
TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the EURALO Monthly Meeting on Tuesday, 17th of March 2015 at 19:00 UTC. On the call today we have Siranush Vardanyan, Mikhail Medrish, Wolf Ludwig, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Yuliya Morenets, Rudi Vansnick and Narine Khackatryan I show apologies from Roberto Gaetano, Alan Greenberg, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Sandra Hoferichter, Sébastien Bachollet, Oksana Prykhodko, Yrjö Länsipuro and joining us actually is Narine. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco and myself, Terri Agnew. I'd 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: Thanks a lot for this roll call. Let me continue with the next Agenda Item, which is a review of AIs. If you have a look at the AIs we had three points from our last meeting. Wolf to send an email to the EURALO list, proposing to create a Working Group. Wolf to review the EURALO bylaws as suggested before the last monthly call, and discussed at our last monthly call. I will circulate this mail and ask if there are more people who are interested in the issue, and to join such a Working Group. I've seen no feedback on this, and this makes me believe that besides Oksana there is no feeling that could be a need or priority for EURALO at the moment. This AI was accomplished.

Point two - Wolf and Yuliya to follow up on the CROPP proposals - yes, we have this on our Agenda for tonight's call. The third one is to follow up with Heidi to review the proposal for FY16 funding for the GA. This

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.

was accomplished as well and we'll have this on the Agenda again. Most of the AIs are done, and I think the last one we can accomplish tonight. If there are no questions from your side regarding these AIs I'd like to hand over to Olivier for the next Items on the usual ALAC consultations and his excellent briefings. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Wolf. We've had quite a few statements that were recently approved by the ALAC - three of them listed on the Agenda page. The first one is the translation and transliteration of contact information PDP initial report. That was adopted with 13 votes in favor. I think Rudi has a few comments about this, just after I've finished with the other statements. The potential change to registrar accreditation insurance requirement was adopted with 15 votes in favor. The title I changed to registrar accreditation insurance requirement is something that was needed because in many developing countries registrar accreditation insurance was particularly expensive, so the ALAC wrote a statement on this, in favor of it, with specific points and specific conditions for it.

IDN TLDs are international domain names. LGR is the label generating root procedural implementation, maximal starting repertoire version two. This one only collected nine votes in favor; one of the concerns being the statement was very highly technical in nature and some people didn't understand it. This is not to say there was no overwhelming support for this, so our IDN Working Group, thankfully, are active, and one of the Co Chairs drafted this, and there was extensive feedback in the Working Group. If you're interested in IDNs then please join the Working Group, and if you don't know about IDNs

that's maybe a good way to start learning about them - that's of course any character set that is a non-Latin character set.

That's what I'm revealing here, [unclear 00:06:10] has a specific [unclear] character set, but also Greek and Armenian, and others that are different from the Latin character set. Let's go now to the statements and process currently being drafted. There is a vote on the GNSO Policy and Implementation Working Group publishing an initial recommendations report. This is a Working Group that's been working for a couple of years already, so the initial recommendations report is particularly important, and the whole Working Group started out because of a problem when implementation of policy takes place, sometimes there needs to be adjustments to the policy; the way it's designed, and the question is really where is the line between policy and implementation?

So that initial report makes for very interesting reading. The ALAC is already voting on a statement that was drafted, and I know there will be a follow up on this in the future. Draft report rights protection mechanisms review - Leon Sanchez drafted a statement about this. It's also to do with the intellectual property rights, related to domain names and related to trademarks for example. This is really a review of the mechanisms that are in place to protect intellectual property rights. You're dealing with the Trademark Clearinghouse, the uniform rapid suspension system, and also the [unclear 00:08:00] dispute resolution procedures. Unfortunately, Leon's proposal is not on the Wiki yet, but as soon as it is, no doubt staff will be publicizing it and asking for input from At-Large.

Statements that seem to be stalled, there are none of them, thankfully, which is good news. There are some other public comments, which the ALAC was asked to provide a statement for, but did not provide a statement for, or at least at the moment have not decided to move forward with providing a statement for - for example the release of country and territory names within the [unclear 00:08:56], .hamburg and .berlin names. There needs to be an amendment to the contract if that's the case, and the deal closes on April 14th. If any of you feel strongly about this then please make yourself known to staff or to Wolf, and you can pick up the pen and write about it, and write a statement in support or against it, depending on what your point of view would be, with the ALAC, and of the At-Large community afterwards.

The new public comments request requiring decisions, there's one very recent one that's come out, and that's the Internationalized Registration Data Expert Working Group Draft Final Report. That's all to do with the WHOIS and it's part of the WHOIS review in looking at using non-Latin character sets, and put all of those details into WHOIS. We will be asking the Registrant Issues Working Group about this and also the IDN Working Group about this, to find out if there is a need for a statement. That's the current work going on. It's a little involved, because of the high number of IDN-related statements, but there are also others that deal with the GNSO and with PDP.

So I really invite you to have a good read of some of the statements drafted. It will only take five minutes. They're only a couple of pages, and you might even learn something. That's it for the time being. If you have any questions, I'm available to answer them. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks a lot for this briefing. Are there any questions or comments? I see no hands raised at the moment, which indicates everything is clear and your briefing was exhaustive. As you noted previously, Rudi also wanted to give us some information. I don't know whether this fits directly under Agenda Item #4, briefing on ALAC consultations and initiatives, or whether it fits better under AOB. Rudi?

RUDI VANSNICK: Thank you Wolf. It's related to the comments that ALAC has been giving to the Translations and Transliterations PDP Working Group. We just want to inform you on where we are now, because there is a while that... The comments have been sent in. We built a metrics of all the comments we got and in total we got 91 we have to handle. On Thursday we're going to have the last part of the 91 items handled and we'll be able to start creating an initial report after the comments. It's just to inform you that there is no disconnect. We're working on it.

It takes a lot of work to get all the comments through and see which direction we're going, so I just wanted to give this back to you as we are grateful to At-Large and EURALO and all the RALOs for bringing comments to this quite important PDP that needs to be finalized for the BA Meeting. We're coming close to the end of this process. I'd like to thank you all again for your input, and hopefully we'll come back within 2-3 weeks with an initial report that you can then get to and eventually bring us some more input to. Thank you for allowing me to give you a short report on this one.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks Rudi. May I just ask - as soon as this report will be accomplished and available, can you forward a copy to the EURALO list?

RUDI VANSNICK: Yes, sure, I will do it immediately after we've got this done. You'll be informed and get a copy of it.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, sounds great. Then we can see whether there are any EURALO Members who'd like to comment on this. Thanks a lot for this briefing and information. Are there any questions or comments, directly for Rudi, for some additional background? If this is not the case, I think then we can finish Agenda Item #5 and continue with #5, which is what we discussed at our last call from February - it's EURALO's request for FY16, when we discussed it on our previous calls in December and January, that we'd prepare a submission and ask for a face-to-face GA in Dublin, in line with the autumn 2015 ICANN Meeting there. Meanwhile, since our last call, we had slightly overworked our submission with Heidi.

Heidi was extremely helpful in some final fine-tunings, and our request was submitted to the FBSC. We had a long meeting there, and it was among the submissions besides other similar requests from other RALOs for GAs. It was adopted and it's been forward to ICANN, and it's still under discussions there. I hope we'll get some feedback or good news in the near future on whether our request for the GA in Dublin will be

approved or not. Are there any questions from your side? You can refer to the links in the chat room for further details.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Wolf, the next step for this process is that the Board Finance Committee will be looking at it about now, through the end of March, and then the final decision should be announced by April 15th. I'm hoping we're going to have the response by no later than that date and perhaps earlier.

WOLF LUDWIG:

This means we may have a chance on our next call in April to know where we are and whether the request was approved. If it is, then we need to immediately start with planning for this next face-to-face GA, which is always a little more sophisticated in preparation than a non-face-to-face or virtual GA. I think then we know what we have to do afterwards, starting in April. Thank you for the additional information. Do you have any further questions regarding the FY16 budget development and EURALO request? I see no hands raised.

Then the next AI, what is in my opinion more or less the duty of tonight's call, we have briefly talked about the CROPP submissions during previous calls. In December and January we decided to dedicate our five slots in the context of the CROPP to EURODIG in Sofia, and we now have to identify and select at least five potential candidates for this. As this is always a difficult issue, largely we had a list of five main candidates and two replacement options, which was quite useful, because once the five slots were approved, people on the slots told us that due to professional

commitments or constraints I'm not able to do it, and to go to Berlin. Then we had two good placement options on the list who could step in.

Therefore, just for the procedure I'd like to suggest we do it in a similar way this year, and also for the second round of CROPP, in discussions between Yuliya and myself and others in Singapore, we thought it could be good to have some criteria for the next selection round. This criteria are suggested - they're not approved. They were discussed between Yuliya, myself and others in Singapore, on the spot. They were listed here, and are not necessarily complete. If you have any other ideas or suggestions to be added under this list of criteria you are welcome. Please step in now so that we can add such another criteria, if you wish, otherwise we should agree on such criteria.

Once we've agreed on them then we should have a look at potential candidates, which we've discussed already, and one of the criteria that's preferably selecting candidates - not from existing ALSes but potentially new ones in the region - but it may be that we won't find enough new people. I've tried to identify some of them. I have named some options here, but they're not confirmed, and I didn't want to contact them before there is some kind of approval from this EURALO monthly call. Another important criteria from me is I think we should try it again like last year, where we created a kind of precedence to give one slot to Armenia, to our friends from Armenia.

I think this is a good signal, and this is important, because I'm always impressed and I'm always pleased that our friends from Armenia, we have three people here. We have Lianna, we have Narine and we have Siranush from Armenia. They are the among the most [unclear

00:24:44] people, and I think the interest and commitment to EURALO is once again that we name a candidate from Armenia on our EURALO list, being aware that Armenia, according to the ICANN regional model is not considered as part of Europe, but this is a point we've contested over the years. We consider them as part of Europe, and I think for the upcoming EURODIG 2015 in Sofia it would be very interesting to have the Armenians included and also actively participating in the discussions for the pre-event day, before EURODIG opens.

We'd like to be with our Eastern European dialogue and have the closely involved in this preparation process. These are the explanations from my side so far. Do you have any questions or comments? I hear no questions. Can I take this as a constant to the criteria we've drafted here on the screen? I see approval from Olivier's side. Excellent approach related to criteria - Yuliya fully supports it. So this is important. Once we've agreed on criteria it makes it much easier then to particularly look to potential candidates. Without having criteria it's a stomach-based discussion, but on the basis of this criteria, and just for the Als, and to follow up, I think we should note that during tonight's call the suggested criteria for the selection of the candidates were approved in this call.

There is one more piece of information that's also on the document. We have discussed, when we had phone conferences, ISOC Europe. ISOC Europe will be a newly institutional partner of EURODIG and will be strongly involved for Sofia, and we discussed for this ISOC Europe, this Frédéric Donck that there may a need to decide for the CROPP to have some more funding programs from another organization, because getting civil society, technical community people to Sofia may be a

challenge, particularly for people from the region. ISOC Europe may sponsor some European Chapter Members for Sofia. Therefore under this assumption I thought we should concentrate our selection on non-ISOC candidates, but it's not exclusive.

There is the list of the names we've drafted so far. You can see below there should be one candidate from Armenia. For me, it would be extremely difficult to make a choice among the two. Unfortunately we cannot nominate two of them. Most probably we'll get only one approved, but at least as a minimum criteria that should be one of our Armenian friends on the CROPP list. If I may suggest that our Armenian friends may help us and let us know which of the candidates, or another candidate, they would prefer, and we will take the recommendation from our Armenian friends into consideration, and put the name on the list.

We were thinking, while concentrating on some other regional options, to include somebody from Bosnia and Herzegovina, to include somebody from Macedonia, to try to get somebody from Croatia, and as a fifth candidate I suggested Bogdan Manolea, who is an existing member of an existing ALS from Romania. The reason why I put Bogdan on the list is he's already suggested and listed as a speaker for the [unclear 00:31:39] European roundtable or dialogue, and to join us in Sofia Bogdan would need some funding. Therefore, these are the suggested names. I see Narine's hand raised. Narine, you have the floor please.

NARINE KHACKATRYAN: First of all, thank you very much Wolf for proposing [Bogdan 00:32:22] for the CROPP, and thank you Yuliya. I'd like to stress that [Hakla Vardan] represent the civil society. He is a director of the [unclear 00:32:35] Armenia Large-Scale Initiative, and he is the founder of the [Education Centre] At-Large structure, and the Board Member of ISOC Armenia. He has been active in the Internet since 2003, being the content holding [agent 00:32:49] of the [unclear], and since 2010 [Hykas] has been working to develop and establish the Internet Governance Forum in Armenia. He was one of the Members of the Working Group on Internet governance.

I'd also like to take this opportunity and stress that today, and in general, definitions shape the policy, and when it comes to new ideas and new terms we often need to create new language and new vocabulary to describe new phenomena. Internet governance is compared to being a new phenomena, and when we speak of issues that didn't exist several years ago it creates a lot of issues and maybe even some [verbal 00:33:44] sometimes. I'd like to summarize and say that the translation of a very well-known [group] introduction to Internet governance [unclear 00:33:50] foundation was initiated and headed by [Hakla Vardan]. Thank you very much.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks for this comment Narine. I think we will take this recommendation into consideration. We can also, more or less, approve those candidates who are listed and supported already, so we can prioritize on them. As you see, there are still some names missing, like for Bosnia and Herzegovina. I have somebody in mind. For my last trip

to Belgrade last week, when I attended the Domain Name Forum, there was a young lady representing, and she was from Bosnia and Herzegovina. She didn't have a visiting card and I somehow lost her name, so I'll have to check again to come up with this.

The other names on the list, like [Filip Cyrznovski 00:35:27] from [Metamorphosis] Macedonia, they are an [unclear 00:35:31] member, but I do not know them personally, therefore I cannot confirm whether they are strongly interested, but it would just be [fine] from our side, because as we all know, we unfortunately do not have many members in this region, and it could be an opportunity, by encouraging the people listed here to get more familiar with EURALO and to encourage them to become a new member. This was the consideration, but there needs to be some more work be done on this list.

Finally, as I said before, we need seven candidates - five main candidates and two replacement options, and your ideas on this are strongly welcome. Any further comments, questions, ideas? If you do not have the list completed tonight, I invite you all to please think about potential candidates and you can directly send me or Yuliya a suggestion, and then we can put them on our list. We are a little bit under pressure, because we should try to accomplish this list, possibly by the end of this month. There is a relatively short deadline now for the submission, and this must be really completed by the end of the month, when we have to submit it to the CROPP Review Team, and the CROPP Review Team need some time to review it.

Then it has to follow some procedure, and this will take around eight weeks altogether, and so it's high time to do it and to accomplish this. I

see that this was also mentioned under the AIs from today's call. Any ideas, suggestions, or any further comments on this, Agenda Item #6? I see no hands raised. Nobody is speaking up. Then let me continue with the next Agenda Item, which is EURODIG planning process for Sofia in June. This is related to what we discussed before, and what we usually do during our monthly calls is give you some update on the planning process.

As we announced at our last call, there was a program structure proposal, after the planning meeting in Sofia, and in January this proposal was finished by the 15th of February, just after the ICANN Meeting in Singapore, and there was a second round or consultation for this draft proposal outline. We've received quite a number of comments, and we are now looking into the comments, and based on the program structure and the comments we'll try to come up with a consolidated program for Sofia by the end of March, and then to continue with further preparations for EURODIG. We will keep you updated. Unfortunately, Sandra is travelling back from Pathos tonight.

Perhaps as side information, we are now concentrating our efforts on the next EURODIG in June in Sofia, but meanwhile we have already got candidates for the subsequent EURODIG, and it's already decided that EURODIG 2016 will be held in Brussels, organized by EURIG, and we already have a potential candidate for 2017 already, so it looks like we are getting a lot of approval, but our next challenge for the moment is Sofia next summer, and we will keep you updated on further preparations. As I mentioned before, there will be a pre-event organized by a group of people, by a Steering Committee from south-eastern European countries, but it's an event concentrating on the

particularities from south-eastern European countries. The pre-event will feed into EURODIG.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Wolf, two questions. One is do you need any material from ICANN or At-Large for Sofia for the EURODIG?

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks Heidi. Good point. I guess as Jean-Jacques Sahel and [Prya Bekali] are heavily involved in the preparation process, I think they will care for material, and as ICANN is a sponsor of Sofia there will be an opportunity to introduce EURODIG, and I'm quite certain there will be some related preparation. Let me suggest to check this bi-laterally with Jean-Jacques Sahel and [Prya Bekali].

HEIDI ULLRICH: Perfect. Just to also let you know that we have just placed an order for USB drives, so we have quite a few that we could send you as well for that.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Sounds interesting. Let's keep this in mind and discuss this bilaterally at the next opportunity with Jean-Jacques Sahel and [Prya]. Okay?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Perfect. The second question is, with the workshops and sessions there, will there be remote participation possibility?

WOLF LUDWIG: Generally there will be remote participation for most of the program - not necessarily for all the workshops. The first day we have four parallel workshops and the second day we have four parallel workshops, and the facilities do not always offer remote participation, to my knowledge, of all the workshops. But the main tracks will have remote participation.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, perfect. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Any further questions regarding EURODIG preparations? Next steps? I see no hands raised. Christoph, you have the floor please.

CHRISTOPH BRUCH: Thank you very much. Just a detail about Sofia - there will be a EURid Board Meeting in [unclear 00:46:19] on the 27th and 28th of March, in about a week's time. If there are any questions that Sandra wishes to raise with EURid about the sponsorship of the Brussels meeting, please feel free to let me know.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, thanks Christoph. As far as I know, I was not in Brussels yesterday and today, but I know there was a meeting with EURid with Giovanni

and some more people from EURid and today they had an on-spot inspection of the venue, which needs to be booked now for 2016. Brussels is quite difficult. To my knowledge, it's the same suggested venue where the ICANN Meeting took place in summer 2010. So some know it already, and they did more detailed planning today, but if there are more questions, I can let Sandra know that she can also refer back to you.

CHRISTOPH BRUCH: In any event, I send all the members of EURid information that I receive from Sandra and yourself.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks a lot. Any further comments or questions from your side? We will keep you updated on any further developments regarding EURODIG. This is a standing Agenda Item. The next Item on the Agenda is #8 - briefing on the upcoming At-Large review. As you may know, there have been previous At-Large reviews, but the next one will particularly include RALOs. This means also EURALO. I'd like to ask Olivier again to give us a short briefing about essentials of this next At-Large review.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Wolf. Again, yes, we've got this At-Large review that's come up. For those of you not around for the first At-Large review, this is a time when ICANN gets an external firm to study each component part of ICANN, and the GNSO is the part of ICANN that's one of the earlier ones that comes forward with a review process, and now it's our turn to move

forward. The last At-Large review yielded a lot of excellent changes for At-Large, including the creation of a seat number 15 for a Board Member from At-Large. This is something that was very important for us at the time, and became clearer as being very important during the course of the review.

This round now is set to come up with some equally important recommendations, and it's going to be looking more at the RALOs in the review. The first review was looking just at the ALAC itself and how to make the ALAC more effective, how to make its outputs better, how to provide ALAC with the means to be able to grow and be functional. This occasion, we're going to look at the RALOs and try and find ways to make RALOs more functional, as far as policy, as far as all matters of At-Large are concerned. That includes supporting the ALSes as well. For this we have a small Working Party that has been constituted that includes two people from each of the RALOs.

For Europe, it's Wolf and myself. We also have one Chair and two Ex-Officio Chairs. Holly Raiche is leading the whole progress for At-Large, so she's the Chair of the process. Then Cheryl Langdon-Orr, who was the then Chair when the first At-Large review came is Ex-Officio and Alan Greenberg, the current Chair of ALAC, is the third person leading the process. There's likely to be a number of surveys. This is going to be a process that will take several months, if not take us to the end of the year. We're looking at making recommendations from the year 2015 to 2019, the next four years. So it's very important that you also take part, especially if questions are asked of ALSes, because without the input from the ALSes it's going to be very difficult for us to improve the RALOs

and provide the means by which RALOs can establish that vital link between the ALAC, ICANN and the ALSes - the end users out there.

So this is why this is just an introductory talk now, but I think it's important that we all participate, that RALOs participate, and that your own communities participate as well. I think I've said what I needed to on this. Wolf, have I forgotten anything?

WOLF LUDWIG:

Well, first of all, thanks Olivier. I think you've almost said everything essential. Just a small detail I'd like to add is that in some previous discussions on the next At-Large review, and as RALOs will be included this time, I suggested that there should be a review also of my term as a Chair. I think there should be an independent critical review on my function I've assumed over the last couple of years. I think it would be a good idea to have such a critical look during the At-Large review. I don't know if this was already approved, but I'll follow up on this for the further design of the details of this review.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks Wolf. I don't know whether a decision has been made on the review of your Chairmanship. What I would say though is that it might be unusual to just review one of the regions. It might be interesting to look at all of the regions. This is quite a formal process that runs with the ICANN Board's Structural Improvements Committee, and so as far as the review is concerned, if we're going to go for reviewing specific parts in RALOs, it would be probably be a fairer thing to do it across all of the RALOs, and certainly as far as recommendations are concerned it would

be something that would need to be helpful for all of the different regions.

I just remind you that the review cycle is a five-year review. First there is the conducting of the review, which takes about five months. Then there is the planning of the implementation, and then the actual implementation of the improvements. The planning takes place at six months, roughly. The implementation of the improvements take 9 to 12 months, and that basically goes then on a full cycle of up to 36 months, if not a little bit more, depending on how progress takes place. I just wanted to add this point. There is a presentation that was made to the ALAC and Regional Leaders about this. It's a bit involved and at this point in time I don't think it would be that important for our ALSes to be fully into this.

Just to let you know, this is formal way of ICANN to continue its continual improvement process, and that's what sets ICANN different from any other organizations out there - it undergoes this constant improvement.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thank you Olivier. I see Christoph's hand raised. I cannot hear Christoph. Yes? Okay.

CHRISTOPH BRUCH:

Just to say, Wolf, I appreciate your honorable humility in proposing this, but I very much agree with Olivier that this should be done on a deeper [unclear 00:58:52] basis. What is interesting is for the review to produce

a profile of the roles of RALO Chairs, and particularly advice to incoming Chairs of the RALOs when there is a change, but I don't think this should be done on a personal basis. I agree with Olivier on that.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Just a last clarification from my side - while it was also thought as an impersonalized way, it should have a look on the necessities of the function of the criteria for proper running and functioning of a RALO, and more or less the way it was assumed, by me, whether it was an appropriate way, or strengths or weaknesses, et cetera. This was the kind of verification I was suggesting - not completely related to my person, but the way I assume this function, more or less.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Once again, it's a good point, and I'm not against doing that, but I think what we could do it is do it across all of the RALOs, for the reason that there must be less [unclear 01:00:40] in that, and the challenges which you faced were also faced in other regions as well. It's one of these things where there will definitely be lessons learnt from this, and certainly some improvement then to provide Chairs with the means to promote the ALSes and serve them better.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Yes. I entirely agree Olivier. I think there is nothing better to help you learn than mistakes and wrongs righted, and proper consequences from mistakes. This was always key in my professional life - be open, reflect mistakes, and errors, and try to make the right thing out of it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If I can just jump in, I would add it's not mistakes - I think it's more challenges that one is faced with, and being able to have the tools to overcome these challenges. These are tools that ICANN can provide, if we put it in the review. In other words, it would provide RALO Chairs with further tools to be able to face the challenges that we have.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. I think we're at the beginning of the process. I think we'll have plenty of opportunities to discuss this in further detail as it approaches. We are running short on time. We have now accomplished Agenda Item #8, and we'll keep you updated on this review in its course. I think Agenda Item #9, planning 2015 EURALO face-to-face GA in Dublin, we can postpone to our next call. I hope in April, as we heard before, there will be some decisions taken, and maybe we'll have approval for the face-to-face GA in Dublin, and then it will be high time to start with detailed planning.

Therefore, let's postpone #9 to the April Meeting, and if there are no objections, let me ask you if there is Any Other Business from your side? I see no hands raised, I hear nobody speaking up, so I guess there is no Other Business. For today then, we are through with our Agenda, with a couple of minutes' delay. Let me thank you all for attending this call and for your input and participation. I wish all of you an excellent rest of your evening. Thanks again. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]
