WOLF LUDWIG:	Welcome to the call. As Sandra noted already, it is a check first of all as we are still in January it was to wish all of you an excellent New Year.
	Let me start with today's agenda. This is point 2, "Roll Call and Apologies," and I would like to hand over to Terri.
TERRI AGNEW:	Thank you, Wolf. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the EURALO monthly meeting on Wednesday, 21 January 2015, at 19:00 UTC.
	On the call today, we have Wolf Ludwig, Yuliya Morenets, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Siranush Vardanyan, Narine Khachatryan, Sebastien Bachollet, Pedro Veiga, Sandra Hoferichter, Roberto Gaetano, and Christopher Wilkinson.
	I show apologies from William Drake, Christoph Brunch, Jordi Iparraguirre, Oksana Prykhodko. Yrjo Lansipuro may be joining a little later in the call.
	From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, and myself, Terri Agnew.
	I would like to remind all participants to please state their name before speaking for transcription purposes.
	And a quick update: Lianna Galstyan has just joined us as well.
	Back over to you, Wolf.

WOLF LUDWIG:　　　　　Okay, thanks a lot for this roll call and apologies. Let me go over to our next agenda item. That is "Review of Actions Items From 16 December," the last call in 2014. What was [inaudible] on our follow-ups regarding agenda point 9, "Budget Planning," where we found already some approval that we will try some CROPP submissions for 2015, particularly to participate at the EuroDIG in Sofia with focus on potential new members from South or Eastern Europe.

The second action item was to prepare a budget request for the next fiscal year regarding our next general assembly what may be, if approved, convened in line with the ICANN 2015 autumn meeting in Dublin.

This was the agenda of the action items from our last call. Are there any questions on these points? Remarks, comments from your side?

All two still have to be done, the CROPP submission, but we have still some time and we need to identify some candidates. I suggested to [meanwhile in a scribe chat] with Heidi that we will wait until the planning meeting of EuroDIG in about a week in Sofia and maybe we will find some suitable candidates on the spot there to include them in our five suggestions for the CROPP submissions.

If there are no questions on this agenda item or action items, let me go over to the next agenda item what is now the usual briefing about At-Large/ALAC current reviews. I would like to give the floor to Olivier. Please, Olivier, go ahead.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Wolf. Can you hear me?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, very good.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, fantastic. Thank you, Wolf. I invite everyone to click on the agenda for the Policy Advice Development Page, which has all of the work that the ALAC does as far as policy is concerned. Today, I'm going to be looking at the agenda and going in the order of the agenda so as not to confuse everyone.

First, the statements approved by the ALAC. There has been one statement approved earlier on in the past month and that's the ICANN Draft Five-Year Operating Plan. We had commenting on the operating plan, and that's adopted with 15 votes in favor and therefore it passed.

Let's concentrate on the statements currently in progress or currently being drafted.

First, there is the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Initial Report. Now this has to do with the translation or the transliteration of internationalized domain name WHOIS information.

WHOIS is a process by which you can find out the owner of a domain name. With the internationalized domain names now in use, there is an added problem in that WHOIS only works in standard Latin character

sets. But when you have a place or an address that's in Chinese or in Arabic or even in some cases names that have an umlaut in German, for example, the city of Zürich would be spelled in different ways.

There need to be rules for the transliteration of this information. A working group has been working on this for quite a long time because you can imagine the complexity of this whole thing. There are a few proposals which are being made in that report. Particularly interesting looking at the accuracy of the information and ways to improve the accuracy of the information.

There are seven recommendations, I think, in there with some questions based around those recommendations. It's pretty interesting stuff that I recommend that you have a look at.

At the moment, we have Satish Babu who is the assignee for this public comment period. He has put together a first draft. This is still open for comments. The comments will close today actually in a few hours' time. They actually closed yesterday. Oh, dear, I thought it was today. Well, you can probably still comment quickly. The vote is due to start very soon. I haven't seen the vote out there yet. The vote starts on the 23rd, so you've still got a few hours to comment on this if you wish to do so.

Next, the IDN, so again, Internationalized Domain Name Top-Level Domains. The LGR – LGR is Label Generation Ruleset – Procedure Implementation. That's a little bit more complicated, certainly a lot more technical.

This deals with the IDN variants. To give you an idea what a variant is, if you look at the word "école" in French, some could write it with an

accent on the "e"; some could write it without an accent on the "e." Or if you look at "Strasse" in German, the two "ss" are one variant – so "Strasse" or "Straße," with "ß" which is a special German character to denote the two "ss."

When you have a domain name that is an IDN domain name that therefore doesn't really use the Latin character set but is able to use the different character sets from around the world, well, is "Strasse" equivalent to "Straße" or is it different? Therefore, you need to put together some rules to show what equivalencies there are between the different ways of writing the same word.

That's exactly what this work is all about. It does get a bit technical, but it's fascinating because this really is putting together the rules for being able to write domain names in Arabic and Bengali and Armenian, Greek – in all world's different languages – and making sure that this doesn't bring end-user confusion by having these new domains.

That at the moment is still at the beginning of its cycle. Satish Babu is in charge of drafting something. If you have any comments on this first initial report that is being put together, then please comment as soon as possible or get in touch with Satish. Of course, as with everywhere, if you wish to comment, the way that you do it is to log into the Wiki and type in your comments at the bottom of the page. I'm sure the drafter, Satish Babu, will be looking at these when he drafts the comment.

The third statement that's currently being drafted is one about the Potential Change to Registrar Accreditation Insurance Requirements. Any operating company, and especially registrars, need to have some

kind of liability insurance if things go wrong and if, when things go wrong, it actually results in a lawsuit or whatever. That's a standard business requirement that ICANN has asked for.

The only problem is that in the United States and the Western world, liability insurance policy of at least $500,000 is not such an expensive thing as such compared to the standard of living. But in developing countries, that is a sizable cost. It has been recognized that this could be one of the inhibiting factors for registrars to be created in developing countries.

ICANN is now considering making this requirement less stringent, perhaps relaxing it somehow, and has asked several questions in that public consultation asking whether there are valid reasons why ICANN perhaps should continue to require the insurance. Perhaps there is not requirement for this insurance. Asking if the insurance has actually been helpful or if this is something which ICANN is asking for and has actually never been used in any way, etc.

There are five main questions in there, and there's also an explanation of what the next steps could be for ICANN. Tijani Ben Jemaa and Evan Leibovitch are the current assignees for drafting a comment. There's no first draft of the comment yet. You're very welcome to send in your comments well in time. The public comment closes on 13 March, so there's still plenty of time to look at this.

As far as other comments are concerned, there are several public comment requests to which the ALAC has decided so far not to submit statements. They're all in the agenda. I'll read through them without

explaining what they are. If you're particularly interested in one of these topics and you think that there should be a comment made the ALAC, then please voice this either on this call or after you've read this and send it by e-mail over to the EURALO list and maybe you can become a penholder for a statement on there.

This first one about the Release of Country and Territory Names Within the .BMW and .MINI TLDs. There is one about the IDN Top-Level Domain Program Label Generation Ruleset Tool Project that goes even further into the technicalities of internationalized domain names. There are comments requested for the Renewal of the .JOBS Sponsored Top-Level Domain Registry Agreement.

Also, another one is the Release of Country and Territory Names Within the .DVAG, .TUI, .SPIEGEL, .ALLFINANZ, and .FLSMIDTH TLDs. Again, you can see in several locations the same sort of questioning regarding the country and territory names as second-level domains. Then the IDN TLDs LGR Procedure Implementation Guidelines for Designing Script-Specific Label Generation Rules. Again, this is a complex one for the time being, and the reply period ends on 27 February. It's highly unlikely that something will be drafted on this.

There are three new public comment requests that have just come out that currently are requiring decision. First is the WHOIS Accuracy Pilot Study Report. As you might know, WHOIS which I've just spoken about before which is effectively the database of owners of top-level domains, the WHOIS accuracy sometimes leaves much to be desired – addresses that don't resolve, telephone numbers that don't work, e-mail addresses that bounce back.

EN

There is a regular study that is being conducted by an organization called NORC at the University of Chicago. They have conducted a study in previous years; they've conducted a study this year. They have found some improvement to the accuracy of the results, so their report is published. If you think there should be a comment from the ALAC, then please step forward for this. I recall I think last year the ALAC did make a few points on the study last year. I haven't had a chance to read the new study this year and whether the points have been taken into account or not.

Secondly, the Annual IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process Review. There is a fast track for allocation of country code top-level domains, and there is a review that has taken place to find out if this has worked out or not. Satish Babu and Maureen Hilyard are currently considering drafting a statement.

Thirdly, the GNSO Policy and Implementation Working Group has now finally published its Initial Recommendations Report. This is a working group that was created by the GNSO because there had been some problems where GNSO policy had been implemented by ICANN and ICANN staff and because of cost considerations and various other considerations recommendations had been changed slightly during the implementation process and it came out that actually what looked as though it was a slight change for implementation was actually a change in policy. So there needed to be some kind of rules to be put together for not only the implementation of policy but the follow-up from the policymakers about the implementation and some rules of engagement in this.

Finally, the GNSO has come out with a plan for this. The process – again, I haven't had the time to read this in detail – but we are considering looking at this because this also affects At-Large because when our representatives are involved in cross-community working groups or involved in GNSO working groups.

It certainly is important that the rules of engagement and the rules between policy implementation and execution are well set and the feedback and the follow-up by the GNSO – and I would imagine if we follow the same rules in At-Large – the follow-up by At-Large should follow specific ways so that it actually becomes part of the DNA of the operation of ICANN rather than an ad hoc process where sometimes we could just be told that we have no business in following up on the implementation of things because that rests into somebody else's hands and not ours.

It's been a little bit long, but that's all of the work of the policy that the ALAC is following. If you have any questions, as usual I'm ready to answer them. As I said earlier, if you wish to volunteer for any of the work in this, then please make yourselves known or e-mail staff or follow up by writing your comments in the Wiki page.

That's it. Back to you, Wolf.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, thanks a lot, Olivier, for this excellent briefing and overview about current consultations. As you mentioned already, are there any comments from the other participants on this or questions to Olivier? I see no hand raised so far. If there are no questions or comments on our

EN

agenda item 4, let me continue with our next point what is a "Briefing From the Cross-Community Working Group on Accountability" which had its first face-to-face meeting on Monday and Tuesday in Frankfurt.

From our side, it was Sebastien and I who participated in this face-to-face meeting, which was a quite interesting one. I would like to offer the floor to Sebastien and, if he wants, he can give us a brief overview or impression from his side. What can be accomplished by some remarks from my side, but first of all I would like to give the floor to Sebastien. Sebastien, can you hear?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Hello?

WOLF LUDWIG: Hello.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, I can hear you, and I would like to be sure that you can hear me.

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, we can hear you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, good. Thank you very much. Thank you for your invitation to talk. Yes, indeed, it was a very interesting meeting and a lot of changes and a lot was done during this meeting. It's a large working group. There are

EN

25 members but a lot more participants or observers, including some who traveled to Frankfurt to participate in this meeting.

It's a very complicated topic because, first, there is some deadline even if they are not totally mandatory. But even if we imagine that the IANA stewardship transition must happen before the end of the contract between ICANN and NTIA next September, it needs to be done before. For some participants, it's also important to do that before this transition. One of the questions was the discussion of: what needs to be done before, what can be done after, and can we use as a leverage the fact that it's done before the transition or not?

We had some different sessions. One was on finding what are the possible situations where we need to be sure that what the group will propose will mitigate the situation. It's what was called the "stress tests." We were with 25 scenarios. At the end of the discussion, there are a grouping of four or five types of scenarios. We will work on that again in the next few weeks.

The second discussion was about some definition. What is a community? What is the way we want the community to express? What are the processes or the organization we need to set up to enhance the accountability of ICANN?

We spent a long time also to discuss within the Work Stream 1, that means what needs to be one before the transition of the IANA stewardship, what are the main issues, topics, or proposals that we need to push? We ended up with a nice graphic with a lot of arrows, and it will be also discussed again.

Before going to Singapore and in Singapore, there will be one open meeting for the community to participate and discuss with the working group.

Two points: the first one is that for the moment ICANN is not taking care of the travel of the member of the working groups. If they are not already there, they will not be supported to travel. That will be my case, and I will not be in Singapore for the moment.

The second point is that I was the only one who disagreed with the output of the content of this meeting. I don't know if we have enough time now to discuss that. I guess you need to have some documents prior to the discussion why I disagree and what was the purpose. But if I try to summarize, the situation is that a lot of proposals are to add one body.

Generally, they talk about a multi-stakeholder group to be so-called on top of the Board and who could decide about the budget, the hiring of the ombudsman, and some redress action. Also, approval of key decisions like bylaw changes and strategic plans. My point of view is: why create a new structure? We need to fix what is not really working within the organization at each level, and also of course at the Board level. I can expand on that, but I don't think we have enough time now. But I will be happy to have the discussion with you and to have a real exchange on this topic.

I will stop here and thank you, Wolf, for allowing me to give my feedback on this meeting the last two days. Thank you very much.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, thanks a lot, Sebastien, for this briefing and some of your conclusions. Christopher said, "Sebastien, I think more details would be very welcome now." I fear, Christopher, when we open up the floor, that's one additional question. But the whole issue, I'm following this now up since beginning of December, and the more you enter into it, the more complex it becomes. There are so many scenarios on the table.

I think one of the key questions is what Sebastien mentioned already. There are some people in the working group who I think about who would prefer an external control mechanism or a control institution outside ICANN. A lot of participants I talked to are not in favor of any external solution. Many of them are arguing ICANN, as it is, is good enough. It needs to be improved, and the problems to improve accountability of ICANN can be solved by an ICANN internal reform by some remodulation of certain accountability mechanisms. I guess Sebastien and I, we and many others, we are all in favor of an internal solution. To my perception, it was a sort of majority opinion in Frankfurt as well.

But as I have seen two hands raised, first, Christopher, and after that, Olivier. Christopher, you have the floor. Christopher?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: You can hear me?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, we can hear you.

EN

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Okay. Briefly…

WOLF LUDWIG: There's an echo in your line.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Yeah, we'll fix that. Very briefly, first of all, I believe with the general line that Wolf has just explained. Secondly, I've been following one of the CWG working groups and, frankly, we do not get the same impression from what you've received from the Frankfurt meeting. A small number of registries and of other participants are continuing to argue very strongly indeed for external solutions, including taking the IANA function completely outside of the ICANN organization.

I'm afraid to say that in recent meetings and on the list, Olivier and myself are among the very few who have queried this tendency. I don't know whether Olivier, who is on the call of course, would agree with me, but I feel that those of you who wish to see the solution coming from a reform of ICANN's accountability and the maintenance of what has come to be called an internal solution, they need to come on a little more strongly.

Otherwise, the ICG (the high-level coordinating group) is going to be confronted with some highly contradictory proposals. I'm concerned about that, and I've expressed my reservations on the list. Olivier, I'm very glad to know, has also queried this tendency. But I'm not at all convinced that that argument has been won.

Thank you very much for bringing this up, Sebastien, and I think it's an important issue for us for the coming weeks. [inaudible]

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, I agree, particularly with your last remark, Christopher, that this will be an important issue. I guess the upcoming ICANN 52 meeting in Singapore will concentrate on these issues and also may deal with a very narrow timeline which is, in my opinion, another key problem. If you regard the complexity of the issues at stake at the moment and narrow timeline and circumstances under which this has to be discussed and coordinated and approved by the broader community, this is very ambitious.

But I would like to give the floor to Olivier now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Wolf. I'm just going to share a few of my insights on the current process.

Christopher was just speaking about this. As you know, in parallel we have two processes. We have the Cross-Community Working Group on IANA Stewardship Transition. That has a very tight deadline because the transition of stewardship in the overall scheme of things is supposed to take place at the end of September. The proposal for transition should be sent to the IANA Coordination Group by the end of this month, so we're looking at very tight deadlines.

There are two main streams of proposals in there. One is looking at creating all sorts of external organizations, including a contract

company that would be replacing the U.S. government which currently holds all of the contracts with a company that would hold all the contracts. That's one way of doing things.

The other way, which is the one that is favored by the ALAC and certainly by At-Large Working Group on the IANA Stewardship Transition. We've spent countless hours discussing this, both by e-mail and on weekly conference calls that we hold every week. Of course, if you are interested in this topic, then you're very welcome to join that working group and to make your voice heard in there. That solution is one which is seen as the internal solution, and that requires some significant accountability improvements within ICANN for the IANA function to be performed to the utmost level of accountability without requiring an external oversight of some sort.

That's the way that we've been designing it. This is where the focus on the Cross-Community Working Group on ICANN Accountability comes in because the ALAC's preferred position is one where we do need to have either the completion of the work of the Cross-Community Working Group on Accountability or at least some significant progress or promises that specific requirements are going to be met by ICANN when it receives that report or the results of the work of the ICANN Accountability Working Group.

As a result, the ICANN Accountability Working Group has divided its work into a first work stream, which is related directly with the IANA work, and a second work stream, which is pretty much everything else. The first work stream is subject to a very tight deadline. The progress which has taken place this week and in Frankfurt – none of us on the

IANA Working Group have discussed this yet – but the progress is bound to affect greatly the timeline by which the Cross-Community Working Group on IANA Stewardship will be able to reach some kind of proposal.

Because at the moment, there is no consensus in that working group. We are split with those people that are supporters of the external way of ensuring running the IANA function and others who are saying that it's internal. Exactly the same problem that the Accountability Working Group is currently having in proposing an external body to ensure the accountability of ICANN.

This is where we have this problem with recursive accountability. Who makes sure that the body that is being created is going to be accountable? If that body is going to make sure that ICANN is accountable, who makes sure that this body is accountable?

This is where I'm struck by the politics of it all – because it is all political. It's either that people do not understand the way that ICANN works – and that, in fact, the IETF works as well and the RIRs work as well – which is the peered accountability. You are accountable to your peers, to the other people that you work with. The organization is accountable to itself through a set of review processes with some independent organizations that come in, provide a first report, and then the people in the organization – the community – works through some kind of process to make sure that there are improvements when there needs to be that.

Unfortunately, some are saying, "No, this is not enough. We need more." Sometimes one really wonders – and this is just my personal

view on this – but one really wonders if some are not pushing for new committees and new organizations to be created in order for them to actually have a job or some position in those new committees and some position in those new organizations. That is a real concern that I have because we see this again and again.

Finally before I close off just my thoughts on this, I also have major concerns that some perhaps organizations and also individuals are seeing these two processes that are taking place at the moment as being a major game changer, being a way to completely change the way the DNS is being run, the way the Root is being run, and try to effectively – right now is the chance for them to get their way.

Whether it's something that is sponsored by a country politically or whether it's sponsored by a number of companies, we're seeing the kind of instability today as the kind of instability we had just before ICANN was created. I was around back in those days, and there was an enormous amount of political moving here and there.

Ultimately, I think that the – and ironically, in fact – the stabilizing factor for all of this is going to be the U.S. Department of Commerce, that National Telecommunication and Information Administration (NTIA), who are going to have to look at what plans come out of the IANA Stewardship Transition Working Group and, of course, the coordinated work that will come out of the ICG.

Larry Strickling, the undersecretary for commerce, has said very openly at the IGF in Istanbul, if we're not satisfied that the solution that is proposed is something that will serve the public interest, we will have

EN

no qualms whatsoever in throwing it back to the organizations that have built these and say try again. I hope that we don't reach that, but this is always the end option that might happen. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, thanks, Olivier. I think this was a very valid opinion and contribution. I'm a little bit in a dilemma because we have 15 minutes left from our call time. But I realize it's a burning issue, and I have at least two more people who want to respond on that. I suggest I will give this a spontaneous priority now and would like to ask Jean-Jacques first and Sebastien afterwards. Anybody else who would like to contribute, please raise your hand now. I would like to ask, Jean-Jacques and Sebastien, please try to be as brief as possible. Jean-Jacques, you have the floor, please.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Wolf. Can you hear me?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes. Please, raise your voice a little bit.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Right. Three points: the first is one brought up by Olivier, which is the context in which all this is happening. I agree with him that everything is in flux right now and that many parties are trying to make use of it. They are jockeying for position. It can be individuals; it can be groups; it can be companies. I agree that this is a crucial moment, and because it is in

flux this is the moment when if people have ideas they should come out with them.

My second point is about timeline, also mentioned by Olivier. As you know, in the ICG of which I am member, initially we had announced that all contributions were expected before 15 January. For the time being, this has been pushed off to 31 January, but even then I'm not sure that it will be ready by then for us to evaluate this completely, all the contributions, but we'll see.

My third point I think is of a greater concern to me. It's that what I'm interested in in the ICG is to make sure that the user perspective is not out of sight, that we bring it constantly back to the user perspective. In this sense, I must remind you that we are expecting the major contributions actually from the technical community. The [numbers] community, the names community, and the Internet protocol communities.

As far as I know, there will be no specific ALAC contribution to this. I und that ALAC is very present in the two groups which are working now, one on accountability and the other on transition. I'm sure that our representatives, who are very knowledgeable people, will make the ALAC voice heard in that context. But my purpose here is to remind all of you that it is of crucial importance that the user perspective have an input into both the accountability and the transition working groups.

Of course, I in the ICG as a member, will assess and evaluate all the contributions, but I can in no way influence the content. If something is missing, for instance, in the input on accountability or transition, I

EN

cannot on my own nor can in the ICG put a new input. Because our job in the ICG is not to invent; it is simply to assess and to put in shape into a global proposal. Thanks.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks a lot, Jean-Jacques, for this contribution. Next is Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Wolf. I want to say that I agree with both Christopher, Olivier, and Jean-Jacques on the different topics. I think we need to find a way to have this discussion, maybe within EURALO a little bit more time, but within At-Large.

I was a little bit surprised by the fact that I was the only one who opposed to the document we had in front of us. I asked myself I am supposed to be not just my voice but also the voice of the [inaudible] At-Large why I was the only one. Why no one from the other from At-Large was not on the same page or why other was not on the same page. It is really troublesome for me.

In the same time, when I heard both Christopher, Olivier, and Jean-Jacques, I have the impression that we are on the same page. Maybe we don't take the exact same wording, we don't act exactly the same, but the meaning is the same. Then as Olivier said, we need to be stronger and we need to put this voice now in a stronger voice.

I understand that there is an At-Large Working Group on the IANA Transition. I don't know, but I don't think that there is one on

accountability. Maybe for At-Large, we don't need to have two. Maybe one could be enough. If you want me to try to participate, just I need some more information on that.

It's important. I need personally two things. First is to have your input because I am not just my voice but your voice. The second is of course if it can support what I think is better, but if it's not, I will take your point of view and promote that.

Once again, I was really and I am still surprised to have been the only one saying that we need to be careful on where we are going, how we are going, and not to increase the complexity of this organization in adding layers. I don't know where was my friends from the other region from At-Large. I hope it's not the end of the game. Thank you very much.

TERRI AGNEW: Wolf's audio line has become disconnected, and we're dialing back out to him at this time.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Maybe Olivier can thank the leadership during you try to call Wolf again?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you, Sebastien. I just added a few more things. There are webinars that are taking place, that are being scheduled. But I'm actually very surprised that we haven't heard more from end users.

EN

It's interesting to note that the noncommercial stakeholders group, which is part of the Generic Names Supporting Organization, has not had the same point of view as the views that we have relayed from the At-Large community. There is certainly less trust in the noncommercial stakeholder group, less trust in ICANN being able to ultimately be accountable if everything was done internally. They have pushed for external accountability mechanisms but also an external solution to the IANA stewardship transition too.

We're somehow at odds with them, and the NCSG is primarily, if not all, civil society at ICANN. I'm not sure why there is this disconnect between the two. But in general I firmly believe we need to stand our point and push on the track that we are pushing on and, of course, try to get as much input from our community as possible to make sure that we are aligned with the views of our community as well.

I not that Wolf is back on audio, so back to you, Wolf, and apologies for jumping in.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks, Olivier, for bridging my drop-off and for your [inaudible] comments.

As we are really running short of time, let me suggest I noted [with pleasure] that this issue is really a burning one also in our community. Let me suggest to give it a prominent place in our February call. After the Singapore meeting, we will come back to this issue again.

I have only two small remarks from my side. I think as far as I could realize we have broad agreement on the EURALO level that we all favor an internal solution, and we do not have much in common with those who are struggling for any external option. This is my first, let's call it an observation.

My second remark is on Sebastien's comment why in Frankfurt there was, besides him, not more strong voices regarding objection to external scenarios. I shortly have to explain my role. I was in Frankfurt at the Frankfurt meeting not in my EURALO function, but I was simply as an observer in my new and temporary role as the personal consultant to the new GAC chair. I was there for [Swiss] [inaudible] and I was accompanying Thomas Snyder. We had a clear agreement in this limited function I will not speak up on anything. This should be probably understood not to create a confusion.

But, Sebastien, only please I would at least deal with two more short issues – EuroDIG Planning Process and, point 7, New ALS Applications – tonight, and only I have a few minutes left before last comments. Sebastien, you have briefly the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Wolf. Thank you for raising this issue. I was not talking about you at all. There are five, one per region, representative of At-Large. I am the one from Europe. I was talking about my colleagues from the other regions. You were participating, but I was not thinking of you when I was talking about my fellow colleagues from At-Large. Thank you for raising this issue.

I am sure that it was very good to have you because you now know from inside what has happened in Frankfurt, and we will be able together to move At-Large I hope in the right direction. But thank you again.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, thank you, Sebastien for this concluding comment on agenda item 5. Let me now quickly go over to point 6 what is "EuroDIG Planning Process for Sofia, June 2015." As you may recall, we had a call for proposal until the end of last year. We collected proposals and compiled them. I would like to give the floor to Sandra to give us a short summary and overview about the next steps. Sandra, you have the floor.

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

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, we can clearly hear you. Speak up and go ahead.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: At EuroDIG we had slightly different approach this year to call for proposals. For the first time, we provided categories for reports that might be interesting or relevant for [inaudible] Eastern European [inaudible] for Europe. But we still left an option "other" and gave the possibility to the submitter to propose a category if he or she thinks that this proposal is not covered by one of the given categories.

With this process, which I think worked out quite well, we received a little bit more than 70 proposals. Just to give you a very quick breakdown on the numbers, the majority of proposals came in on the category of innovation and economic development. We received 21 proposals on this category. The second was human rights with 17 proposals. Then followed by accessibility, 15 proposals. Then a new category was formed because many participants submitted a proposal under category which was about Internet governance be named as participation in Internet government policymaking; these were 10 proposals. Then 3 on security, 3 on media in the digital age, 2 on internationalized domain names, and 2 proposals did not really fit in one of the categories and we called them cross-cutting.

We had very good participation from the civil society and the technical communities, followed by the governmental organizations and academia. Then it was a bit weak on the business side, international organizations, others, and unfortunately only one proposal from [youth] section. But on the other hand, we had a very good balance between Northwest and Southeast [inaudible]. This was more or less, not really balanced, but it was a good relationship.

For now, we put all the proposals online on the new website. If you haven't seen it yet – but I guess you all did. You are now able to vote. It's not really a voting process, but it's more or less a "likes" process. But you have to register in order to avoid that people just "like" multiple times.

Please, go to the website and participate in the evaluation and voting process because this is another important tool to make your voice heard

and to bring the topic that you think is most relevant for you to bring this forward. It's an additional tool for the EuroDIG team and for the community to set the agenda and to collect all the right proposals.

The next opportunity to discuss the proposals will be next week in Sofia. It will Monday and Tuesday in Sofia. We will also agree there on the overarching theme. This is always a very good opportunity to get in touch with the local community and also with the ministry who is very much engaged from the local host site. They are co-coordinating with Unicart, which is a company in Bulgaria.

We expect around 60 participants for this planning meeting. This is number is as usual. We received that number in the last three to four years. Also ICANN will be represented. Andrea Beccalli is participating physically, but let me invite you to participate remotely. We offer remote participation facilities, and we hope they work out better than in the past so you will be able to join us during that meeting.

Also, we are still looking for an opportunity to give an update on the EuroDIG process during the upcoming ICANN meeting in Singapore. It will most likely be during the European coordination meeting on Wednesday. If a draft program is already drafted as of Singapore, then we will also try to find the possibility to invite the community to comment on this draft version.

Of course, there will be no Geneva meeting because simply there is no IGF meeting in Geneva in March or February this year. We missed that opportunity of community conversation, and we will try to do it either online or maybe try to cover it during the ICANN meeting in Singapore.

If there are any questions, please contact Wolf and we will be happy to answer and look forward to you maybe next week in Sofia or in Singapore. Thank you very much.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, thanks a lot, Sandra, for this excellent summary on the EuroDIG process. As you said already, if I see no immediate questions or comments on it, you are always free to send questions or comments directly to Sandra and me and we will reply on anything what you want to know. As you know, it is a standing agenda item on the EURALO monthly call agenda, and it will come back in February again.

Let me just go over this with a short briefing on point 7. As you may recall, we had a new ALS application from Russia some time ago. There was a due diligence process made by staff. The DD forms were sent to the leadership. We had a look on it. We didn't circulate it on the list again for some privacy consideration because DD forms may contain some sensitive or confidential information.

But about a week ago, it was Terri who posted a mail on our list asking for our regional advice on the applicant. As usual in these procedures, we said if there are no objections raised until today midnight, the regional advice to ALAC who will finally decide on the certification will be approval.

As Terri mentioned here, the deadline for our original advice is today midnight. I haven't seen any response or comments on this, and therefore I guess that it may as usual be approved. Then this approval will then be forwarded to the ALAC. And I think at the end of the month

at the next ALAC call, there will be a vote on this. Therefore, I am confident that soon we may welcome a new ALS. I am particularly pleased to have the first ALS from Russia what is strengthening the EURALO membership into the eastern part of Europe.

If there are no questions on this point 7 regarding the new ALS application, I think we talked a lot about preparations for Singapore. It was posted in the chat that the IANA transition will be a main point for ALAC during the Singapore meetings. There are a lot of parallel sessions on the issue. I think it will be one of the main items for ICANN 52.

We talked intensively last time at the December call about point 9, the "EURALO Budget Planning for 2015." We agreed. Already we mentioned it under the action items, etc. Therefore, I think we do not have to come back on point 9 today. We can bring it up regarding the follow ups at our February call.

To conclude today's meeting, let me go over to point 10, "Any Other Business." There was one point brought up by Gisella recently when she pointed me to the fact that the third Wednesday in February what is our usual timing for the monthly call is exactly the Tuesday after the ICANN meeting. As we all know, this is a critical timing because staff is exhausted after a week-long ICANN meeting. Travelers from our side are exhausted.

Therefore, I suggested assuming your approval that we will postpone the February meeting just by one week. We will leave it on Tuesday, not like today. Today the postponement was due to my occupation in Frankfurt until yesterday night. So for February, the date will be

Tuesday the 24th. Please note it in your agenda. It will be the fourth Tuesday of the month.

I guess due to the circumstances I mentioned, this is justified again. As I said before, considering the strong interest from you for all these complex IANA transition questions, I will concentrate our next February call with a round-up from Singapore and particularly highlight the IANA transition for the call to give it a prominent place.

Are there any objections? Are there any comments with the approval to proceed in this direction having the February call at the end of February? Yes, I see Jean-Jacques Subrenat approving. Sandra Hoferichter raised her hand. Sandra, you have quickly the floor.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Yes, I just want to note that this is actually the same day as the ALAC call is taking place, and it might be difficult for some ALAC members, especially [me with the family business]. ALAC calls are usually going into the evening and we haven't even set a time for the ALAC call because now we have a [inaudible] system for the ALAC calls. So this might be conflicting within this other call.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, thanks, Sandra, for the hint. Let me suggest I will sort this out with At-Large staff that we try our best to find an appropriate and satisfying solution. I think we cannot solve the issue right now. I have to check. I have asked At-Large staff already, and they told me it could be

an option. Let's sort out the details with At-Large staff who will have the overview. Okay?

If this is agreed, sorry for the delay of this today the first January monthly call, but I think it was justified by the intensive debate on the agenda item 5. I thank you all for your participation. I wish you an excellent evening, and I hope to have you back again on our call next month. Thanks again, and I wish you a very good night. Bye.

TERRI AGNEW: Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines. Have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]