever, maybe that's one possibility.

There are many others like participating in different kinds of worldwide event, like [?] international or the one on February 11th, or whatever. There is something that we can also do at ICANN itself, because as we are going to be there, we may be interested. [?] organized maybe three or four [?] gathering, it's called party because it wants to be really amenable to remove all the technical things, all the talk of technical things related to cryptography, maybe associated with...

So basically the idea is just to spend an afternoon, two or three hours, share our knowledge. So hands on, experience on how do you configure BGP or whatever on your Thunderbird, for instance. How do

you properly configure your browser? Firefox or others? Regarding plug ins, and calculations, and default, and these kind of things. So it's a very basic thing. You can make it as complex as you want, but just for a start, you start with the very basic things, explain to people with their own computers how to configure, properly configure a browser, how to configure the mail agent.

And then if you have time to make, talk a little about encrypted chats, or maybe how to encrypt a directory, how to encrypt a directory that you're going to put in [?] and things like that. So maybe we can do something similar in ICANN, or not just in EURALO meetings or whatever, or just exchange these kinds of experiences. [?]

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thanks a lot Jodi for this very good example, what individuals or organizations or ALSs can do if they have the capacity. I can go to another good example in Switzerland where one of [?], member organizations put up a similar initiative with a private party. There are some regional elections going on the 9th of February. And the digital [?] together with others, with a private party, they are candidates who stand process regional elections, what is there point on mass surveillance?

There are asking them critical questions. They want responses before the 9th of February, and they want to publically here the point of view and potential initiatives that could be dictating, etc. against mass surveillance. And this is just one good example, how they are on differently levels possibilities and opportunities to join such an

international action day, etc. And I would see certain importance that EURALO is encouraging all those members who are active in this direction on the ground.

If not all of us, all of our member organizations to have time or capacity to organize something by themselves. Any further questions and comments on this issue? Otherwise, let me suggest, as we have often done it in the past, when a proposal, an idea, came up and was put forward for discussion, and as we often have done, if there was no objection, no substantial objection raised against such a proposal than we mostly have considered this as approval, silence of approval as the majority of the other members, and I would like to handle this issue here under point four in a similar way.

I would take this as approval and we could forward that EURALO is formally and symbolically supporting any initiatives that are going on during the international action day on 11th of February. Can we agree on this? I've seen here in the Adobe Connect that staff has already taken note.

EURALO approved with a vote, the international action day on 11th February, etc. and I will contact the electronic front foundation, and I will also let know our members from digital courage who were strong behind, the driving force behind action days, that EURALO is in support of their action days. Any further questions to this?

If not, let me continue with the next agenda item which is a follow up on CROP and regional submissions expected by EURALO. As some of you may recall, we discussed this issue already in December. We gave a

short briefing and introduction of what CROP is, and was also question by Christopher in the chat room a good response from Oksana. And it's a pending issue, just to summarize, there are...

Every region has five pilot slots for this pilot program. If there are any events in the region, we can suggest up to five members to get travel support to attend such events, and as we discussed at our last monthly call, in the period where CROP is due to, there are not many major regional events. Last time we mentioned also ICANN [?] but ICANN [?] ...later it will not be the same as the call period, but certainly next EuroDIG in June 2014 in Berlin, what as a regional highly important event.

The last time we had our general assembly in line with the EuroDIG in Lisbon as you may remember. Most of you have been invited to attend the EURALO face to face general assembly, and to attend the Lisbon EuroDIG the same time in Berlin. EURALO will not have its general assembly, the next general assembly will be in line with ATLAS II, two weeks later in London.

But it would be good to have at least some of our members given a chance to attend the Berlin EuroDIG. And my idea was especially to invite EURALO members from different European countries to attend EuroDIG. As I have not seen any main [?] so far on the list, I have made my own list and I would like to suggest the following people and EURALO members to be suggested for any CROP support. These are, as we discussed last time, two members from Romania, Siranush and Narine.

We have last time already discussed about possible objections because Romania, according to the ICANN regional model, is not considered under Europe but under Asia Pacific, but as Siranush and Narine are long standing members, and they've proved long fidelity to EURALO, as you may have seen, they are always present at our monthly calls and I consider them as EURALO members, and I think we should try to have this accepted, and we should at least ask support for them.

We cannot guarantee that this will be approved, but at least I think it's worth a try. The other names I have on my list are from Eastern European, Oksana and Vladimir, both members from Ukraine. Then we have [?] from Bulgaria. Then we have [?]... and we have [?] from [?]. These are the names I have listed. These are more names than we have travel slots, so I would try it from [?].

I started with including Siranush and Narine, and it's the two won't be approved by the CROP review team, we still have five candidates on our slot, etc. and so this is my suggestion to get this done. Are there any comments or questions from your side? Yes, I see Olivier's hand raised, Oliver you have the floor.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Wolf. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond for the transcript. I was just going to say, I don't know whether Narine will be allowed by the CROP program as travel in Europe. As you know, the end no go decision is that of ICANN itself. But what I would suggest though is that if you are going to proceed forward with some requests, make those requests as early as possible so that if there are rejections of the

request, then you still have time to be able to submit another request for other people.

I remind you that the time it takes for the process to be able to a go or no go, a red or a green light, is about eight weeks, and eight weeks is over a month, and you only have until end of June. This is for events all the way up to end of June, so you know, passes very quickly, and I would therefore urge this community to file those CROP requests as soon as possible. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thanks a lot for this comment Olivier. I totally agree with you , and I'm aware about this. I think we should move forward. Our proposals, our suggestions, until the next monthly call in February, so we'll be right in time. The only thing that I'm now asking for your approval, I'm aware about this formal restrictions that Romania is not included in our regional according to the ICANN regional model. We have raised this issue repeatedly, also in the last consultation rounds on ICANN's geographic model, where we have always argued that there are exceptional cases like Romania who do not fit with ICANN logic, and the ICANN perception.

I think we should make a trial to underlie our point of view. Sometimes in politics you have to be [?], and also sort of stubborn to pinpoint to certain issues. Therefore let me suggest we try at least, we make the suggestion, if it won't be approved by the proper review team, we still have two or more members on our list to be presented for approval which are definitely in our region.

I see you have raised your hand again Olivier, you have the floor.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Wolf. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. But I understand your point of view and your suggestion here. I would just like to add, I think it is highly unlikely that such a request would be granted this year as part of the pilot program. I remind you this is a pilot program, however if you want to make a point about it, a horrible point about this, it would certainly be a strategy that would definitely allow for At Large, and for the program to be improved next year that would allow for such cases on an one on one individual basis, because you're absolutely correct that it's an aberration something like that, things like that.

But just to repeat, it would be unlikely that this would be accommodated this year. Next year, if you put this as a [?] that would greatly strengthen the case for this to be allowed something like this. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, Olivier, I see your point. And I think enough realistic to see the trouble and the arguments that we are running into, etc., but I would like to, as I said before, go for a trial at least. And if it's not approved, we have tried it, etc. and we have identified more members on our list we can submit and which are definitely inside the regional model, etc. So it's, let's say tactically, double as submission, but I think it's going into the right direction, and I see that Oksana has raised her and, and Oksana you have the floor please.

OKSANA PRYKHODKA: Thank you Wolf. Do you hear me?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes we hear you clearly.

OKSANA PRYKHODKA: Thank you very much for your proposition. Actually I would like to apply for the EuroDIG participation, but just now, I would like to stress on the point not only Armenia but Ukraine and Russia also are not part of the ICANN strategy for Europe, and that is why we highly appreciate any discussion of this situation. Thank you very much.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks a lot Oksana for this comment, but as you are aware, I didn't look whether Ukraine is part in the context of the ICANN strategy, etc. but Ukraine is definitely part of the regional ICANN model, and that's a reason why both ALS from Ukraine have been approved for Europe and not Asia Pacific. Therefore, as you know, Moldavia and Ukraine, etc. are considered as Europe, Romania is not.

And I think as I said before, I have listed the names, I would forward it to At Large staff to be added among the action items. The next step I think which is important is the question, who is preparing for the missions? And until what deadline. I think we have to do this soon after this monthly call, in early February, to have it submitted until our next

monthly call, and then we have to wait and see what the CROP review team is saying on our submission.

How they would structure it. Most probably they would refuse at first to name this stronger arguments, but then we still have five members on the list. As I said before, I'll repeat the five names again. Besides our Romania members, we would ask for Oksana and Vladimir from the Ukraine, we would ask for [?] from [?] Bulgaria. We would ask for Valentina from [?] Romania, and for [?] from [?].

For the moment, and for this call, I just, as I see no other names or suggestions, I just would like to have your approval now on the names I suggested, and that we continue with the formal submission procedure as soon as possible. Anybody want to help with preparing the submission forms? I would like to see at least two more people who are assisting into this direction.

I take it for granted that it's the secretariat will be Yuliya, assisting in this, and as Oksana is part of, a member of the CROP review team, I would also would like to have Oksana on board for preparing this. Okay. I have seen some approval on this suggestion and this procedure. I see Oksana's hand raised, Oksana you have the floor.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO:

Thank you Wolf. It's Oksana Prykhodko. I would like to [?] that I really a member of CROP review team, and I ask the [?] if it would be a conflict of interest if I am as a member of this review team, will apply for [?]. There is no conflict of interest. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: That's a good point, good suggestion, Oksana, but in the case, I must admit, I do not see a real conflict of interest in this. The only thing I could suggest in this situation is up in the review team, on your person, you can abstain in your vote. So you say, okay, in this case I'm personally concerned, therefore I would not vote for myself and just abstain in your personal case from such a vote. What is an usual procedure in comparable situations.

If no more questions are raised, we will bring this up at our next monthly call, again to see the follow up. As we are running short of time, I have to speed up a little bit. Now with our last agenda items, what is point six, what is ATLAS II event planning and working groups. This is an ongoing procedure. There are a lot of calls almost every week, etc. to prepare program and various events for ATLAS II in June in London, and I give Olivier the floor for a short update of three minutes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Wolf. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I'll try to be very short in summarizing. So there's been, as you said, a lot of work going on. The overall list of events, which includes the agenda, is very close to being complete. The working group that deals with the agenda has been doing a lot of work on that, led by Tijani Ben Jemaa.

There has also been some work done on the sponsorship side of things, so as to be able to bring in some sponsors to fund a lunch, fund a dinner, fund the showcase which is going to be not a EURALO showcase, but a worldwide showcase of At Large, which might be called something

else for the showcase, but for the time being we'll just call it a showcase.

But apart from that, there has also been a focusing onto the subject area that will be discussed by the At Large structures. The focusing on the five or six subject areas that At Large structures will be working on, and topics that will be worked on. If all of this is taking place openly, and it really is a community building the At Large summit for the community. I would like ask staff to please fix the link of the ATLAS II onto the Wiki.

Actually, we've got it on your agenda. And I'm just basically want to say that this whole process is open for anybody who so far has not taken any part in it to be able to take part. A whole lot of people that are involved in the overall organizing committee, the organizing committee, but underneath that, we've got a link to ATLAS II working groups. And if you want to integrate one of the working groups, each one has their own mailing list, then please email staff, and they will add you to the working group mailing list and take it from there.

I think that we're on time at the moment for an excellent [?] At Large summit. Thank you Wolf, back to you.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay, thanks a lot Olivier for this update. And Heidi has posted the link to the respective workspaces of ATLAS II. As Olivier said, I would just would like to underline, it's never too late to join one of the working groups as far as I've seen so far. We are quite well represented in

several of these working groups, with Roberto, with Sandra, with me, with [?] from ISOC France.

But there is still some working groups where we are not strongly included, therefore just let me repeat... I forgot Julia who is also part of these groups. And so we are still looking members to be well represented positively in most of the working groups preparing ATLAS II in the summer. If there are no questions on this or comments anymore let me continue with the next agenda item, which is EuroDIG open planning meeting in Berlin.

Just a brief update. Sandra you have the floor. If your line is still as bad as it was before, make it as a file please.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Yes, I've change [?] ...is it better now?

WOLF LUDWIG: You are still very distant with your voice.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: The technical is always an issue.

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, okay, now it's better.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay. [?] right now that we are having two public planning which we agree on an EuroDIG program in June. And the first planning meeting starts on Friday the 31st of January, and it will be noted [?]... the planning meeting [?] ... If you're still not able to participate [?] ... more participation [?] ... schedule. We received more than 90 proposals, which [?] ... And at the moment, [?] ...to vote on [?]... to vote [?]... to be in the agenda for EuroDIG [?] ... 14, and I really encourage you to use the opportunity, especially [?] ...

...online voting, and I just realized [?]... online voting but [?]... and to the online vote. And at the moment, we have quite, online voting [?] ... as well. [?] ... already, which is a great thing, and there will be additional tool, not the only tool but additional tool [?]... EuroDIG agenda [?].

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks a lot Sandra. It was really, really difficult to follow you with all your attempts, I know. I made just a summary in the chat just repeating [?] 95 proposals during the call period, what is the utmost we got so far over the years. They were all compiled and listed to be reviewed.

There was a new voting tool on the EuroDIG website given the community the opportunity to express their preference on the proposals [?]. But if complimentary consultation tool, and the results of the online voting will be presented at the end of the week until Friday, so voting is open to be presented on Friday.

And Friday we will meet one day in Berlin to discuss the proposal listed, and to discuss and decide about topical priorities and first outlines for

the Berlin agenda. This is more or less what is going on at the moment at the EuroDIG level which is quite... This is many people who have been registered for the open planning meeting in Berlin what will be a big prep meeting, etc. So the process on a very good and very promising way, and we will keep you updated during the next public calls on further EuroDIG planning procedure.

If there are no immediate questions regarding this agenda point, let me suggest to come to our last one, what is standing item on the monthly call, the 2014 challenges for the region. As a next big challenge, what is mentioned here but we do not have to go through [?] at the moment what will be the Board candidate for the 15th election and voting consultation. What will come up in the next week, and will more ground for discussions.

Next is EuroDIG in Berlin what we have just considered now and updated you now, and the last one I have on my list among the 2014 challenges is EURALO's involvement in ATLAS II in London and preparation of the EURALO general assembly. But there is still time for this and we can go into details for ATLAS II and EURALO GA in our next monthly meetings and calls.

Any further questions on agenda item eight? Any comments? Anything you want to add? Otherwise you can always comment or make up your mind via the list. Yes, I see one more hand raised, Oksana you have the floor.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Thank you Wolf. Do you hear me?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes we hear you clearly.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Oksana Prykhodko for the record. Olivier, can I talk about ALAC meeting before, with the list all for candidates for ICANN Board, Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, absolutely Oksana thank you for bringing this up.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Because what we have now is a list of final result candidates and therefore examples, and Jean [?] is on this one. As far as I know, he is a member of ALAC, so it was decided that during... Olivier, maybe you can describe the situation better. The situation of voting.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes thank you very much Oksana. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond for the transcript record. Very good point, yes, some of the candidates that are on the list are on the ALAC. As far as I understand, I don't think there is any blocking of them from being able to take part in the vote. More the case of being able to... Well, there is a complexity here basically, and I'm not quite sure I know exactly whether you are precluded from voting if you are, being a member of the ALAC if you are candidates are not.

And that will become clear in the next couple of days. The Board member selection process committee is meeting tomorrow, and will be able to shed some light over this. What is important is that during the ALAC call today, there has been a resolution to be passed, to be able to swap members of the electorate that might be ineligible to vote due to whatever position that they might be in. Whether they are missing for example, if somebody has passed away, if somebody is ill and is unavailable, this sort of thing.

So, a resolution was passed to make an amendment, an addition to the rules of procedure. In addition to this, I would like to provide you with the list of the candidates which the Board candidate evaluation committee has come up with. And I need to find it very quickly, and of course, just when I need to find it I can't.

So Jean Jacques [?] is one of them, and in fact there are five people all together in the overall list. Here we go. I've got it. So in alphabetical order of last name, there is Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Sebastian [Bachoulette], Allan Greenberg, Evan Leibovitch, and Jean Jacques [?]. The next stage now is for the RALOs to be looking at this list of candidates and to discuss within each RALO if they wish to add any more people to this short list of starting candidates.

So at the moment there are five of them. And does the RALO think that there are any candidates that are missing from this short list? The thing though is that if you want to add more candidates to this short list, the only people that it may add are people who have already submitted, what they call their statement of interest, their application for – to apply to become the At Large selected Board member. So that list of all

of those candidates is going to be published shortly. Theoretically today is the day when most of those lists are going to be put up and staff is building the pages as we speak.

When they do this, then the RALOs will be able to look at that list and decide they want to add someone. If EURALO decides that they would like to add an additional candidate or more from the list which will be published, then it will need to seek support from at least two other RALOs to be able to bring this candidate forward over to the short list of candidates that will be voted on.

I hope this has clarified what the next steps are, but thank you for bringing this up Oksana.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. Thanks a lot for the explanations and updates, Olivier. I'm sure there will be some more mailings on this, and we follow up this discussion at the next opportunity and I think I'm almost certain it will be prominent part of the discussion at our next monthly call. If there are no immediate questions, comments to be made, yes Olivier, I see your hand.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes, thank you Wolf. Sorry to be coming back to you on this, but I'm not sure there will be very much time during the next monthly call as we will... The timeline is very short for all of these things. It's a very strict timeline, so I would suggest that the follow up will be by email on the EURALO mailing list.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. What is another important option, and I'm sure we'll come back on this because the regional consultation was an important part of the procedure, and we will keep you updated and then once we have this short list, we will ask for additional suggestions from the region as Olivier outlined before. And if not, we will immediately start with the consultation on the suggested names.

Any further comments? Anything under any further business? We are behind the time already. If there is nothing urgent, let me thank all of you for taking the time and having joined our January, our first monthly call of the year. Thanks for your active participation, and as you have seen under the action items, there are some points we have to follow up. And we will keep you informed, and I wish you an excellent evening. Thanks a lot for your participation and goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]