
WOLF LUDWIG: ...EURALO monthly call. The first call after the last ICANN meeting in Singapore, what is the our agenda tonight. As usual, I would like as next step in our agenda, to ask that our whole call and apologies.

TERRI AGNEW: Certainly. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the EURALO monthly meeting, on Tuesday the 24th of February, 2015 at 19:00 UTC.

On the call today, we have Mikhail Medrish, Yrjo Lansipuro, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Wolf Ludwig, Jimmy Schultz, Christopher Wilkinson, Llanna Galstyan, Yuilya Morenets, Jordi Iparraguirre, Sandra Hoferichter, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Narine Khachatryan, and Christoph Bruch.

I have apologies from Roberto Gaetano, Pedro Veiga, Oksana Prykhodko, Sebastien Bachollet, William Drake, and Palamena Popova.

From staff we have Silvia Vivanco and myself Terri Agnew.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you Wolf.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks a lot for the roll call and apologies. As the next point in our agenda, as usual, we have the review of the action items from our last call on 21st of January, 2015, what was point one's application from

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.

support from [inaudible] Russia was approved and official regional advice to be sent.

From my side to staff, this was done. And the new member was certified immediately afterwards, and I would like to welcome our new member on our call tonight, it's Mikhail. Very warm welcome from my side to your first monthly call, I think.

Second point was, that a call to take place at the end of February, and we had postponed from the third Tuesday of the month, which is usually our day to the last Tuesday of the month, to allow some more time, especially for staff to relax after the stressful Singapore meeting.

Are there any questions from your side regarding the action items from our last call? If this is not the case, I would like to give the floor to Olivier to tell us about current elect consultations and initiatives as usual. Olivier, you have the floor.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Wolf. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Can you hear me?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, we can hear you very well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Wolf. So, thank you everyone. I'm going to try and be quite brief. I've got 20 minutes, but I'll go a little faster than this. There are

not that many current policy consultations or requests for comments that are in the pipeline. You will seek a link to the policy advice development page, which is where the ALAC builds all of its policy pages, the master table that has all of the links to the various policy work that is done.

We will be working on this present agenda. And so first, there has been just one brief statement approved by the ALAC, and that is one on the translation and transliteration of contact information. It's a PDP, a policy development process, that was undertaken by the generic names supporting organization. It's an initial report, and so this statement was drafted to comment on this initial report, drafted by Satish Babu.

And it's primarily to deal with internationalized domain names. The translation and transliteration of names in the WHOIS records, is important when you have new domain names that are in Chinese character set, for example. Then what happens in WHOIS when you have a Chinese address, and the name of the person in Chinese, how do you translate this? How do you transliterate it to the Latin character set? So that us who only have the ability to read Latin characters are able to access this?

This one has already been voted on, it has been adopted by the ALAC. I invite you to have a read of it in your time, if you're interested in this. And of course, it's valid, it's the Chinese, but it's also valid for Cyrillic characters, for Greek character sets, those that are of interest to the RALO regions.

Next, there are currently two statements that are being drafted, and are in the pipeline of being drafted. One is to do again with internationalized domain names, top level domain. And that's the label generating rules procedure implementation. It's quite involved. It's your maximum starting repertoire version two, and what it is in effect, is the inside rules for any internationalized domain names variance.

It is, if you look at it, it's actually quite complex. What it looks at is 28 different scripts, among which you have Arabic, Armenian, Cyrillic, Georgian, I mean, there are lots of them. And all of these have a certain number of code points, which show what is allowed and what is not allowed when you have a variance of that character.

To give you an idea, a character with an accent on it, e or e with an accent. Is this supposed to be the same character or is it a different character? When it's in a domain name. And so the idea rules that are being put together, lots of them, I think, it says here, 33,942 points, and 97,973 valid or context code points for the different versions of Unicode, which is a coding system that's used for the IDN.

Anyway, there is no, at the moment, there is no proposed statement yet. The closing time is in about a month's time. Satish Babu, who is our expert on this, will be drafting a first statement very soon. Because much of this work still remains to be done in Europe, those of you that are interested in it, in actualized domain name for some of the European non-Latin character sets, would be interesting for you, maybe to read this.

And perhaps if you can look in the future of getting involved in the work that was taking place with those internationalized domain names. I know I spent a lot of time on it, but it is a particularly important building of the future of the internationalized Internet. And so that's really important.

Now, the second statement that's currently being drafted is the potential change to the registrar accreditation insurance requirement. This one is currently being worked on by Tijani Ben Jemaa and Evan Leibovitch. What has happened is that, ICANN has asked in signing with registrars, that they require to have a specific amount of insurance, liability insurance, when running their business.

And that is something [inaudible] says, it requires that to be at least \$500,000, or a lesser amount of the registrar can demonstrate to ICANN that a lower limit will still provide for reasonable compensation in the event of a covered loss. That is something that is quite expensive for some registrars in some parts of the world, especially in the developing world.

So ICANN is looking at perhaps reviewing the request for liability insurance, or maybe even not having a request for liability insurance. And so, that statement will be looking at specifically, there is a much more complete expansion on what is meant on that Wiki page. If you're interested in looking at it, and providing your comments, please do so.

Again, when providing comments, you have to log into the system, to the Confluence system, community Wiki. And you can type in your

comments [inaudible]... page that has this request for comments. These are the two statements that we are currently doing work on.

Now, there is no statements that are currently stalled, thankfully, and there are some public comment requests which have been published by ICANN, and which the ALAC has decided to not submit statements to. If you think that there should be a statement in one of these, then please put your hand forward, or shout it out on the call, or email staff and ask that you would be interested in contributing or perhaps interacting on these issues.

The first issue that has got a very short ending period, which actually is today, would be the internationalized domain name, country code top level domain, fast track process review. There wasn't anything that was breath taking in the fast track process. It seems to have worked quite well, and so it was decided that the ALAC would be drafting a statement on this.

The second one is again, to do with internationalized domain names, top level domains. And that's to do with the [inaudible] generating rules implementation, different aspects then the maximum starting repertoire. This one just looks at the guidelines for designing script specific label generation rules.

And the comment period is going to end in three days times. It was decided that there was not enough time to draft a statement on this, and the guidelines that are currently given, that have been laid out, or designed by the team, seem to be working okay. So rather than just saying, "Yeah, we're fine with that," no statement was drafted.

And finally, the WHOIS accuracy pilot study report. That was a very interesting study, which was performed by [inaudible], looking at the accuracy of WHOIS. WHOIS being the database of the registrants of the top level domain... The registrants of the domain names. For example, ICANN dot org is registered by ICANN. And so the WHOIS records comes to ICANN with their details and so on, but there are significant number of addresses which are wrong, or telephone numbers which don't work, or email addresses which bounce, as far as these contact details are concerned.

And a company has performed the review of those, has taken a sample slides of about 10,000 addresses, 10,000 telephone numbers, and 99,000 email addresses and checked those out. And found out that there has been an improvement. The work of the ALAC is supposed to comment on this. I'm not sure we're happy with this improvement, we're still not there yet.

So these were not, signatures were submitted. There were two new public comment requests that are requiring a decision, whether we should be drafting a, some kind of response or not. It has do with their generating name supporting organization policy and implementation working group, who have published their initial recommendations report.

This was a working group that was setup awhile ago when some policies that the generic name supporting organization has sent to the Board for approval, were approved by the Board, and when staff, ICANN staff, implemented this policy. There were changes that were made due to various reasons, mostly to be able to implement something that was

workable. But also, in the course of changing those recommendations a little bit, what has happened is the GNSO thought that there were, it also changed some of the policy work.

And so a clear delineation of where policy starts and ends, and where implementation starts and ends, was reported. And that's how the work was started in this, and it started quite a while ago. And so, the GNSO has actually now come up with three new standardized processes for GNSO deliberation. First is a GNSO input process, secondly a GNSO guidance process, and third the GNSO expedited policy development process.

So rather than just have one size fits all process, it has now three different streams that will be addressing different points of the policy and implementation pipeline from the design to the drafting recommendation, and then to the implementation and draft the execution of those recommendations at the end of a pipeline. It's very complex. It's very GNSO focused, but I would say that it's important because this has the potential to totally affect the bottom up multistakeholder process by which we built policy across all of ICANN.

So I would suggest we have a look at this. And if you have any comment, and think we should be a distinct, remembering this is an initial report, we need at this stage to address something that we don't think is going in the right direction. Please, put your hand up and to volunteer for drafting, for helping the drafting of this.

And then secondly, the draft report on the rights protection mechanisms review, this is a draft report. Since the first stage of the

report, again here, there are a number of rights protections processes that were set up when the new generic names, sorry, when the new generic top level domains creation process was started. And so these include the trademark clearing house, the uniform rapid suspension system, and the post delegation dispute resolution procedures. The trade marking through the process that works when you start a new top level domain, and you effectively have a list of, that companies can apply to, and put their trademarks into so as to stop other organizations that do not hold the trademark to a domain name, to register a domain under that top level domain.

The uniform rapid suspension system and the post delegation dispute resolution procedures are both some ways to recover a domain name from someone who has not followed the rules, or doesn't have much legitimacy in having registered this domain name. So they're reviewing, all part of the ICANN review processes. There are quite a few relevant resources in there, and because it's an initial report they're basically asking if the community provides some input on this.

If you think that we should, then again, put your hand up, and it would be a great to see someone from EURALO leading the drafting of this. And that's all what's going on in the policy here at the moment. There is a lot going on. This is one of the ALAC's main work. And of course, I'm open to comments or questions about any of this.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thanks a lot Olivier for this detailed, excellent briefing. Are there any questions or comments from your side? Please raise your hand. Step

in, take the opportunity. Well, I see no hands raised, and this may indicate Olivier's that your explanations and briefing was rather exhaustive.

Yes, I see a hand raised by Olivier again. You have the floor again.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Wolf. It's Olivier speaking. I don't know if it was exhaustive or exhausting or so horrific...

WOLF LUDWIG: No, I was meaning exhaustive in the positive sense, not exhausting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I know, I know, I'm kidding. Just again, there is constantly new requests coming out from ICANN for community comment. You will notice always in the ALAC announce that many of these are carried, and if you want to find out where we are at any time, at any point in time, then the link to the policy advice development page, which Terri Agnew has very kindly put on the chat, is the one that you have to bookmark and look at.

Because that's where the action happens. And without the input from you, the end users, and the people who have the links to end users, they're not going to be able to make that bottom up multistakeholder system work. So that's just the appeal that I wanted to strike out. And thank you for this Wolf, and back to you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks again Olivier. If there are no questions under agenda item four, let me continue our call with point five, what is a briefing from the ICANN 52 meeting recently in Singapore. As I can see from our list of participants, there were quite a lot of people like Olivier, Yuliya, Jimmy, Yrjo, Mikhail, Sandra, and Jordi in Singapore who maybe already familiar. But it was Christopher who asked me for putting this on the agenda of tonight's call.

And therefore, I would like to ask Olivier, Sandra, Jimmy, our At-Large members, for a short quick review of their experience and impressions, etc. from Singapore. Olivier raised his hand first, and Olivier you have the floor.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Wolf. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I think it is, indeed, it would be helpful to have just at least a recording of what's happened in Singapore. The two main topics, as anyone who has vague interest in what's going on in ICANN has noticed, are the IANA stewardship transition work, and also the work of the ICANN accountability process, the review that was taking place.

So primarily, those two have taken an enormous amount of time, and there were a lot of public discussions. So just to let you know, the IANA cross community working group is called the CWG, and the accountability cross community working group is the CCWG. So, they were a lot of meetings with the CWG, there were a lot of meetings of the CCWG. And public meetings, working group meetings, and the

progress has been, personally, I would say, it hasn't been that fast, but what is [inaudible] to provide some coordination between the CWGs and the CCWGs, to also make the whole community, as a whole, understand where we are.

And we are still a certain distance away from finding consensus in the CWG, and from actually have resolved in the CCWG.

WOLF LUDWIG: Olivier, I'm just told you are almost un-audible. I don't know yet, I don't whether... I can hear you perfectly, but others indicate to me in the Adobe Connect chat, that they have difficulties to hear and understand you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Some have good voice, and some don't. And some can hear me well in the Adobe Connect. Okay. Shall I try again?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Wolf. Olivier speaking. So just summarizing, there has been a lot of work that was done in the CWG on IANA stewardship transition, and the CCWG on accountability. Soon be helping, for everyone to be more coordinated together. And some new working practices have now been introduced, because there seems to be, at the moment, a

stalemate in the CWG on IANA stewardship transition, with four different proposals being put across, and no overall consensus on which proposal to move forward.

So that was the majority of the discussion of the work that took place in Singapore. And I'm glad to report that the cross community working group on IANA stewardship transition has just held its first post-Singapore meeting, and started working on these new work practices, cutting the different problematic topics into, what that call, bite sized chunks. So chunks to make these things a bit more tractable and maybe trying to resolve one small problem at a time, and make little steps forward, with the hope that they will be some progress, and that we will be able to reach consensus within the next month or so.

It has also been announced that there will be a face to face meeting of both the cross community working group on IANA stewardship transition, and the working group on the, the cross community working group on accountability. And that will take place in the weeks starting the 23rd of March 2015. So in four weeks' time, both of these working groups will be meeting face to face in Istanbul.

That is primarily what I've been following, and I'll let others fill in on other parts of the ICANN meeting.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay, thank you Olivier for this, for your part of the briefing. I see Jimmy has raised his hand next. Jimmy, you have the floor.

JIMMY SCHULTZ: Thank you Wolf. I hope you all can understand me quite well.

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, I do.

JIMMY SCHULTZ: Thank you. Yeah, I don't want to repeat everything Olivier has already mentioned, [inaudible] correct, and I wouldn't have, could have said that better. I just wanted to add my impression, my feeling, that I think that, of course, there are a lot of discussions about the IANA stewardship transition. If we can make it in time, until September, I think we're on a good weight, because I see a majority really in trying to work hard on this, that we can make it on time.

This is not going to be September, it's going to be October, November, December. I don't think that the end of the contract in September is a real hard date, we have to match. But there are other things coming up, like the discussion about the IGF and the United Nations, which is important for the whole debate. And another thing I pointed out and I think everyone understands that this is more of a hard day, we have to, is that there will be no President Barrack Obama December 2016. There will be someone else.

And the race for the presidency will start six, nine months earlier. And we have to have a solution before that. Because I don't think, a president running a campaign [inaudible] where it will, maybe in the situation we are right now in the world, decides well we have to keep the Internet under US hands.

So I think [inaudible] until the end of this year, we're in time. If not, maybe the window of time when it closes for us, which is like that. [Inaudible]. So that was my personal impression, about ICANN 52. Thanks.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks for this valuable comment Jimmy. The next, and I see approval from Olivier's side. The next in my line is Sandra, and afterwards, Yrjo.

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

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, so far I hear you quite well.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: I guess I'll reiterate, I don't want to reiterate what Jimmy just said, but would like to add that I also see a big problem ahead of us, is this community is not able to find consensus on the IANA stewardship until September, it doesn't necessarily mean that we have to come up with, or that we have to keep the deadline for the transition itself, but in September we should have at least a work plan, and a solution which is based on a broad consensus, for two reasons.

One was already mentioned. We will have another government, and nobody really knows what happens afterwards. And the other reason I

see is the extension of the IGF mandate. If the community is not able to come up with a solution in September, those who are writing the decision about the extension of the ITF mandate, might have a look at it, and say, "Okay, if this community is not able to work, output oriented, then why should we extend the ITF mandate?"

So I think at this point, the ITF is ICANN are a closed off nexus than ever before, and sometimes [inaudible] at ICANN's and just might have increased in the past, that we are attending to, to speak about how we work and how we see, but sometimes [inaudible] secret, are there other, to discuss policy issues.

This came out quite clear during the policy discussions, is somehow well, okay, it takes place in the working group, somebody wants to implement it, he or she could participate in the working group, but I think we should use the valuable time to meet face to face, would have more opportunity to discuss [inaudible] the overall ALAC meetings, and do less of procedures.

Now I have to say that Evan started his term in Singapore, so mine has been an exceptional case in terms of that, he has to set a theme for his leadership term, so there might be some [inaudible] for this meeting, that in the future, we should use that opportunity and help to take the agenda further, we can get most of our [inaudible]... Thank you very much.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks Sandra for this valuable comment. I am pleased about the debate tonight. The next on my list is Yuliya, and Jean-Jacques, and then Olivier. Yryo, you have the floor first.

YRJYO LANSIPURO: Thank you Wolf. Since I'm the representative of EURALO on the Nominating Committee of ICANN, I just want to give you a short status report. We now have 94 requests for application forms. This year, this is a two step process. People first have to ask for the application forms, and when they get them, they can fill them in.

We have indications from those who have requested application forms, that about 60 of them are applying for Board positions, and others for GNSO, ccNSO, and ALAC.

We had a meeting, the Nominating Committee had a public meeting in Singapore, and it was pretty well attended, taking into account that the most important subjects were certainly elsewhere. Thank you very much.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks a lot for this briefing from the NomCom, from Singapore. This sounds rather promising, in my opinion. The next one is Jean-Jacques, please you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. This is Jean-Jacques speaking. I'd like to follow up on the report by Olivier, and the [inaudible] about the ICANN 52 Singapore. I

participated mainly in the ICG meeting, sixth and seventh, and also through remote participation. So it's very likely that I don't have full view of what happened in Singapore. But, in any case, I'd like to offer the following.

First of all, transition, several things. One is that, as Jimmy indicated, there are actually two calendars and they may be partly contradictory. The first one is the proposal calendar for transition, and I agree with his analysis that although there is a close-off date for the contract, on the renewal of the contract, I don't think that will be the chief indicator. If it takes more time for us in the ICG to hammer out and propose a proper proposal, well I think we will choose completeness and relevance, rather than timeliness.

The other aspect, of course, is the political calendar, as already mentioned. And I think that, there again, there may be people who are now beginning to look at their place in the history books, but I don't think that will be the overriding consideration. So my only consideration or view of this, as far as the calendar is concerned, that if we go towards the end of 2015, or even a bit more, provided we can come up with a good proposal, that is the most likely outcome.

Now, another point which struck me during these discussions in Singapore about transition, is that Larry Strickland, in the forum, made a remark calling for greater coordination and cooperation. The two main trends of work in working groups, and that is on the one hand, the working group on transition and the one on accountability. And I think his message was very clearly received, and I have noticed that even in

the course of ICANN 52 in Singapore, there was already a serious attempt to bring the two together.

And another remark I have to make, is exactly one of the consequences of this, which is that the ALAC Chair has proposed that there be a certain merging of the ALAC participation in the two working groups, the one on accountability and the one on transition. I think this is a very good tendency or trend, and I, as a representative of the ALAC in the ICG, certainly approve of anything which goes in the direction of merging, or at least, closer cooperation between these two very important aspects.

That's what I have to say about transition. If I may just add a word about another topic, which is the NetMundial initiative. I note that ICANN 52 was the first international ICANN meeting after the announcement of the formation of the NMI coordination council, of which I'm a member, and so it was interesting to see if there were any remarks in the margins of Singapore, about the purpose of NMI, and perhaps of its work.

I think it was fairly low key. Bill Drake organized a forum in which all of this is explained, but at least from a distance, I did not perceive any very negative remarks, nor great enthusiasm. So my conclusion on this part is the general attitude towards the coordination council of the NetMundial initiative, at this stage, underline at this stage, seems to be wait and see. Thank you Wolf.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. Thanks a lot Jean-Jacques for your elaborations. Before I give the floor to Olivier, just a short observation on your last point. I was talking to various people in Singapore about NMI initiative, and what I could understand is there are still some lasting reservations about the initiative, and particularly the role of the World Economic Forum. But on the other hand, people remembered that you are somehow as a representative from EURALO, you have been selected to the council.

And the general attitude is somehow, it's good to have a foot into, in this initiative and in the council, and there are good other civil society representatives like Bill Drake, and [inaudible], etc. And I think there is still a lot of confidence that you may actually, once the council will start its work by the end of March, as we know, that you may play a good role in this. And we are, people are generally very interested and curious about the outcome.

You want to quickly reply on this Jean-Jacques? Jean-Jacques?

He has raised his hand, but now I think he has lost, we have lost him. Until we get Jean-Jacques back, I would like to give the floor to Olivier, who has raised his hand before. Olivier, go ahead, you have the floor.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Wolf. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I had a question... First, a couple of things. First a question for Yrjo Lansipuro regarding the NomCom. Will he be sending the report card, which the NomCom has sent in the past, to the EURALO mailing list as well please?

WOLF LUDWIG: This was a question to Yrjo.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yeah, can I...?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes please.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yeah. Thank you. Yes, the next report card will be sent as soon as we have had this month's meetings, that is a phone conference with the NomCom. That is to say the, as you recall, the report card was last sent just before the Singapore meeting. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Does this answer your question Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks Wolf. It's Olivier speaking. Yes, that's helpful. I think I might have just missed the one that was sent to EURALO, but I just saw recently the report card being sent to another of the RALO lists. So I wondered. It might be that they were late in the other RALO in sending the report card over. That Yrjo was speaking about. Just to make sure that we have that report card.

So that was one thing. Can you hear me? I've received a note that you can't hear me very well. Can you hear me?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, we can hear you. I can hear you very well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Someone just told me please speak louder.

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, closer to the mic.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So I'll try my best, and this probably has to do with the network here, rather than the phone. You might have heard that the NTIA stewardship and the accountability has pretty much taken so much time, and indeed, tonight, it also has taken so much time, we did a lot of other things in Singapore. Obviously, we also had our Sunday session meeting with Sally Costerton, the senior advisor to the president on global stakeholder engagement.

We also had Tara Camel, the senior advisor to the president on government engagement. We started work on looking at the next set of ALAC review. The ALAC has to go through a full review, including a review using an external company that reviews the way that the ALAC works, and its performance, etc. And this process is actually starting very shortly.

Holly Raiche, from APRALO, will be in charge of shepherding this process, and so that there was a first meeting with Larissa Gurnick, the

strategic initiatives director, who explained to us what this full structural improvement and review process is going to be like with us. And the emphasis is going to be particularly on the regional At-Large organizations, this time around.

Last time, it was particularly on the ALAC itself. This time it's on the RALOs. And it will, I think, involve everyone in the RALOs, because there will certainly be some interviews and questions being asked on community members, on how things can be improved. We also had a long discussion with Xavier Calvez, the ICANN chief financial officer, and we were looking specifically at the fiscal year 16 AC and SO special requests, or advisory committee and supporting organizations special request process.

And I know that in our agenda today there will be a discussion about this. And we had a number of other meetings. And finally a signing of a memorandum of understanding between the North American region At-Large organization, and ARIN. So the equivalent regional Internet registry. I'll leave it to Sandra, if she wants to speak a little bit about the ICANN Academy working group that met face to face in Singapore.

The ALAC met with the country code name supporting organization to try and see how we can work better together. We, of course, had a meeting with the Board as well, which was something that was very important, with several points being discussed with the Board, including the At-Large summit follow up.

We had a meeting of the At-Large summit follow up working group, well follow up on this to see where we were going to go next. And the

implementation of all of these 49 recommendations that were done during the At-Large summit. So these are not dropped, we're just moving forward with them. There was work by the At-Large accessibility working group, face to face meeting that took place there. That made a lot of progress as well.

And then there was some discussion on the website update, because the ALAC is going to have soon have a new website that will be a bit of a milestone and a basis for all of the new ICANN image of all the supporting organization and advisory committee. There was also a discussion about...

WOLF LUDWIG:

Olivier. Can you cut down a little bit? We are running short of time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thanks. There was so much going on. I think I've sort of touched on most of the things that took place. Just, I think the important thing to remember was just the At-Large summit follow up, and there was much work in that, and the technology taskforce is also working on its own part of the, trying to put together some kind of a policy process management system of some sort.

And I think that's all there was. But all of the recordings of this are online. So if you're interested in the recording, and the transcripts of all of the sessions, they can be downloaded. And I'll send you, I'll put in the chat the link to the main work space. We've got that. Terri has put the link over on the chat. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks a lot Olivier. Terri put already a link in the Adobe Connect, and I have still Christopher on my list, under this agenda item, and we really are running short now, but Christopher you have the floor next, please.

You are muted Christopher. The floor is yours, but we cannot hear you.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Okay. Here we go. Sorry. Well first of all, thank you very much Wolf and all the colleagues for the briefing about Singapore. I think that has been very useful for all of us. I would just like to comment on Jean-Jacque's report on the NetMundial initiative. I feel that there is some ambiguity in this area, which is not helpful to NetMundial or to the IGS.

On the one hand, I understand that people were invited, and sometimes quite senior people were invited to support the NetMundial initiative on the basis, because it was basically supporting the IGF. And preferably namely in the area of funding. But on the other hand, some of the discussions particularly in relation in terms of references, the NetMundial initiative suggests that, and ICANN could actually emerge as a competitive to IGF in terms of international policy coordination.

I don't expect, and I don't ask Jean-Jacques, to answer this now, because I think that in this foreseeable future, the secretariat and the council of the NetMundial initiative, they'll need to clarify that ambiguity, because governments and individuals who are supporting NetMundial on the basis of the support for the IGF, would be

disappointed that if some point in the future the IGF participants thought that they were being upstaged, or [inaudible] by the [inaudible]. Just something to think about. Thank you Wolf.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. Thanks a lot Christopher. I think Jean-Jacques is just typing in the Adobe Connect, and I'm sure he will keep us updated during our monthly calls, or via the EURALO list on any further development about the NMI and the work of the coordination council.

Due to time, serious time constraints, I would like to now finalize agenda item five, briefing from ICANN. I felt it was in the interest of the majority here on the call, and therefore I let time exceeding already. Also remaining agenda items, I would like to give very short announcement slots, and a short summary of two minutes to Sandra on the EuroDIG planning process for Sophia, and the second consultation found. Sandra, you have the floor. Two minutes please.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you Wolf. [inaudible]. After the first planning meeting, there won't be a second planning meeting, because there are [inaudible]... at this time. So therefore we will publish the first draft program structure by latest, tomorrow, or end of the week, for comments. And invite you all to send your comments until the 15th of March to this program structure.

After this program structure, we [inaudible] stop reaching the focus points in organizing things, and then the [inaudible]... session

organization for the EuroDIG 2015 work starts. Regarding the Eastern European [inaudible], I'm very happy that we could manage to organize such [inaudible] IGF for the region of southeastern Europe. The initiative started in Romania, [inaudible] but meanwhile [inaudible] is heavily involved in this initiative, and also [Maureen], and I would give one minutes for my two minutes to Yuliya to finish what update on [inaudible]... Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. Agreed. Yuliya, you have the floor, please. Yuliya is typing, I see. She is probably not...

Okay. And I just thought that we are allowed 10 more minutes for our call. Yuliya you can hear us, so I will [inaudible] with my mic. I can say that there will be a next coordination call for the SCE roundtable tomorrow afternoon, where Yuliya and I will participate. And the provisional preliminary program of the AC roundtable was accomplished by 15th of February, and this will be a key issue of tomorrow afternoon's call, and I am confident that we will come up with some sort of final agenda for the pre-event of EuroDIG.

And of course, we will keep you updated during our next monthly calls on the EuroDIG planning process. If, and as you can see, Sandra added some more information in the Adobe Connect. If you have no immediate questions on the EuroDIG process, let me continue with the next agenda item, what can be very short, in my opinion, as well.

This was a few of EURALO bylaws. This agenda item was suggested again by Oksana Prykhodko. And I think we had various discussion in

the past, in Lisbon, during the London general assembly last June on this point, and I have prepared explanations on this, which what you can see now on the screen. And I think the point is we are all aware that EURALO bylaws are extremely long, and bulky, and overloaded, etc.

But on the other hand, so far they didn't restrain our functioning in practical matters. And I, when I've discussed this bylaw issue, and it should be a priority, etc. I had no feedback so far from any other people, that say they saw an urgency to pick up this point. If there are people who want to create a working group on this, this would be fine, but we need a number of dedicated volunteers, and I can promise you revision of bylaws is usually hard work.

And if anybody of you sees an immediate necessity or an urgency to start this work, please come up. Let me know. I'm ready to help, and to support such a working group, but frankly speaking, I see, at the moment, no immediate need for it, and we can discuss this further, but I need some feedback for the time being. I have the impression that this is only seen as a priority by Oksana, and if there is no other support for this from the community, I think there is no need to go into further details of it.

Are there any questions, comments, remarks, from your side? If this is not the case, let me continue. Yes Olivier? Please, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Wolf. It's Olivier speaking. I just put my hand up, but it doesn't work. Just a quick comment, I'm totally in line with you, I agree. And perhaps sending a note out to the EURALO list asking if there are

any volunteers for a small group of people to read those bylaws, and point out, summarize basically, what they think should be changed in there.

Because as you said, you said they were very complicated, they're long and so long. I've seen the bylaws of other RALOs, some of them are even more complicated and longer. So it would be interesting if this small group could be pointing this out. But obviously, if we don't have anybody who is interested in this, then I don't expect you to be working on this, or just one person to be working on this. So your line is absolutely in line with what I would suggest. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. Thanks Olivier for this comment. I agree. I will, after the call, put a short note on the list, encapsulating what we argued, what we discussed almost a year ago already, and if there are any new interest of people who think this should be done, if there will be a reaction and candidate for creating a working group, then we can follow up on this.

If we get no other reactions, then those of Oksana and her point is only on a path of the bylaws, what it's about, a selection, this goes back to the Lisbon general assembly. And she has problems with this part, which is, in my opinion, not the one that needs to be revised. There are many other parts that needs to be reduced. But if there is no response, I think we can go ahead and forget about it.

The next agenda item is point eight, what is the monthly call timing and flesh with the CCWG accountability. This will be again the case in next month, in March, where our monthly call clashes with this working

group, but it won't be the case anymore as Gisella told me in April onward, and therefore, I do not want [inaudible] we really have to change, the only option would be to postpone it again from the third Tuesday to the fourth Tuesday.

What we usually did in the past, this is something we can consider, and discuss, and follow with At-Large staff. Are there any suggestions from your side?

If this is not the case, I will follow up with this At-Large staff. The next agenda item is EURALO budget planning for 2015, point A, CROPP submissions are still pending, but we have to submit our CROPP requests around eight weeks ahead. This means we have still some more weeks. What we need to do is collect the names for the five people we can suggest for CROPP support to come to EuroDIG in Sophia.

So this is still an action item to be followed up by Wolf and Julia. And our submission for the face to face general assembly during ICANN 2015 in autumn, it will be ICANN 54, in doubling the special request was submitted. If there are no questions from your side. Yes, I see Heidi raised her hand. Yes Heidi, you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, thank you Wolf. This is Heidi for the record. The deadline for the submission is this Saturday, the 28th. And the FBFC will be holding a call this week for the final review of the request. I've actually been reviewing all of the general assembly requests, and I've noted the

EURALO one has no part of training, while the other two requests some element of training included in their request.

And I also note that the current EURALO request has several items that say, "To be discussed." For example, subject matter experts, technology support, and potential or planned sponsorship contributions. I'm just wondering if there are plan to add any kind of training, and to add more detail to items that current state, "To be discussed." Thank you Wolf.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. Thanks a lot for pointing to this. While we can include a training component, but so far, I have not seen so much need from our members for this. Of course, we can add a training component, but in my opinion, would make budget more expensive than it is now, and about a potential sponsoring, I cannot start contacting for additional sponsoring at the moment.

I think we somehow need to know whether we may have a chance to contact this general assembly in that plane, and once we see its concern, we can try to reach out to get some more funds.

And for the CROPP, I think we still have a bit more time, as I mentioned before. But let me suggest to follow up with you on this issue, Heidi, because it is difficult to organize or to come to further conclusions at this call.

Once we know whether we have a chance of EURALO general assembly will be approved, we can continue with point 9C, planning for EURALO's general assembly. For the time, I see no need. I see a question from

Narine. Wolf, let there be one person per country for the CROPP proposal. Well this is still open question. Yes, I personally think there should be one per country to allow as many options for Eastern European countries as possible, to bring people in.

And we also discussed preferably we should try not to always consider the same people who have been supported last year by CROPP already. But these are still open questions we have to sort out, and we will submit a list of candidates to the list, and I think we can discuss this at our next monthly call.

Are there any questions, comments, from your side? Because now we are 14 minutes behind the time, 10 minutes were approved.

If there are no questions, comments, remarks from your side, so let me thank you for your participation at our February monthly call. I think we had a very good part about the ICANN Singapore meeting, and I think we could shortly stress the rest of it.

So let me thank all of you and I wish you all an excellent rest of the evening.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]