WOLF LUDWIG:	Let me welcome you to our February monthly call. Tonight, some of you I have seen already at the At Large call, which was quite a long one, this afternoon. And I guess this maybe the last one for tonight. Let me start with today's agenda, with the first standing issues, which is the roll call and apologies. I think it will be Julia who will handle this one.
JULIA CHARVOLEN:	Thank you Wolf. On today's EURALO monthly meeting, we have Wolf Ludwig, Frans Gerbosch, Narine Khachatryan, Roberto Gaetano, Oksana Prykhodko, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Greta Jeske, Christopher Wilkinson, Yrjo Lansipuro, Sandra Hoferichter, Yuliya Morenets, Siranush Vardanyan, and Sebastien Bachollet.
	We have apologies from Jean-Jacques Subrenant and William Drake. And from staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Lang, any 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 this roll call. Next agenda item is review of the action items from our January call, and these are posted, as we can see, in the Adobe Connect. There have been two points, EURALO approved support of the International Action Day of the 11th of February. Wolf will contact the foundation and will express support, which I immediate did after our last call in January.

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.

EN

It was appreciated by the organizers and the second, a little bit more complex for time taking. The issue was EURALO was suggested for the members for CROPP submissions and support. Here you have the five primary names we listed and approved at our last call. But plus two alternate candidates which are [?] from Romania and [?]. Just in case, if two candidates on the priority list will be approved by the CROPP review team.

And we will come back later to this agenda item again, so the action items of the last meeting have been accomplished. Any further questions on this from your side? This is not the case, let me continue with the next agenda… Yes, I see Oksana has raised her hand. Yes please.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Thank you very much Wolf. I would like to propose one more issue. I send budget request for [?]… Russian speaking [?]… And I would like to ask you to consider [?] on this teleconference.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks Oksana. I haven't seen this so far, probably I have missed something…

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: [?] five minutes ago.

EN

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. So I couldn't have seen it so far. Okay, may I suggest that we include this under agenda item five, what will be fiscal year 15 budget request with Olivier? And then we can include your request under this one.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Thank you Wolf.

WOLF LUDWIG: Is that okay for you? Okay. You're welcome. And let me go over to the next agenda item, which is point three, what is, as usual, Oliver's part, reading on current election consultations and initiatives. Olivier, once again, you have the floor.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Wolf. It's Olivier speaking. Can you hear me?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Well, we have quite a few statements that are currently being developed or voted on by the ALAC. The first one on the list, and I invite you all to have a look at the wiki which has a link to all of these statements. The first one is the At Large policy advisory board for GTLD proposal. This is a proposal which has come out of a discussion which started way before Buenos Aries.

I think there was even some discussion of it in the Durban meeting held last year. The idea is that the public interest commitment, which applicants for new top level domain have filed, are not particularly well written, and in fact, some of them are not worth very much. And so there is a real concern that the public interest is being looked over by those. And so one of the suggestions that has been recently made by some members of the business constituency in the generic name supporting organization, is that the names which are sensitive string…

So, to give an idea, like dot bank, dot medical, or dot help, for example, would require mandatory use of a policy advisory board that would be setup, that would have a number of people on there, to make sure that the – to commitment that the registrar, or the applicants of those top level domains have given, are actually being used and being followed. The policy advisory boards would have members of the public, but also would have registrars, registries.

They would have a whole mix of representatives on there, a little bit like an oversight committee, that would be looking – if the domain name was being, or the top level domain is being well run. The request in that statement is actually for a public comment period to be opened up. And so a few months ago, in fact, a month ago, there was a letter that was signed by several members of the business community, but also a business constituency but also by myself on behalf of the At Large leadership team, for ICANN to open a public comment period on this issue.

That was unfortunately rejected because we were told the train had already left the station, as one calls it. In other words, it was too late for

something like that to happen, and they were not ready to reopen the application process, or the contracts that were being signed, at the very time. So what we're asking, or what the ALAC is basically asking, is for public comment period to be opened up to everyone, and to find out if there is actually support in the community for this type of model for the policy advisory board model.

The ALAC met a few hours ago and voted, not face to face, but during the call voted to ratify this request, and therefore the text that you see here is within our goal, refers to public comment, which has the purpose, the background, the rationale, and a link over to the policy advisory board model proposal, which was drafted earlier this year, actually late last year, September 2013.

So this is going to move forward, and you will soon, in the next few weeks, see that the, this will go out for public comment for all of ICANN. The next one is the second accountability and transparency review team final report and recommendation, that is the ATRT 2. There has been some text that was drafted by Rinalia Abdul Rahim on this, with input from the At Large community, and also from some of us who were in the ATRT 2.

The draft is there for comment and you're very welcome to comment on it. The closing time for comments is the 28th of February, so we're talking the end of this week. We're pointing out primarily that the ATRT 2 report makes recommendations, but it also makes observations on quite a few things, including when it reviews the ATRT 1, the first instance of the accountability and transparency review, that took place four years ago.

It's really surprising that many of these recommendations have not actually been yet implemented, and so it is actually important that the Board considers implementing those, and reap those observations that are laid out in the appendix B and C and in the rest of the ATRT 2 report. Very important indeed. So the ALAC is just reminding the Board that this is something of great importance, and we push the Board for implementation of recommendation as soon as possible.

The translation and transliteration of contact information in the working group, SOA the input request, deals with internationalized domain names. So, that effectively... When you have, let's say, an international domain name that's in the Chinese script, then when somebody does a WHOIS request to try and find out who the owner of that domain name is, the response is provided most probably, in most situations, would be provided in Chinese, and using the Chinese characters.

And the aim of that working group, which is an outside working group, not out of just At Large, but actually across all of ICANN, the aim of that working group is to try and find the solution for the translation and the transliteration into the Latin alphabet of this contact information. Quite a technical subject, that's why we have asked the At Large internationalize domain name policy working group, which we have, which I think some EURALO members are members of, to provide some input for this.

And I understand that there is a statement that currently is being drafted, and if you wished to comment on this please put your comment on the wiki. Third, the [?] review mechanisms to address perceived [?] expert determinations on string confusion. That's an

EN

interesting one as well. Basically the ALAC has pointed out a few months ago, through one of its past statements, that there was complete inconsistency in the rulings which were made by adjudicators where, external to ICANN, that were supposed to adjudicate in cases of string confusion, visual similarity, and possible confusion of Internet users.

To give you an idea, dot cam, C-A-M, would be or could be confusing with respect to dot com, because it's just a one letter difference and in some scripts, the two letters might look the same. Similar speaking, dot car, singular dot car, could be similar or could be confused with dot cars, the plural of the word. Now, the interesting this is that ICANN did not want to adjudicate on this. So they basically contracted some external adjudicators to look at the cases when more than one…

First, on the one hand, more than one applicant went for the same word, and then at the same time, when some applicants went for the plural of the world and some for singular of the word, and some went for a word that was similar to another word out there. If I haven't lost you by now, certainly the whole matter has not the adjudicators all together, because they did not speak to each other.

And so in cases where four different rulings, in three of those cases, and I'm just citing an example here, in three of those cases, it was deemed that there was no string confusion. In the fourth case, there was a string confusion. So to give you an idea, I think, in two cases dot cam was found to be similar to dot com. In one case, it was found not to be similar to dot com. These are just words.

And again, there needs to be some consistency across the rulings of the different adjudicators. And it's unfortunate that this matter is only being looked at when the ALAC has actually pointed this out several months ago. So the draft that has been submitted here is basically regretting is that ICANN has taken so long to react to the overall situation of this discrepancy between the different rulings.

Alan Greenberg, who is holding the pen on this, is actually going to beef this up a little bit, make it a little bit stronger, that we express deep regret, and not only that, we will point the Board to the fact that we have already pointed this problem earlier. Why is it a huge problem now? Because guess what? The Board has ignored our advice and has signed contracts with a few of the companies that had string confusion, or potential string confusion.

And therefore, there has been at least the one case where a contract was signed with a company that was offering a word that was the plural of, and a lot of companies that had the singular term for the word. That is definitely going to bring confusion to Internet users. Unfortunately, we told the Board so, but we were not listened to on this occasion.

We just want to make the point on that. Next, the related issue of the compliance. This is a point which started up with Garth Bruen, having complained about the ICANN compliance department for a while, Garth runs an organization that looks specifically for discrepancies in WHOIS records, and sort of bad applicants for domain names. And applicants which are out of compliance and which therefore make the registrars that accept those applications out of compliance as well.

On that occasion, what has happened was that got people on sending bulk data, using bulk systems, bulk submissions process. But the compliance department has, in its processes, even if you submit [?] will then look at each one of the submissions, one after the other, one at a time. The statement which the ALAC is going to submit is basically suggesting to the compliance department that in places where the complaint, the subject and complaint is not an individual apparent, but a more widespread problem, that effects a whole range of domain names, or a generic top level domain registrations.

At that point, there should be a way to batch all of these together for the ICANN compliance department not to waste time on looking at the issues individually one at a time. And that draft is effectively suggesting that the… Because time was of the essence, there was a motion that was made on the call, and this again was passed just like the previous motion, with 13 votes in favor, no abstentions, and no one voting against.

And then finally, the ICANN Board resolutions from its meeting on the 7th of February, 2015 in Los Angeles. That's another issue with the technical liaison group. Now, the technical liaison was something that was to stand on the Board, and there was a proposal by the Board to basically, what do you call it? To remove that position because of it was of little use.

But removing that position on the Board also removed the technical liaison from being on the nominating committee, the ICANN nominating committee, and that's something which we said was probably not a

good idea with regards to outreach to get good technically minded people to be able to apply for the Nom Com process.

So the ALAC sent a statement that was ignored. And then now, we see the rationale for the ratification of the removal of that technical liaison, which actually contradicts the reasons for removing that liaison to start with, as it was proposed by the Board. So the Board proposed that this was not a standing measure. It was just a case of better management, and of double – sort of having those people represented on the Board.

And the rationale basically hinges on the fact that it is a costs savings measure. So there is obviously a discrepancy there, and Dev Anand Teelucksingh has been asked to draft a statement to point this out, and several issues which he very eloquently described during the ALAC call. So I invite you all to keep a watch over this page.

Basically within the next 48 hours we will have a proposed first draft on this page, and of course, we will be sending a call for comment on that. That pretty much closes the work that we've done there. There are a couple of more public, open public comments which the ALAC has decided not to have a statement on. The first one, the qualified launch program from new generic top level domain registries [CROSSTALK]… That's something that really has to do with gTLD registries and does not affect, the last program really doesn't affect Internet users directly.

And there was some proposed modifications to the GNSO operating procedures to address resubmission of motions and working groups self-assessments. That's an eternal GNSO matter, and looking at it, it did not appear to be affecting users directly. It's more of the internal

EN

issues in the GNSO when they have to resubmit motions, and when they have to look at how well their working groups are doing.

So, these are all of the inputs. The public comment process is one which is continuous. And so just to let you know, there is a policy advice development page, which is constantly maintained, [?] it was constantly maintained by Matt, soon it's going to be taken over by Ariel, the new ICANN staff who has joined, Ariel Liang. And so that… I'll quickly put the page on the chat. So that's the At Large policy development page.

That page is being updated daily. That's a constant pipeline of policy development that is taken place. If you want to comment, you are very, very welcome to do so. If you want to pick up the pen and be someone who drafts the comments, then you're even more encouraged to do so. We need more people. Just one thing though. Until now it was possible, or until recently it was possible to send an anonymous comment.

In other words, you could comment on every page and not need to login. Unfortunately we were attacked recently by a spammer that sent several hundreds of spam, which staff had to manually delete. So what we have done is to disable the anonymous comment for a certain period time, which we might keep it for another month, let's say, until that spammer gives up, hopefully.

And in the meantime, so you will have to log in onto the wiki in order to be able to put a comment on it. If you don't have a wiki login, then it is still possible to comment, by actually sending your comment to At Large staff and At Large staff will be transcribing this and transferring it onto

EN

the wiki on your behalf. That's all I needed to say, and I hope I haven't taken too much time, but I'm open to questions if you have any.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks Olivier for this briefing. I have seen two hands raised. The first was Christopher and the second was Sebastien. I give the floor first to Christopher. Christopher, are you still with us?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hi. Wolf, thank you. Christopher here. Olivier, just a word about the policy advisory board. I have some reservations about this, and I wish we had a discussion in EURALO before the meeting earlier today. First, there is a question of principle, which I think you already – you're already indicated that the ICANN Board was been too cavalier and off-hand adopting proposals which had a public interest dimension which they have ignored.

Secondly, if we go ahead, or they go ahead with the public advisory board, the costs must be supported directly by ICANN. To go back to the registries concerns to support the past, is half addressed, is moving sands. The cost must be supported by ICANN directly, and if ICANN wishes to recover the costs where the GTLD is concerned, that is very fair.

But for the public advisory board to have to go begging to the registries concerns that they're advising to support their costs, that's not acceptable. And thirdly, there is a gem in the proposal which suggest that somebody somewhere is going to decide who is going to a member

EN

of the public advisory board. That is a position of considerable power and influence, and there is no indication, in my first reading of the text, there is no indication of what that is going to be.

And we have already seen that the PICs proposed by some of these registries are a fig leaf, a front. And I think the mechanisms for appointing the memberships of these public advisory boards will turn out to be an extremely sensitive issue. So I really think we have to take a step back from this. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks Christopher for this comment. Olivier, would you immediately like to respond to Christopher?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes please Wolf. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I absolutely understand Christopher's concerns, but let me just make this clear. It's actually not too late to comment. Why is it not too late to comment? Because what the ALAC has decided and has approved is for a public comment period to be opened, opened up on the subject of public – of policy advisory boards.

The ALAC has not basically sent a note to the Board and said, "We want a policy advisory board to happen, or this thing to be mandated." The ALAC has basically asked for a public comment to be done on it. So, certainly, one thing that could be done is to take the transcript of this call and Christopher, your intervention just now could be, once that

EN

public comment period is open, could go directly into the public comment, and that will bring the input that you have to bring into this.

And certainly, I'm sure others might have other concerns, and others might have suggestions as well for this concept. Whether it is finally accepted or not accepted, but at least the ability to open the discussion is going to be there, and for a forum to be there to discuss it ICANN wide, and in fact, world-wide.

The concern the ALAC had was that when the letter was sent by several individuals to open a public comment period on this, there was an outright response initially from ICANN staff, so not even from the Board, but from ICANN staff to basically say, "It's too late. We don't even want to discuss this. And you had a chance to discuss this in the past, we're not going to reopen the discussion."

That's where the discussion is and so Christopher, you will have the chance, at that point, to voice your concern. Had we not open the public comment period, then there would not even have been a discussion on it. And similarly, some are also asking, what is the GAC thinking about this? That was a question which was asked during the call, during the ALAC call. In fact, the GAC appears to be split on this and it would be interesting to hear the point of view of individual GAC countries, when the public comment is open, if they are going to make submissions on this as well. Thanks.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks Olivier. I see the Adobe Connect chat that Christopher posted, "I sent an email to you all to that effect." So, this may be

EN

considered and [?] up again. There was also Sebastien who raised his hand before. I don't know whether this is still valid or desired.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If you can hear me, it's Sebastien. Thank you. The ALAC [?]… I was not able to take notes, but [?]… under the delusion… [?]… because in fact it will not be a [?]… which maybe the same thing. But, the [?]… two from each of the three TLD member [?]… and the [?] together, to the technical liaison group will become this group of eight people.

And with the participation of people from the technical community, from other parts of ICANN. And [?]… of the budget. And the way [?] …rationale was not [?]… so that I asked for change. I hope it will be done soon. [?]… And I don't think is because you are a member of the Nom Com, but the only [?] for you to participate and [?] which candidate, [?] candidate for the Nom Com. [?] … members of the Nom Com.

And I am not sure what we could do, these issues this one either. But, I understand your point of view, the rationale I already [?]… Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks a lot Sebastien for this additional elaborations on this. I see Olivier who has raised his hand again. You have the floor Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Wolf. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I appreciate very much Sebastien's explanation with regards to the

rationale that will probably be re-drafted or re-explained a bit differently. With regards to the Nom Com, there is one thing which I think is sometimes misunderstand, the nominating committee actually does two jobs.

The first one is searching for candidates out there. The second one is selecting candidates. And it's that searching for candidates part which requires a very diversified nominating committee because when you are on the Nom Com, and I'm speaking here from my experience, when I was on the nominating committee, when you are on the Nom Com the first people you look for is your immediate community.

And so the technical liaison who was on the Nom Com had very open access to the IETF, open access to when it was someone from IETU, to people who were in the IETU circles, very open access to the world wide web consortium circles, much more than any of the other nominating committee members that were of that committee. So this is where there is a concern that we are effectively closing the door to being able to have this further reaching into the depths of those communities, if there was a requirement by the Board to have somebody with such knowledge or such links.

So the ICANN Board is effectively somehow reducing its reach into the world wide web consortium, for example, if it was to go out there to find someone to build up stronger links with the W3C, just as an example. On the other hand, I think it will certainly be absolutely welcomed in our community that the actual technical liaison group will be constituted, and it might be that the benefits of that outweigh the shortfalls that removing someone from the Nom Com has.

But that still remains to be seen, and I think that our community will still voice its concerns on this. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, I'm not on my computer. If I could just add to... It's me, Sebastien. Quickly, because we don't have so much time on the call. But, [?]... it's the [?] ...the one who change each year from visibility to the [?]... And that's the one. And with the TLG group, with eight people, Nom Com will be able to go to [?]... to outreach and [?]... And I get your point, and I don't think it's [?]... to what is happening. Thank you very much.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks a lot Sebastien. And I see some approval to what Olivier has said before, explaining the work of the Nom Com, and also some approval from Yrjo, one of our Nom Com members. If there are no further questions or comments to our agenda item three, I'd like to remind you that we are running short of time.

I would like to continue with our next agenda item, which is point four, what is the final state of CROPP and regional submissions. As you may recall, we discussed this in more details at our last monthly call. It was mentioned already in the review of the action items, that we made some submissions for this CROPP request, with several candidates. And

there was a working group formed last time, and it was [Fran?] and Julia who were part of this working group.

And as far as I understood, the regional submission was posted or filed today. Yuliya, I give the floor to you. Can you confirm? Yuliya are you available for this? There is Silvia who has posted a link on the respective page for community regional outreach pilot program fiscal year 14. This gives an overview of this pilot program again. And while if Julia is not available, she confirmed today, directly, that the submissions from our region discussed and approved at our last call, has been submitted and uploaded via the respective application forms.

And to my understanding, it's now on the CROPP review team, where Oksana is part of – to have a closer look on our submissions. And afterwards there will also be a statement from ICANN's vice president multi-stakeholder engagement Europe from Nigel Hickson, who has to review our requests from this point of view and to approve them as well.

Are there any further questions or comments regarding this agenda item? Otherwise, I would say this is, yes I see the comment from Yuliya in the chat. Indeed, it was uploaded and the confirmation. So we can consider this as being done and accomplished, and we now have to wait for the first response from the review team, and whether this will be approved or considered in the next couple of weeks.

If there are no immediate questions to agenda item number four, let me continue with agenda item number five, what is fiscal year 15 budget requests. And it's again Olivier who has the floor. We had a briefing call

EN

yesterday evening on this, and Olivier can give us a short summary of this please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Wolf. It's Olivier speaking again. So, the fiscal year 15 starts in July 2014, and runs all the way up to June 2015. The system that is here is a little bit more speeded up than in previous years because ICANN is trying to optimize that it runs its budget. And so rather than having two levels or two rounds of agreement for additional requests from regional At Large organizations, this time it only has one, which starts a little bit early, which means that the closing date for this is the 4th of March, 2014.

That just gives us, I say, a maximum of a week and a half to be able to file requests. There are some requests which I think are not going to be required that, for example the ones where we have asked for travel to a regional meeting, such as the regional IGF, otherwise EuroDIG for example, because those now fall under the community – the CROPP basically, the community regional outreach pilot program, which is expected, hopefully. That's not guaranteed, but it's hopefully expected that this will be concluded as being positive and then continue in the fiscal year 15, FY 15.

So that reduces greatly the number of requests being made, or that could be made. On the other hand, there could be requests for the IGF workshop, if one is going to design a workshop at the Internet Governance Forum, or other requests for travel to meetings which might be outside of the local – so outside the EURALO region. Or other

requests such as the making up of material for specific subpart of a region, etc.

In fact, when you look at the FY 15 budget development workspace, you will see that some of the other RALOs have already filed a request that is also at the bottom of the page linked to last year's budget development workspace FY 14, 13, and 12, which gives an idea of what the requests have been in the past.

It's important to note a couple of things. First, the request form is pretty much the same as last year, so no challenge on that. Secondly, it is shown in some places that the requests have to be sent to controller at ICANN dot org. Please do not send the requests to controller at ICANN dot org.

An ALS needs to ask the EURALO leadership for its approval, and should the EURALO leadership should file those requests on the budget workspace, which is mentioned in the chat, Silvia has put it over in the chat, and then the At Large finance and budget subcommittee will look at those and file them themselves with At Large staff, filing them themselves.

If you have no ability to edit the wiki or you're confused by it, and I'm here turning over to the EURALO leadership, then just send your request to the staff at ICANN dot At Large dot org address, and they will put it on the FY 15 budget development space. I have heard that there was something filed by Oksana, I think, asking for possible funding things like Adobe Connect room, and some extra conference calls, etc. to start a Russian speaking group, and in fact that's entirely possible.

EN

However, this doesn't actually need additional financing because this is actually an internal ICANN thing, and I believe there is some funding within the policy development, which is what At Large falls under, there is some funding to be able to have extra conference calls and things like that.

So, it doesn't need to be requested under the FY 15 process. Heidi, am I correct in this? Could you just enlighten on this one please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Thank you Olivier. So I looked at Oksana's request, and as Olivier has noted, since it is really only activities such as teleconferences, Adobe Connect Room, etc. these really fall under normal support that ICANN provides for their ACs and SOs. So given that, it really doesn't need to go under a fiscal year 15 community special request, since it's really something that we can just provide if either APRALO, not either, if APRALO and EURALO would like to support that working group.

Or Olivier, if you would like to ALAC to support that, or to approve that kind of working group, then we can just go ahead and do our normal processing. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay thanks Olivier and thanks Heidi for this additional explanations. I think this is getting clear now that this is not an additional formal request to the finance budget subcommittee, it just needs some formal approval from our side besides APRALO, and I see no reason why we should not approve this from our side.

EN

So, it's up on Oksana to follow up with Heidi for any support on this. If there are no further remarks or questions on agenda item number five, I see that Yuliya Morenets is back in the call, and she asks me to give the floor for a last, and short, back up on agenda item four, what is the confirmation for the CROPP submissions. Yuliya.

YULIYA MORENETS: Yes. Thank you Wolf. Okay. Talking, this works, because I [?] my phone, so I'm sure that you can hear me. Good evening. As you just said Wolf, last time we discussed in detail CROPP submission and the names, and it was general agreement for the names of five candidates. So the working group would mainly focus on the application form.

It was the work done on the, to bring answers to different questions from this application form, working together hand in hand with Oksana. And so that was analyzed earlier this week and it was [floated?] today. So the five candidates, we all agreed on. And there was a confirmation email sent to the group, to the review team, to let them know this was online and can be reviewed.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks for this update Yuliya. We are running short of time, and I have to put a little bit for the remaining agenda items. What is now point six, ATLAS II [?] working group. I've noted Olivier for a short briefing of five minutes, but would be a little bit long. Let me just suggest to make a very short update on this. Yes, event planning is going on there.

There are different calls of ATLAS II working groups almost every week, and this is a very good way of proceeding until London. Are there any further questions or comments? If you would like to add something to this Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Wolf. It's Olivier again speaking, and I realize I'm probably the person causing those delays. I was just going to say we need more participants from the European region, and from EURALO in general. Most of the regions are doing very well in bringing in volunteers for this, but this is really happening, this is in London.

I know that some of you don't consider London as being part of Europe, and in fact, the British probably don't consider themselves as being part of Europe either, but it is. And we need a few more Europeans in there. But, as you said, things are progressing very well indeed, and we're going to have an excellent, excellent At Large summit in London. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. I was just tempted to say Olivier, on your remarks, this is not our fault that UK is sometimes not considered as Europe anymore. This is more of the responsibility on the other side. Just my short perspective. But as you said, okay, it will be very wishful if there could be some more EURALO involvement in the particular working groups.

There is, at the moment, those people I regularly see at the call, there is Jordi who is quite active in this working group, there is Matthew [?]

from ISOC France, and there is Roberto. Besides myself, and there could be desirably more involvement from our side over the next months.

If there are no further questions on agenda item six, let me continue with point seven which is a short, a very short briefing from Sandra on EuroDIG open planning meeting in Geneva last week, which was the second planning meeting after the first in January in Berlin. And both of them have been quite productive in my opinion. Sandra, you have the floor for a short update. Can you hear me Sandra?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Wolf. Can you hear me now?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, we can hear you now.

SANDRA HOFERCHTER: Okay. Perfect. Yes, we had planning meetings, one in end of January in Berlin and the other one, which is a tradition already, back to back with IGF open consultation in Geneva. In Geneva we had around 20 participants attending this meeting, and it was a very short meeting just 90 minutes, but the results were quite reasonable. And we were very surprised, not surprised. Of course not surprised, but we were very happy about the very good comments we received.

[More information] about this meeting and related documents you can find on the EuroDIG planning meeting page. I just posted the link at the

same time as Silvia did, so we have it a few times here now. We will find on this planning meeting page, you will find the first program outline. And this first program outline was subject to discussion during the first meeting.

Also very important, which goes actually along with the program outline, is the EuroDIG wiki. We just, let me post the link again. Which we just setup for more interactive and collaboration work to organize a session. In the past, it was always difficult for organizing groups to form themselves, for new participants to join a new working group.

And we really hope that with this EuroDIG wiki, we offer a possibility on one hand to allow [?] collaboration, and on the other hand, on a long term basis, we hope that the wiki can become a sort of an European wiki or Europe interface for all Internet governance issues. So that you can actually have a look at what issue has been discussed a year before, can build upon that and avoid that next year, on a long term basis.

So, everybody who would like to participate in the EuroDIG process is asked or we kindly ask you to contribute to the wiki. Each session will get its own wiki page soon. And under this wiki page, everybody is invited to contribute to the discussions with ideas, links to relevant documents, and of course – and we then hope that the planning process is becoming much more transparent, less repeatedly and more engaging that it was in the past.

It is a bit of [?] and we are very looking much forward to the results, and we hope it will be a great success also in terms of keeping the long term

goal in mind that it should become a database for European database in the future. Thank you very much.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. Thanks a lot Sandra for this brief update on the EuroDIG planning process. I think at our next call in March, we can most probably present you a consolidated program outline for the Berlin EuroDIG in the summer, and we will keep you informed on this over the next monthly call. If there are no immediate questions or comments for this agenda item, let me now go over to the agenda item eight, which is 2014 challenges for the region.

I would have wished to have a little bit more time for this on tonight's call. So next priority among us is planning the Board candidate [?] selection and voting consultations. If you go to the link, which was provided in the agenda, on the Board candidates May 15th election, you can find the names of the BCEC selected candidates. And actually we have five names on this list which is more or less in alphabetical order: Rinalia Abdul Rahim from Asia Pacific region from Malyasia, which is Sebastien Bachollet well known from France the incumbent for Board 15.

Then there is a candidate from Canada, Alan Greenberg, again, who was already in the race at the last term in 2010. Next is Evan Leibovitch from Canada. And the next candidate is Jean-Jacques Subrenat from France, which is the current Nom Com selected EURALO At Large member. So we have these five names, and we have to start a consultation round at EURALO, because as we did for the last time, we

EN

were the only RALO who conducted such a regional consultation to allow the chair, a directed vote, on the final voting.

So, we don't have time to go much into detail in the call tonight, let me suggestion we will follow up on this on our mailing list. And let's discuss and decide about a timeframe and an appropriate procedure for this. Do you have any questions for this agenda item?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Wolf, this is Heidi.

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes Heidi. Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you. I see that Oksana has put her hand up now too. I just wanted to let you know that the deadline for letting the BMSPC know the proxies will be the 4th of March, so it is coming up very quickly.

WOLF LUDWIG: The deadline for the 4th of March is fine. I have understood it's for whether we would like to have additional candidates on the voting slate.

EN

HEIDI ULLRICH:	No. I think that has actually passed. I think that the 4th of March is to let the BMSPC know who in EURALO will be taking the vote for Jean-Jacques.
WOLF LUDWIG:	Yes, of course. Thanks Heidi for reminding me on this. Jean-Jacques Subrenat is an ALAC member, is – would be usually a month electorate for this final rotation, but as he is personally involved, cannot, of course, be part of the electorate. We have to look for a replacement for Jean-Jacques Subrenat for this. And this is something quite urgent, I agree.

Are there any suggestions from your side who can be a candidate replacing Jean-Jacques Subernat for the final voting? If there is anybody who stands up for this, who is interested for replacing Jean-Jacques Subernat as a proxy in the final voting? Otherwise I could ask whether possibly Roberto would be interested? |
| OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: | Roberto cannot… Wolf, it's Olivier speaking. Roberto [CROSSTALK]… evaluation committee, so he's not [CROSSTALK]… |
| WOLF LUDWIG: | Right. Sorry. This was my mistake because he is also another level as a chair of this – and of course he cannot step in for as a proxy voter. But I see Oksana's hand raised. Oksana you have the floor and afterwards Roberto. |

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Thank you chair. Oksana Prykhodko for the record. I would like to raise the issue of the mechanism of the selecting proper replacement for Jean-Jacques Subrenat, and voting for the Board candidate. Can we organize voting mechanisms just now? As far as I understand, there is no clear provision in EURALO by a vote, how to do in such situations.

We agreed to edit our bylaws, maybe we have to start with such situations also.

WOLF LUDWIG: No, please Oksana, don't make it more complicated. The whole issue is, we do not need a formal provision in the bylaws on this. This was a procedure we discussed and decided when this issue came up first in 2010, when it became clear that the three ALAC members, the chair of each RALO would be a part of the electorate, and I express more or less the desire, at the time, I said, "I do not want to vote on my personal preference. I would like as a regional representative a directed vote [?]." And that's what we decided in 2010, which worked quite well, and I think we can more or less replicate the procedure we had last time in 2010 for having a chance for regional consultation for our members.

And the candidate who will receive the most votes, will be the candidate, I at least, will vote for. But other ALAC members can also take this more or less as a recommendation for the region for their vote. I see Olivier's hand raised.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Wolf. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking for the transcript record. I was just going to mention, for the record, that NARALO is conducting a vote to select its replacement voters, because they are also in a position where they have to replace some of the voters since they have two people that are on the ALAC that are candidates.

So they're doing votes. I know that time is tight, but they're doing it. I don't know, Heidi might be able to provide you with details as to how long that vote is, etc. Or Silvia maybe, probably will know this. But it's not unheard of.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. I was just told in the Adobe Connect by Sandra that Oksana actually asked only for the procedure to replace Jean-Jacques Subrenat. It's up on you to – and Oksana added not only for this case… Well let me try not to make up things. I think for the regional consultations, the procedure is more or less clear as it was in 2010.

Either somebody comes up with a substantial objection on the procedure we have chosen in 2010, then we can enter a discussion. If there are no substantiated objections on the procedure we applied in 2010, I think it's a good model to proceed for 2014. It's not a question now whether we need a formal procedure for the replacement of Jean-Jacques Subernat, and it's up on you here to decide, yes, you want a formal procedure, you want a formal voting on this.

But keep in mind that any formal voting round means a lot of additional work for At Large staff and for me as well. So if you insist on a formal

voting on the replacement of Jean-Jacques Subrenat, we can do it, we can organize it, but keep it in mind the more complicated those procedures are the more time taking they will be. Oksana you raised your hand, you have the floor.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Thank you chair. Oksana Prykhodko. I don't remember what was going on in 2010 because at that time, even my organization was not created. But I remember Avri's proposition, to help voting on every issues. Maybe [?] return to this issue because now there are not on 2010 but in 2014. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Well, I do not see – I do not understand the link. I know a lot of Avri's suggestion on different issues, but I do not immediately recall Avri's suggestion on this. Avri was in the discussion in 2010 already, but that was another issue. I would like to have your opinion whether we need a formal consultation round of possible replacement of Jean-Jacques Subrenat, this is the most important because the deadline is the 4th of March.

I see Sandra raised her hand. Sandra you have the floor.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: I [?]…

EN

WOLF LUDWIG: I have difficulties understanding you Sandra.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: …which are going to decide on [?]…

WOLF LUDWIG: So Sandra, I didn't understand anything what you just said, there was an echo on the line, and I see that other problems to hear your valuable comment on the question. Do you have a better… Can you make a new…

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Can you hear me better now?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yeah, now it's much better. Go ahead.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay. I was going to say, I don't want to overcomplicate the vote procedure, but I still would like to open up a little bit more transparency at least among the mailing list to give other people the chance to raise their hand, that they want to replace Jean-Jacques.

And he is one of 15 ALAC members, and only those ALAC members plus four regional, five regional chairs can decide about the next director for At Large.   And I think we should, in terms of transparency and

accountability, we should open up this question on the mailing list. I don't know how to setup the procedure, which [?]…

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks Sandra. I got your point and I think we won't have a lot of time until the 4th of March, which is next week, to have a long discussion on procedures, but what is normally taking enormous time. So only I can suggest under the action items of tonight's call is that later this evening, I will post respective mail on the EURALO list, shortly explaining the point of the problem, why Jean-Jacques need to be replaced and we are looking for candidates for his replacement.

And giving a deadline until end of the week to suggest names for Jean-Jacques's replacement. And then we have to vote among those people who are following up on this until beginning of next of week, to come up with a regionally agreed replacement for Jean-Jacques. It's a developed procedure to follow up like this.

Can I see any comments from your side on approval? Otherwise I take your silence as approval to continue on Jean-Jacques replacement as I suggested. I see approval from Olivier. Okay. So as of now, we have procedure on the replace on Jean-Jacques until next week. I see some more approval here. Okay, thanks a lot for this.

After that, we have to agree again. This could be the second part of my mail, to ask the community if they would like to follow the same procedure for the regional consultation on the – on all of the candidates, whether we should do it as we did in 2010 or if there are any better ideas, as Oksana linked to an idea from Avri. And she will

EN

told me she will forwarded this to us to let us know what exactly Avri suggested so we can take this into consideration.

But we do not have endless time for discussion on procedures. We have to come up with an agreed procedure as soon as possible, and then after these elected replacements for Jean-Jacques Subernat, we need to have to start the consultation about the five candidates.

I guess this could be a valid solution for the moment on this. It's more or less a top priority because we do not have much time for this. This has to be settled during the next weeks, and I think we set a very good example last time in 2010, because we were an exceptional case compared to other RALOs when we had a least a directed vote for the EURALO chair.

And I think this is a form of democracy. We should proceed in 2014 as well. Any further comments, any further questions on agenda item eight? Because we are already considerably behind our time scheduled. If there are not any questions or comments, let me come to the last agenda item, which is any other business.

There are only two short things. One is I was invited for EURALO presentation at Lisbon University next Friday, at a workshop. It's a good opportunity for outreach, etc., and I will make this presentation. And next point under any other business is now Heidi, she'll be presenting Ariel who is replacing Matt Ashtiani as At Large staff. Heidi, you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Thank you Wolf. You may know that Matt Ashtiani is transitioning out of At Large to the strategic initiative division, and in his place we have – we're lucky enough to have found Ariel Liang. Her bio is on the chat. She is actually a citizen of China who moved to the US when she was 16, and completed her undergraduate degree at Vanderbilt University, followed by graduate work at Columbia University.
	Her experience in the world of work includes at the UN, and at the, I believe, the East Asia Institute in DC. So very much… She's been on this call today with you, and she also just went through her first ALAC call earlier today. And I just would like to welcome her to all of you. And those of you in Singapore will be able to meet with her face to face. So Ariel, welcome.
ARIEL LIANG:	Thank you so much Heidi. And hello everyone. Thank you for talking about my brief work and educational experience. And I'm really looking forward to meeting every one of you and learning from you. And very excited to go to Singapore to meet all of you. So thank you so much again. And please chat me up or send me an email to see if I can be of any assistance. Thank you.
WOLF LUDWIG:	Okay. Thanks a lot Ariel. I think we will have the pleasure to meet you soon in Singapore and at other opportunities. Welcome onboard, and before close this call, as usual, Olivier, you have the last word.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Wolf. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I was just going to add one more piece of any other business. But a very significant piece of other business.   I would like to bring to your attention the ICANN Board resolution on the globalization of ICANN. Yes, the Board has put together a resolution and posted it, to provide Fadi Chehade with the green light to start work on ICANN globalization.

That doesn't mean just opening up offices around the world, that means actually moving ICANN out of the relationship that it has with the US government. And Fadi Chehade has been in France last week, will be in the UK next week. Was in France, and was interviewed and explain that one of the possible outcomes would be for ICANN's offices to also... Well, remain in California on the one hand, but on the other hand, nothing stops ICANN from also opening up offices in Geneva, and putting itself under some kind of international jurisdiction.

Long project which apparently does not to happen quite fast.   Big repercussions for our region as well, since Geneva is in the EURALO region, and it's something which I think you should all be aware of. It's one of the big talks and the big discussions that are going to take place within the next several months.

So it's very fresh off the press and you needed to know. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay thanks Olivier for this additional information. I think this is really of great importance.   My only slight doubt is whether opening new offices worldwide is the only answer for the international organization

EN

strategy for ICANN, or whether they are other complimentary or additional steps needed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Wolf, it's Olivier. Let me say this again. No. That means taking the headquarters out of the US. The oversight of ICANN would not solely by the US government, but it would be an international something that would provide the oversight of ICANN. This does not make it a non for profit corporation anymore, it then makes it an international corporation at that point.

That's the significance of what the Board has given the green light for Fadi to look at, and what the Board is going to be looking at. In might well be that they decide that this is not possible, but the very fact that this is being discussed at the Board level, and the community will be involved in this, is particularly significant because it's the first time this is actually put forward, and a time of great potential change. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks. Of course, I agree with you Olivier. I see already there is a competition going on in the chat between Geneva and the Vienna of most appropriate alternate seats for ICANN, but this is something we do not need to discuss and decide about tonight. Preference, I see, the gate is open, as you say. I think this was the last item on our agenda.

It was an exciting call, in my opinion. I beg your pardon that I didn't manage to handle this call in the given 60 minutes timeframe, but there

were too many interesting or important things on our agenda. I thank you all for your patience and for your attendance and wish you an excellent evening. Thanks a lot and speak to you soon at our next monthly call in March. Enjoy your evening. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]