WOLF LUDWIG:	Let me suggest that we start our monthly call for September right now. I would like to ask Julia whether you can do the roll call.
JULIA CHARVOLEN:	Sure. Good evening everybody. I'm very happy to be here tonight. We have with us Wolf, first of all. We have Desiree Miloshevic, Adigo, Frans, Greta, Jordi, Manuel Schneider, Narine, Oksana, Olivier, Roberto, Sebastien and myself. And we do have two apologies from Sandra and Yrjö.
WOLF LUDWIG:	I just mentioned another apology, which is Annetee Muehlberg.
JULIA CHARVOLEN:	Exactly. And Annette.
WOLF LUDWIG:	Okay. And Christopher, who's in the Agenda.
JULIA CHARVOLEN:	Exactly. And we do have Christopher, apologies.

WOLF LUDWIG:	Right. Okay. I have to get into the AC again because it broke down. The next point on our Agenda tonight is a review of AIs from our main call. I have checked these this afternoon and the only AI that was noted from our main call was a follow up on the individual ALSes certification, and we will come back to this point later, among our briefings. This AI from me can be considered as being done. The next point is a briefing on current ALAC consultations and initiatives, and this is as usual for our monthly calls.
	Olivier's part of it and I would like to hand it over to him.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you Wolf. I just have to speak to you about a handful of current statements and documents that we're putting together. If you look at the Agenda you'll note there are four recently adopted ALAC statements and documents, and I thank the people who held a pen on these. The draft Next Generation gTLD Directory Services Model is about the Expert Working Group. That's basically looking at a replacement to the WHOIS system.
	The Community Priority Evaluation Guidelines update from ICANN is basically looking at the guidelines that the consultant, WHOIS, was going to be looking at the community priorities and the guidelines and provide some details to other appointments that they might have missed in their document. The rights protection mechanism requirements was to do with the trademarks and as we mentioned on this one specifically, it was to do with the IDNs. As you know we've got quite a vibrant IDN Working Group.

And then the ALAC Rules of Procedure Email Guide was actually not a statement but an adjunct document to the new ALAC Rules of Procedure, and that dealt specifically with the different email lists that we have. The current statements being developed: there is a DNS Risk Management Framework Report. The ALAC is currently commenting. We are a little bit late in filing this and I must admit some of it is due to myself wanting to add a few more points to the statement currently on the Wiki.

Primarily, from my experience, it's the DNS Security and Stability Analysis, the DSSA Working Group, which has stopped its work due to the work of the Board and DNS Risk Management Framework. So this will come out in a few more days. If you have any points you'd like to make you have another 24 hours to read through these reports from Westcliffe – who are the consultants that are presenting this report –, and make your views known.

The statement on WCIT [00:06:15], the World Conference on International Telecommunications, is still in my pocket somewhere. There's been some movement recently with various governments preparing for the follow up to the WCIT. As you know, the ITU has quite a few consultations going on one after the other, so that each Summit would push governments into asking for the ITU to become more multi stakeholder rather than just more and more governance and everyone else is just an observer.

The consultation on ccTLD delegation and redelegation, user instructions and source of policy procedures is actually… There's two statements:

there's one for the ccTLD, there's one for the gTLD delegation and redelegation. The two statements are slightly different from each other. The one that is drafted by Cheryl Langdon-Orr is looking at how ccTLDs are redelegated, and there's obviously a political element to this. As far as the gTLDs are concerned it's more of a commercial thing.

But the two currently are being drafted and I hope that you will have time, when Matt sends the notes over to the lists for people to bring their comments in, I hope people have time to comment on that. Finally, the confusingly similar gTLDs – Alan Greenberg has drafted a note on this statement and the vote is going to start today. So the ALAC will vote on this. I think it's a pretty good thing.

It effectively shows that there has been some objections due to string similarity and visual confusion, and for some reason the same cases involving different parties – for example .cam and .com, there have been three objections. Two of them were treated by the same person and the third one was treated by another person and for some reason one panel decided that these were visually similar and in another case they were not visually similar.

So it's a bit of a mess because you cannot have the same two strings that are on one side seen as similar and not on the other side. So the statement effectively asks for the Board to reconsider the process by which this has been currently looked at, and also look at other similar problems, for instance the plural of a term, like .hotel and .hotels and also the IDN equivalent of a term. You'll see that on the statement.

That's pretty much it for the time being. I'll just remind you all that there is always a forecast of some forthcoming public comment. That's found in the At-Large policy development [00:10:00] engagement space, which you'll see a link to in the Agenda. I welcome questions of course on any of these statements.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thank you Olivier for that quick update. Let me ask if any of the participants have any questions or comments on the points presented by Olivier? I see no hands raised in Adobe Connect. Yes, I now see a hand raised by Desiree and I'll take Desiree first and Olivier afterwards.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Thank you Wolf. I'd like to thank Olivier for this quick presentation of all the statements that At-Large was working on. Just a point of clarification: before the last draft of the At-Large as a public comment, do we have a PDP procedure for a EURALO? When can we see the last draft, to get the comments in? Because I'm feeling that we are actually losing some traction and comments are being placed to the mailing lists, one which is [00:11:33] comment.

WOLF LUDWIG: This is a question directed at Olivier. Olivier, it's your turn again.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Wolf. Actually, whenever there is a public comment that starts, in general, if it's gNSO related we ask our gNSO liaison, Alan Greenberg. And if it's ccNSO related we ask our ccNSO liaison, Cheryl Langdon-Orr. If it's IDN related we ask the IDN Working Group, etc., etc. In general, in those Working Group, someone steps forward to pick up the pen and draft a first statement.

As soon as a first statement is drafted and Matt Ashtiani forwards the link to the first draft to the ALAC Announce mailing list, which announces all the things taking place – and I hope that everyone in EURALO is subscribed to the ALAC Announce mailing list as well, because that's where everyone is informed about what current consultations there are.

I'm only going through the list now due to the fact that it brings a little more impact, but of course there could be a public comment starting tomorrow that we're not aware of and EURALO might miss it if you wait for the EURALO monthly calls to look at it. If anyone is not on the ALAC Announce mailing list, they're very welcome to subscribe and I gather that Staff will be providing in the chat box the link to the way to subscribe to this.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks Olivier. I see that Desiree has raised her hand again?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: I appreciate this and I know how the public announce list works, but I was wondering if there's any discussion going on at At-Large as to

whether there should be a timing or cut-off date that we should generally be aware of for submitting comments? I know they all come in at different times and the submissions and the deadlines are different, I was just wondering if there was any discussion at At-Large as to how to streamline this process?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I know that in the meantime Silvia Vivanco has put the link to the ALAC Announce list, so you can just give your email to Staff to subscribe to it. I'm also going to send a link and that's the link to the At-Large policy development page. That's really our dashboard as to all of the things that are happening in this policy development side of things within At-Large, and if you go on that page you will see a big table.

There's a table of closed statements, which shows all of the statements we've done in the past, etc. There's a table of open statements and on that table it says, "call for comments", which is a table that Matt sends a call for comments out onto the ALAC Announce list. And then there's the "call for comments closed", and that provides the time at which the ALAC consultation will be closing.

That's usually one day before we launch the vote, so that it lets the main penholder take in all of the comments we received on the Wiki and work out a final statement. Then we usually have a five-day vote. We roughly have the vote open on the 17th and then it closes on the 23rd. We try and have about five working days to vote and then the date of submission.

So that's got all of the information on there as soon as we've decided it. If you see anything with 'TBC', for example the drafting consultation on gTLD delegation and redelegation user instruction and source of policy and procedures, where Alan Greenberg is supposed to be providing a first draft, that's because that draft has not yet been posted. If the draft isn't posted yet then of course we can't have a start commenting period and a closed commenting period.

As soon as Alan will be putting his online, both Matt Ashtiani and myself are told about it and we'll immediately provide a calendar of how long the ALAC and At-Large has to comment on this. The only thing is that it's always quite a short time. We usually try and do five, seven, ten days, but you have to remember the additional comment period is only 21 days in length, which is the reason why we're always running and trying to catch up with everything that's going on.

But that's where your dashboard is, and I hope that's helpful.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thank you Olivier for this elaboration. Are there any further questions from Desiree or any other participants on this call? I see no more hands raised regarding Agenda Item #3. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was just going to end my little contribution here by reminding everyone that you don't need to be an ALAC Member to be a penholder, and in fact we are in need of people who enjoy writing and are able to draft a first draft of a statement and then carry it through. You need to be part

of the At-Large community but it's not just restricted to ALAC Members, and in fact we have had some instances of not-ALAC but At-Large Members picking up the pen and drafting and producing the first draft. That's all. Thank you very much.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks again Olivier. Any other questions or comments regarding this Agenda Item? Olivier's hand is still up but I think he for the moment has said enough. Let me suggest we continue with tonight's Agenda. Item #4. You may recall our last monthly call, which was a month ago, was the one before the Lisbon General Assembly in June, in line with the last European dialogue on Internet Governance EURONIC.

And it was an exciting meeting at the time where most of you participated physically, and we had some very excellent free events as well as and event with Fadi and Nigel in Lisbon. Just before our General Assembly we had some very intense exchanges and discussions on the spot afterwards, in line with the votings in Lisbon, and we had to do our second voting round after the Lisbon GA, etc.

After that, due to the usual summer break, we didn't have, as usual, our monthly calls. We didn't do one in July or August, therefore this is the first after a long summer break, but there has been some happenings in the time between... As I mentioned at the beginning of this call, in the meantime, the longstanding issue with applications of the EURALO individual ALSes were submitted to At-Large Staff, there was the usual due diligence procedures.

There was the regional advice from EURALO in favor of [00:21:09] application, etc., and ALAC voted by large majority on this application. And as you have realized, finally this new Member ALS, [not is a home? 00:21:30] for our individual Members a more certified for our RALO. And I'd like to take this opportunity to thank Roberto again, who finally pushed the last work and task etc., and is the first contact point for this new ALS together with Mr. Donnerhacke.

Thanks again Roberto for following this up and having brought this to a good end. It was a long story but I'm very satisfied that we finally could make it. I see a hand raised from Manuel?

MANUEL SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I was just wondering if I was missing something, because you were mentioning some activity going on? Of course I know about the individual ALS, because that went through the mailing list, but I just wondered what means of communications or how the other things that have happened have been done, because I haven't seen anything on the mailing list and I was just wondering if I was missing something or…?

Do you remember the mail I sent to the mailing list? Because I was surprised about this decision, which looked to me like a Board decision; that we support the IGF of Ukraine, which is something…

WOLF LUDWIG: Manuel, we will come back to this point under Agenda Item #5.

MANUEL SCHNEIDER: Okay.

WOLF LUDWIG: The next event, among others, is the Ukrainian IGF, and I will explain the procedure again. For the moment, let me continue with the update on the post-Lisbon GA happenings. One of the important issues was certification of the new Member ALSes for the individuals. Then over the summer, every year we have the European Summer School on Internet Governance in early August, where Olivier and I participated.

And it was a new addition of this Summer School with interesting participants and it was a great success. I don't know whether Olivier would like to say some words on it, because he was one of the faculty members representing ALAC and EURALO at this event. And another event was the ICANN [00:24:54]. We talked about this partly during the GA because we applied for Fellowships for the ICANN [00:25:07] early this year.

Unfortunately our request was not approved. The last [00:25:18] meeting took place in Pisa, in Italy, and I didn't participate this year but I've heard from Sandra that a number of ICANN representatives participated from the Board, and Fadi himself participated as well. So the [00:25:40] meeting, which was set to be a third party and therefore not approved for any funding support, Fadi was there and he had some very important inputs, etc., and of course as the name explains, ICANN [00:26:10] turns around ICANN [laughs] and Internet governance, so it must have been a very interesting and exciting meeting.

These two meetings usually happen over the summer break, then it was relatively calm on the mailing list. In August, maybe the end of July, we got a formal request – we're now coming to point five – from the Organizing Committee from the Ukrainian IGF that the EURALO would support this Ukrainian IGF at the beginning of October.

As in previous years, whenever somebody asked for support of a national European IGF, we usually concerned our support if it didn't imply any further financial support and if it doesn't imply any requests in any further capacity. And this was during the summer break approved. As we did in previous years there was never a debate about whether we should approve a national IGF or not.

So we took it as a matter of fact, once we get such a request, particularly from Eastern European countries, we usually supported them. Back to you, Manuel. I don't know whether your questions is answered by this? I see that it's not!

MANUEL SCHNEIDER: No. I don't want to make a big fuss about this now, and please don't take this as any criticism or anything, I just want to understand how the mechanisms work. Just taking the IGF as an example, I'm perfectly find with the decision – nothing to discuss about that. I just wonder who is the "we" you are talking about: " 'we' received the request"? I'm on the Board, I did not see any request. Who was taking the decision?

I agree this is a decision that doesn't need to be discussed on the Board or through any Committee if there is a clear rule that the person who

EN

receives the request will simply approve it and that's it. That's fine. I just want to understand how this is going on because I have the feeling that there was something going on that I missed. I heard about the [00:29:29] for instance in Lisbon the first time.

it would have been good to see some invitations maybe on the mailing list, where can I register? Where could I participate? I'm not sure if I would have had the time but I simply have to acknowledge now that it has already happened and I didn't see it coming. It might be my fault. I just want to…

WOLF LUDWIG: Manuel, let me explain it again. [00:30:05] meetings, for many years, we are trying to use the opportunity to get EURALO Members to the ICANN [00:30:12] but due to the lack of funding they are always organized similar to EURODIG in a different part of Europe. Last year, the [00:30:24] meeting was in Oslo, this year it was in Italy, etc. Usually, volunteer Members from EURALO cannot afford by their own means, if they do not have travel support, to go to ICANN [00:30:40].

We announce it year-by-year in case we would have gotten approval for travel support, and it would have been broadly communicated on the EURALO list, in writing, for Members to register for the next meeting. If we couldn't offer travel support we didn't push it like in previous years. But we mentioned it at the GA that it would happen again this year, in early September, in Pisa.

Coming back to the Ukrainian IGF point, I just want to bring back to your memory, over many years EURALO has had a Board. But the EURALO Board, over the last few years, until the last GA in Lisbon, was practically not functional. Maybe there are some other participants here who have a different perspective on the EURALO Board before.

We have had a new Board since Lisbon and in the previous years, when we got such a request, it was normally sent to the Secretariat or to me and it was more or less a leadership decision if we could proceed. It's not a political issue. It's not an issue we have to discuss in detail because it's tricky, etc., we simply formally approved it.

And it hasn't been an issue so far and I can't imagine that it would suddenly become an issue, but I can promise, now that I see we have a Board who's best intention is to [00:32:49] and to be responsible on such things, next time this will be brought before the Board and the Board can decide on such requests. As I said, I didn't conceive it to be in any way touchy – for me it was a matter of cause.

I also don't understand this sudden opposition on this. I have my own interpretation why we suddenly have this opposition about this issue, that it's brought up as a touchy issue, but for me it's a matter of fact that we should encourage this type of cooperation. Okay, I beg your pardon for having asked the Board, etc., and okay…

MANUEL SCHNEIDER: Let me make clear here – as I said before, I don't see there being an issue with the IGF and I don't see that there are any problems. There is

no need to beg pardon for anything! [laughter] I wanted to understand the mechanisms and you have described them to me so I am happy now. Concerning the [00:34:07], just a suggestion, no matter if it's funded or not, it never hurt to simply send or cc. the invitation mails to the Euro list. Even if people are not able to come it never hurts and it doesn't cost anything.

Concerning… As I say, it's just a suggestion. It's not a criticism or anything, it was just the thing that raised the question. Concerning the Board, we have this Board mailing list. I thought I'd reactivated or at least subscribed to it – the Euro Board list…

WOLF LUDWIG: It was updated.

MANUEL SCHNEIDER: It was updated, thank you. Yes, I agree, the Board was dysfunctional – I think it still is. The point is, if we don't have anything to work on, if you don't have any information, it will [00:35:27]. The point is, the Board is not dysfunctional by itself. If nobody knows what to do, nobody does anything, hence that it's dysfunctional by definition. I don't want to go too much into this. Maybe this is something we have to discuss at the next Board meeting or maybe in person, which would be even better.

WOLF LUDWIG: As you see from today's Agenda, under Agenda Item #8, we will come back to this issue of the EURALO Board and [00:36:04], etc., that will be

sent out for a Board call, so we will follow up on this. And I hope there will be other outcomes in the near future – also from the Board side. But over many years, as a matter of fact, whenever there was an initiative-insisted direction, we had the Board mailing list before and there was never any response on the Board mailing list.

So I hope this will be different in the future. I'm looking forward to any improvement. But over many years it didn't work and we communicated over years, regularly, every European event over every year, we announced ICANN [00:37:04] over the mailing list. This year as we had for the third time no approval of our funding request, it was announced in Lisbon and anybody that would have asked about it could have gotten any details on it.

But we will improve it in the near future. Oksana's had was raised before. Oksana made a lot of comments here in the chat room and there was also a hand raised by Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I see Oksana is asking to "read my question". I don't know if she is able to speak or should I read it for you? Oksana has written in the chat, "please read my question." Does it mean…?

WOLF LUDWIG: I see two dozen questions from her side and let me try and figure out whether there was any concrete question. Oksana, you have the floor.

SPEAKER: May I? I think the question was: "what does it mean, EURALO as a partner of IGF Ukraine and how was it decided?" I think the "how" you've already explained, at least it's clear to me now.

WOLF LUDWIG: In previous years it was always from the first Ukrainian IGF, to my memory. We were asked besides the Council of Europe, besides other partners, whether we would support the Ukrainian IGF. We were even invited. Olivier participated several times at the Ukrainian IGF. Sebastien participated at the Ukrainian IGF. I participated once two years ago, representing EURALO. So there was already a tradition that we supported this event.

So it's nothing new. It's a tradition of support. We were asked by the Organizing Committee in Kiev this year whether we could support the next upcoming Ukrainian IGF by using the EURALO logo. And we said yes, I see no reason why we shouldn't express our support to such an initiative we know already, with our logo. And this is our support and there is nothing else.

So I do not suddenly see why after years it would become a political issue. It was clear over several years and suddenly it's becoming an issue? This is something I have my person interpretation on, but I honestly do not understand. Any more questions or comments regarding this Agenda Item?

MANUEL SCHNEIDER: I just want to say it again – I don't see any opposition on the issue here. It's raised a few questions, they have been answered. I'm fine with it, and I'm pretty sure Oksana will be fine as well. Don't feel too pushed about it. I really don't see that you need to beg my pardon or talk about opposition here. I don't see this.

WOLF LUDWIG: Again, this arrived at the end of July. This is usually a summer break and usually [00:41:45] on the EURALO list. Therefore, I propose to [00:41:54] the list, etc. As I said, we were used to do it in previous years and it was never a matter of discussion, so we just did it, concerned with just sending it global and it was clear. I thought: "okay, like in previous years everybody will be happy," and then we got this comment. Roberto has raised his hand.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Wolf, I was really talking about the [00:42:35], which was the previous point. If you've finished the discussion on the Ukrainian IGF? I was just wondering if it would be useful if I were to say a couple of words about what happened at the [00:42:53], so that everybody's aware?

WOLF LUDWIG: Did you participate in that?

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes, I did. Very briefly – I think that I can maybe send a written note in the future – the [00:43:18] was very interesting this year, especially for the participation of Fadi. Fadi was supposed to come for the first day but then he obtained also a large part of the second day. On the first day it was opened by a presentation by different people from the government and private institutions about the status of the Internet. [00:43:50] the major issues and the status of the Italian registry, .ig.

The second subject was in principle related generally to the Internet diplomacy and Internet governance, but in fact it ended up focusing a lot on the security and the privacy issues related to the case of the Snowden finding about [00:44:47] from the US Government. So that was the large part of the discussion on the Internet government.

The following day the first session, which lasted for the whole morning, was about the production of the new gTLDs; what the opportunities are, what the problems were, the different points of views… There were registries, registrars there, and also I said a couple of words talking from the user perspective. And it was a really interesting discussion and there were also some questions and answers directed to Fadi within the [00:45:40].

Then there was a presentation by David [Mahera? 00:45:50]. There was a presentation about some legal issues. I think that probably the text of the presentation is likely available and if so I'll send it around. Then the last part was looking at the future, but in fact the focus of this – also because we had a couple of last-minute apologies from some speakers –

was on the ATRT 2 Review Team and how well we're going forward with the ATRT.

That was basically it. As I said, I can write a few notes in the following days and send it around with a little bit more information. And I think that Christopher Wilkinson also attended the [00:47:05]. I don't know if he has something relevant to tell us?

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks a lot for this briefing on Pisa and the last ICANN [00:47:17]. Any further information on this from your side, from you Roberto, or Christopher, or anybody else who has participated is of course highly welcome via the mailing list. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Roberto, you mentioned the ATRT 2. Was any Member of the ATRT 2 present?

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes, Avri Doria, for instance.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. I wasn't aware – that's why I was asking. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Any further questions regarding Agenda Item #4.a, #4.b and #5? Any further comments from your side? I'd highly appreciate it if we

could have further input from Roberto and Christopher and anybody who participated there. Sandra could also… She is also organizing the [00:48:40] meeting. Unfortunately she's not on the call tonight so she cannot give another short briefing from her side, but we will continue to share information about this.

Let me suggest, due to time constraints, to continue with Agenda Item #6 – ATLAS II's survey group. After the last Durban ICANN meeting there has been intensive discussions in Durban about the plannings and timings, etc., for the organizing process for ATLAS II, which is confirmed now for next June in London. And before the Durban meeting we sent a draft of a questionnaire to the group. Already there's been one comment on the first draft of the questionnaire from NARALO.

And we discussed it and then we asked Dharma Daily from NARALO to send us to submit a revised version, which she did in early August. And this revised draft is now under consultation in the survey group. There is also a discussion to combine two intended surveys of the community and I think there will be a Sub-Working Group called [logistics? 00:50:35] or very soon they will discuss the revised version to finally approve it, to keep the timeline of the ATLAS II as preparation, etc., or how we could combine the two surveys.

Silvia has posted the link to the ATLAS II survey Wiki page. For any further details please go to this Wiki page and if you have any further questions on this you can directly ask me or you can post a question on the mailing list. I would like to encourage EURALO Members that if you are interested in the follow up of this, please subscribe to the respective

group list. We have the organizing team, we have a PR team – there are several sub-groups – and all the EURALO Members are kindly invited to subscribe to any list they would like to contribute to. Any further questions regarding #6, the ATLAS II survey group?

Regarding #7 on the update on the ICANN Academy: this was scheduled to be Sandra's part, who is chairing the ICANN Academy Working Group. [00:52:30] in Berlin for the last few days with me, because on Monday and today we had the first planning meeting for the next EURODIG, which will be organized for the middle of June in Berlin next year.

So we had, with the host team, a very productive open planning meeting for the last two days, and Sandra is now on the train back to [00:53:00], etc., and she had to submit her apologies for not participating tonight. But she briefly told me that the pilot for the ICANN Academy is on its best way now. The pilot will now be organized for the next ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires, and there was a lot of community feedback on the Working Group mailing list, and she can give us a more detailed update on this pilot project on our next call in October.

I see Olivier has raised his hand. Olivier, you have the floor.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was just going to say two words. At the moment the Committee is putting together a list of the potential attendees of this pilot program, so there will be people from all of the SOs and ACs that have been invited now. And each SO has been asked to provide a list of people that they'd like to send, in addition to all the people that were invited by the

Nominating Committee this year. I've heard that some people have said they're not interested in attending; maybe because they already know about it or maybe because they don't know about it. But that's the stage that we're at.

At the moment we're also collecting the people who will be part of the faculty. That's where it's at at the moment. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks a lot for these details Olivier. As far as I've seen, Jordi will be participating as a Nom-Com… Recently NomCom selected as a student, and you will participate as a trainer or as a faculty member from EURALO. This is right, okay?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's still in discussion but I'm likely to be there, yes. I think I'll probably be there as a student but an experienced student; in other words being able to share my knowledge with others that will be there.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, but I think that's a great thing. Just to shortly recall, this ICANN Academy is a project that was originally developed and came from EURALO. The first draft proposal was admitted two years ago at the end of August and it has matured via many discussions at ALAC, etc. Afterwards it was opened to other constituencies, since more than a year by now it's an inter-constituency project and it has matured over

time. And I'm very satisfied that the pilot will happen just before the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires.

Some EURALO Members are still involved at the very prominent level. Some are chairing the Working Group and Olivier being closely involved and Jordi as well. Any further questions? I see Olivier still has his hand raised. Did you want to add something else?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes please. I was just going to add that in addition to the Academy taking place, which is effectively the introduction for new people, there's also the facilitation skills program that ICANN Staff have put together, that is going to be back-to-back with the leadership program. It's all an integrated program that will last several days.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Any further questions and comments from your side? We reach the end of the hour for our monthly call and we still have Agenda Item #8. It's how to further proceed with EURALO Board and meeting rhythm. Short recall again – there was a very good initiative and very good outcome at the last GA, when a number of new Board Members came in, were selected, elected, who said: "we want to be more active on the Board; to assist as the Secretariat and the Chair," which is highly welcome and highly appreciated.

And there was a suggestion on the table in Lisbon to have monthly calls among Board Members. Now we've tried to take up this initiative again. We will organize a next first Board call and then we have to decide

whether we will have a monthly meeting prior to the monthly EURALO call, whether a monthly call is too ambitious… But we'll leave this to the Board Members; they must decide. So it's all in the hands of the Board Members and we will closely follow up on this in the next weeks.

Any comments, any questions from your side? This is the next… Silvia was just saying the Doodle was sent for the EURALO Board. It will likely be on the 8th or 9th of October. Once it's completed we will confirm the date and we will have the first Board call, and then we'll discuss further details and procedures with the Board Members.

Further questions, comments? I see approval from Manuel. So this is work in progress, and as mentioned I'm happy about this new initiative that finally after years I hope that we'll have an active Board where we can discuss current issues and make broader based decisions. If there are no further questions, is there anything among "any other business"? Our last Agenda point for tonight's call? Yes, Jordi has raised his hand.

JORDI IPARAGUIRRE: Thank you very much Wolf. It's going to be very short because we don't have time, but just to mention that I have already joined the ccNSO Council and all that, and one of the points that was raised by email was that we are really disappointed on how the Staff treated their feedback to the SOP points and all that. So they are going to look for support from other structures, trying to go back to ICANN and say: "maybe we need to work this a bit better," because they are not satisfied at all.

EN

So to make it short, I will send an email to you as a person of the Board or EURALO so that we can discuss how to move that forward and which kinds of support we can provide, if any. So that's all.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thank you Jordi. I don't know for the moment anything about the background to this, but I think it's a good idea to share it on the mailing list. It could be one of the first discussion items for the first and next Board meeting. I think this is a perfect example of when something like this comes up, to discuss it and to make a decision on the Board level first, on issues like this.

JORDI IPARAGUIRRE: I'll do so. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, thanks a lot Jordi. Any further questions or comments from your side? If this is not the case, let me thank you all for your participation on this call. I'm really impressed and pleased that we had around 15 participants at this monthly call. It's very encouraging. I think one of the key projects for the next month is the preparation process for ATLAS II in London, which will also be in line with our next face-to-face GA of EURALO in London. And there is a lot of work to be done.

I would like to have as many of you involved in this next project as possible. Thanks for your participation and I wish all of you an excellent evening. Bye bye.

EN

[general goodbyes]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]