

---

GISELLA GRUBER: Starting the recording. And welcome to everyone. Welcome to today's EURALO Monthly Teleconference on Wednesday, the 18<sup>th</sup> of November at 19:00 UTC. On today's call, we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Oksana Prykhodko, Roberto Gaetano, Wolf Ludwig, Pedro Veiga, Vladimir Kukovsky, Yuliya Morenets, Jordi Iparraguirre, Lutz Donnerhacke, Sebastien Bachollet, and Narine Khachatryan.

Apologies noted from Yrjo Lansipuro and Lianna Galstyan. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Gabriella Schitteck, and myself, Gisella Gruber.

And if I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Gisella. Have we missed anybody in the roll call by any chance? Sometimes we do.

ROBERTO GAETANO: You didn't miss me, but I wanted to check...

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: You weren't mentioned?

---

*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.*

---

ROBERTO GAETANO: No. You didn't miss me but I wanted to check whether, because I had a problem with the microphone. Apparently, you can hear me, right?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It appears so, Roberto. Yes. We can hear you, Roberto, so thanks for testing your mic.

Excellent. Well, let's go directly into agenda item number two, and that's the introduction of the new EURALO leadership. As you will have noticed, I am not Wolf, I am Olivier, and I'm the new Chair for EURALO, and Wolf Ludwig is now assuming the position of Secretariat. He's also on the call.

I haven't really got any welcoming message to add at this point in time. You've all been able to speak to me and meet me, or hopefully most of you have been able to speak to me and meet me in Dublin. Note as I've had a problem finding out where that was because Dublin already feels so far, such a long time ago. But we do have a number of things to follow up with from the face-to-face discussions in Dublin, the general assembly, which I thought went very well indeed, and we can then start planning for the next year and see where we're going to go and get Europe to be basically among the forefront of all the regions in the world as far as ICANN At-Large is concerned.

As you know, we've got quite a few At-Large structures, so we're in sort of the bulk number of At-Large structures that we have an enormous amount of knowledge in this region, and my feeling is that it's not being [inaudible] to its fullest extent at the moment and so we were not being able to channel so much energy into ICANN and into the different

---

component parts of ICANN, the cross-community working groups, the ALAC and At-Large working groups themselves, etc.

But one step at a time. So the first step, I guess, is to put together a board and then to take it from there. So today, the agenda is going to be primarily looking at the action items from Dublin, then afterwards, we'll have a discussion following up on the board itself, the EURALO board, and then a short discussion on the Public Interest Document, which Wolf presented during the General Assembly, and finally, we'll have a quick rundown on the latest of the current ALAC consultations and initiatives, and any of the public comments which you might be interested in attending to.

Now, any other business. Is there any other business to add to this? Does anybody wish to add anything to this call? I don't see anyone pointing their hand up, so let's jump straight over to the action items. Just before that, let me just hand the floor over to Wolf for a minute. If, Wolf, you have any opening suggestions and so on to make. Wolf Ludwig.

WOLF LUDWIG: No. I think all essentials there said and communicated by you already. Therefore, I have nothing to add at the moment.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Wolf. Let's then look at the action items. And in your agenda, you will see that there is a link to all of the ALAC action items for that illustrious week of the 18<sup>th</sup> to the 22<sup>nd</sup> of

---

October. Scrolling further down, as someone is currently doing at the moment, is the one about the EURALO General Assembly.

And in there, there were three action items. The first one – oh, someone’s even taken a little green arrow there. Okay. Oh, part number one. Here we go. Maybe we should unthink this. Here we go. So the first one, Silvia Vivanco to coordinate with EURALO’s Chair on the board election. We’re working on this at the moment. EURALO to develop criteria for the EURALO Chair, Olivier Crepin-Leblond and Wolf Ludwig to draft text before the next General Assembly, so there’s still a bit of time and we’re going to be working on that very soon.

Silvia Vivanco to set up the wiki page on ideas for inreach and ask EURALO members to send in their comments. Silvia, since a number of the action items are referring to you, are there any advances on this? Silvia Vivanco, you have the floor.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Yes. Thank you, Olivier. As you said, we are coordinating the board election. Regarding you said the action item to set up a wiki page on ideas for inreach, I believe that was an idea that was very briefly discussed and presented during the GA. So I believe we [inaudible] more information on what type of structure that wiki page will have, and how that wiki page will help for inreach. So I think this is an action item for all of us to comment today.

And there is one more action item, actually, that [inaudible] on public interest. That will be circulated among all of the RALOs. And the idea is to decide today on the next steps, including whether or not we form our

---

working group with all the RALOs to start a discussion on this public interest based on the paper drafted by Wolf, which was approved at the GA.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Silvia. And indeed, you've mentioned the action items from the second part of the General Assembly, and that's also something we need to move forward with. Has any of this been done so far?

SILVIA VIVANCO: We have acted on the board election and the other action items are still pending.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Silvia. Are there any comments or questions by anyone on the call, actually? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. Oh, no. I do see someone putting his hand up. Jean-Jacques Subrenat, you have the floor.

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

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Very well indeed. Go ahead.

---

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Good. About inreach, I wanted to share with you something that we are starting on the individual users dot-org association. We'll be having our first steering committee meeting soon and one of the agenda items I am proposing is to set up a poll asking our members of what they think would be really necessary and what they expect, what their expectations are for the association.

So I don't know if this has been done in the past two or three years in EURALO. If not, will it not be one way of getting people interested, and it will, of course, automatically feed into inreach. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. I will ask Wolf Ludwig, who was the previous Chair, when was a recent poll or survey sent out? I have a memory that it was quite recent. Wolf Ludwig?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes. There was a survey quite some time ago, to my memory, about preferred topics, etc. What would be interesting for our members. So I think this was similar, done in a similar way by other RALOs to find a little bit more out about particular preferences and the previous discussions, what elements we could probably add to our monthly agenda to make the call more attractive to more members and not only the usual suspects.

And I informally, over the last years, did a lot of direct consultations with members, particularly with those who did not participate continuously, to ask and then find out what could be done to get them

---

more involved, and there was always a lot of suggestions, being more discussion, etc. oriented, etc. and I encourage them, please, if you find agenda as such too formal and too routine, etc. you are always free to suggest topics for each monthly call by yourself.

So if there is any particular issue on the European agenda, etc. you would like to discuss, etc. please just let us know, give me either a direct hint or post it on the EURALO list, etc. [inaudible] can include it in [inaudible] monthly agenda. But finally I have hardly seen any direct follow-up or suggestions after that. So this is an ongoing [inaudible] etc. and I think we have to find this out together in the next couple of weeks and I think it may be a similar challenge for the EURALO individuals but your group is a little bit more – is less heterogeneous as a variety of our ALSs. You have a lot of insight as amongst EURALO individuals, and I think with your typical composition and membership, you must sort out your priorities.

I'm not sure that surveys always is a good instrument to help in this respect. I think informal contact, in my opinion, are sometimes more helpful than launching another survey.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Wolf. I was also referring to I thought that there was a survey of skill in At-Large structures or at least skills in EURALO At-Large structures. Was that not the latest survey that we have?

---

WOLF LUDWIG:

Right. Yes, this was one of the last surveys but this was a survey which was launched by LACRALO, and we also participated on the EURALO level. I think it was launched in early summer and we had – I was always skeptic at the beginning, but finally, I think we had some reasonable participation from our members to my recollection. We had around 20, so about 2/3 of our members participated, but this was about skills, special skills among our ALSs.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks very much for this, Wolf. I don't want to spend the whole call on this thing but, obviously, one thing that we are going to need to do is to analyze this survey and perhaps even provide some feedback maybe during the next call, provide some feedback to everyone about where our skills lie and where we can therefore be perhaps more performance in responding to public consultations and things like that. It's exactly the skills that I refer to earlier in my introductory remarks.

Jean-Jacques, any follow-up by any chance? Thanks for letting us know about this survey but as you can see, there are surveys going on. I know that there is a group in the Capacity Building Working Group and there's also the Inreach Working Group that are currently looking at all of the responses from the surveys in the different regions. The heterogeneity of those responses and surveys because they're not all the same has introduced some difficulty in analysis.

And so they are thinking of looking at having maybe another survey that will have maybe better targeted questions, maybe even receiving



---

professional help from people who know how to write surveys that provide meaningful results.

So at this point in time, it might be a little premature to send another survey right away, but in a couple of months' time, hopefully the aforementioned working groups will have made some progress and it is hoped that they will have a more complete survey that we can then send to everyone and that is not only enjoyable to respond to, but at the same time, provide some meaningful responses that will be helpful for us to understand and for the EURALO board to understand and take action.

Let's get moving, if you don't mind. So we've done all of the action items. Let's move down to the EURALO Board, and the discussion of the document draft selection and performance criteria for EURALO board members and EURALO relevant rules and board election.

You will have seen in your e-mail a note first from Roberto Gaetano but also followed by a note from Jean-Jacques Subrenat regarding the makeup of the EURALO board. At the moment, the bylaws are saying that the EURALO board should have a minimum of five members but could be more, and in previous years, we have had more than five members. In fact, anyone who volunteered and was nominated would be on the board as we've already seen and we discussed this, it hadn't been such a great success with regards to the board actually working together and doing things.

The proposal made by Roberto and I think also made by others and I've certainly heard that in Dublin in the corridors and the end of the

---

EURALO General Assembly is that we have a smaller, more active and perhaps more nimble board that could take action and do things and that could actually even also have some members of the board being given specific tasks so you could have someone who would be the champion of outreach or inreach or capacity building or on specific topics, if there are some topics that EURALO wishes to concentrate on.

And I so far have not seen any pushback towards this. I've seen some support, but I guess here, this discussion here is the start of the discussion. As you will have seen, I've just an e-mail about an hour or half an hour ago before this call, and I was going to propose a number of things, and do some, well, issue a – what you call it, a consensus call, here we go, I finally found it, on a number of things.

First, that we would record the country of the At-Large structure or the country of residence, if it's an individual member who wishes to be on the board, in the nominations and show them in an additional column so as to then be able to then decide on whether we wish to have this person and we will have to take geographical location in account, bearing in mind that in the bylaws, it is said that the board members need to be, as much as possible, from different countries.

Second, if there are no objections in the next seven days, I was going to do a consensus call in seven days, the size of the EURALO board should be at least for this year five members. Thirdly, if there are no objections in the next seven days, the EURALO board should be balanced as per the suggestion, which was made by Jean-Jacques Subrenat, and if there are no objections in the next seven days, we should develop a Board recall process, and I think that this is not something we need to develop right

---

away as in the next couple of weeks, but certainly start an action to put together a process by which we can recall EURALO board members because it would be a serious thing. And I think that if we follow processes, it probably will make it a lot easier to remove a EURALO board member that is not performing their function or that has totally disappeared, then having to build some processes at the time itself and these processes might be seen as being unfair.

So these are the first four. And secondly, the other question I'm asking here is whether we should have a five-member board, including the Chair and Secretariat, so that makes five people in total, or it would be five-member board, plus the Chair, and plus the Secretariat, which would make it seven people in total.

And with that, I therefore open the floor. I realize it's a lot of questions but I'm hoping that we're going to get some answers. First is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. You have the floor, Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you, Olivier. So I'll try to answer several of your questions, starting with the number of board members. I agree that a more compact board would be perhaps more operational [inaudible] but in my interpretation, five would include Chair and Secretary. However, having said that, I think that [inaudible] to make the thing even more active, one is to enlarge slightly this number, so six or seven, but I'm not sure that that is really the most effective way.

And the other way would be, as you just suggested, Olivier, to ask individual board members to assume, for a given period, this or that

---

particular task which comes our way and which we consider important. For instance, studying one particular topic which is on the agenda of EURALO.

My third part about the size of the board, but rather about the criterion of a country of origin you mentioned, Olivier. I'm nominated for this board by Roberto as the founder of the individual users dot-org association, of which I'm now the President or Chair. It so happens that this association is actually virtual as far as its physical location is concerned. The website was created with help from one of our members in Ireland but Roberto is in Austria, Wally is from an African country and he's a resident in London, and I myself am French and live in France.

So I think that there should be just a bit of flexibility but not for individuals, self-nominated, or nominated, but at least for those of us who are nominated not only as individuals, but also on behalf of [inaudible] I just mentioned, as well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. That's that thing that seemed quite well in launching the discussion pretty well, indeed. Let's go to Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Olivier. Maybe to recall the board, you can ask the CCWG on Accountability to do the work. I don't see anybody laughing but I'm [inaudible] we may not spend too much time on that, I guess, we will

---

elect the Chair. Yeah, [inaudible] two years the board, and it may not be a so big deal.

But I really think that what is important is that we end up with real diversity and I hope that we will not pick the same usual suspects but try to have new blood, and that's one way to be more engaged with EURALO, and therefore with At-Large, and that's a good way to go one step further.

And to be totally frank, I think that somebody already member of ALAC is not supposed to be a candidate to be on the board, and I really think that member of the NomCom need to be the same. If EURALO decide to have all those people participating through the board, great. If you decide something different, that's okay with me, too, but I really think that we need to have new people as much as possible and new blood, and not people with already [acting] on our [inaudible] it's very important to ensure real share of the workload. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sebastien. And so far, I am seeing in the nominations page one, two, three, four, five, six – nine people that will compete. And I don't see anyone being members of the ALAC. There certainly is one person who is in the NomCom, I believe, but there's no member of the ALAC per se on there.

There are no rules, as such, at the moment with regards to the board composition, but it does say, though, that these people would be selected and what I was going to suggest is that we actually have a fair and square election on the board members, bearing in mind, of course,

---

that Wolf Ludwig and I have been selected already. So if we were to settle for a five-member board, there would be three positions that would have to be distributed amongst people, the nine people listed, or if we were to decide on a five plus two, we could have five positions that could be distributed among those people that are present. Let's go down the list. Wolf Ludwig, you're next.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Yeah. Thanks, Olivier. Just some points for clarification. In the past, we always had the Chair and Secretariat as ex officio members of the board. This means that we're not considered so to say as members with a voting right in the board, but they were part of the board in their functions as the EURALO leadership. But in my opinion, makes perfectly sense.

We also had more or less a kind of informal rules that we adopted the current ALAC members also being part of this group, but not being particularly elected board members. So I would like to support the idea, let's reduce the numbers to five people at the moment and I think out of the nine candidates, there are people, five people at least who should be considered. I also agree that priority should be given to newcomers and not to people who have been on the board previously over years and didn't contribute too much.

And the last point is that the period for board members is as for EURALO officials is two years. I hope that this further [inaudible] may help for clarification.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Wolf. I've read in there it does say two years, but renewable after one year. Does that mean that in general, it is a two-year term except if...

WOLF LUDWIG: In general, it's a two-year term because we agreed at the very beginning it doesn't make much sense to have a reelection after one year and to have a disparity between leadership terms and board member terms.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Wolf. Now secondly, I've also noticed in the bylaws that it mentions that only half the board should be elected every year, so it's a two-year term with half in one time and half in the other. We haven't had that going on, so on this occasion I would say we probably have to have the whole board selected in one go rather than just going for half and retain the other half since there hasn't been, it hasn't worked in a half and half fashion so far. Is that correct, Wolf?

WOLF LUDWIG: Right. You are right. [inaudible] as well as support was more than a phantom in the past, so wasting too much time every year with rediscussion and reselection of board members didn't make much sense. So my suggestion would be give the construct, give the board a new chance. Give them a period for two years, and if it will finally now for the first time [inaudible] out, then we can discuss whether we come back to the original idea to say, okay, it would be perhaps wise to exchange some of the members after a year but I think people who are

---

well performing shouldn't be replaced after one year. I think we could consider the people who are on the board and do not contribute a lot, then we can reconsider, as you mentioned earlier, Olivier, you can reconsider such people and replace them by more contributing people.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Wolf. Silvia, for everyone's information, has very kindly put the right article of association. It's number 9.5.1, which is [inaudible] here we go. She's going to cut and paste. So my suggestion there is for us to hold fair and square elections, as such, with the people that are nominated, and from this, then we would – I mean, the feeling I have is if people are actually selected to the board by being elected from the At-Large structures, their responsibility is toward the At-Large structures that have voted for them and that would certainly make both a more legitimate process than having a selection of them just like that.

But it would also, I think, certainly put pressure on them to perform and to do things. Are there any other thoughts on that? Wolf Ludwig?

WOLF LUDWIG: No.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Your hand is down. Thank you. Anyone has anything to add? And I note from Alan hopefully allegiance as to EURALO and not only the At-Large structures that voted for them.



---

Indeed, but I'm saying as the electorate, if you want, Alan, the electorate being all EURALO At-Large structures. Obviously, I would say that such a vote would be by secret ballot because as a result, it will greatly reduce any tensions that might be brought in by X voting for Y and not voting for Z, etc., etc.

So usually, whenever there is a selection of people, whether it's an election and so on, it usually is done by secret ballot. And at the same time, what I think would work then is to have just a standard system where all of the names are put on the ballot and each ALS is given – each At-Large structure is given one vote, and is able to vote for people and what we would basically have is the highest number of votes, and we would have to take into account the country. So if you have, let's say, three candidates that have the highest number of votes that all are coming from the same country, then you would take the highest candidate and have them in the board and then you would have to then look at the person in the fourth position if they are from a different country and that they would be receiving a space on the board, etc., etc. Is that clear?

Yuliya Morenets, you have the floor.

YULIYA MORENETS:

Yes. Good evening. Thank you, Olivier. I wanted just to, actually, to suggest because you were mentioning the country. [inaudible] also take into account the region because I think it's very important to have the regional balance, as well, and the particular think about Eastern Europe

---

and Western Europe in order to have balance, as well as a gender balance.

So if you have the five candidates, I think it would be quite important to have at least two candidates like female or three, and two or three males, so we can ensure the very fluent and balanced selection [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks very much for this, Yuliya. That's a very good point. But it complicates things. I'm now having a bit of a challenge. How can one have all of these taken into account so both gender balance and geographical balance and the country and keep it as an actual open vote that is in secret ballot. That's going to be rather difficult. But I guess we have to work this one out.

Yuliya Morenets, you have the floor. Yuliya, you are probably muted. Hello? Perhaps I'm mute. Yes. Go ahead, Yuliya. And we cannot hear you. Okay. We probably have a technical problem for Yuliya. Let's hear from Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. I very much agree with the point made by Yuliya, and I'm sorry that technical problem does not allow her to intervene before I do, but [inaudible]. I think we should take onboard the [inaudible] Yuliya has made but we cannot rearrange the candidates because, after all, the whole point about asking for candidates to come forward is the spontaneity and especially their willingness to serve.

---

So in order to take account of that reality, but also of Yuliya's suggestion, I would put forward this idea or suggestion that when the vote goes out, the notice to all members who have voting powers goes out, then the Chair of EURALO would add a couple of lines saying that it would be desirable if a sufficient level of diversity is achieved in the vote and you can put the various criteria, which have been mentioned by Yuliya and which, by the way, many of us have defended in all sorts of circumstances [inaudible] in the ICANN Board, in ALAC, or elsewhere.

I think that would set the framework and remind our voters about the guidelines or principles, but at the same time, leave the level of freedom which is implied in a secret ballot. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. That sounds like a good way forward. Yuliya, have you managed to hear Jean-Jacques' proposal? Would that fit with your thoughts?

YULIYA MORENETS: Yes, Olivier. Can you hear me now?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah.

YULIYA MORENETS: Hello? Yes.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can hear you now.

YULIYA MORENETS: Yes. I apologize for the technical problem. Yes, I heard actually partly probably yes, I wanted just to put forward this suggestion, actually, as we do and as it's [inaudible] actually during the [inaudible] selection, and as you were suggesting. If we have let's say the three candidates, the best candidates selected from the country and we have them from the same country [inaudible] so we can take the better rated candidate, the first one. So I think we probably should do the same with the gender selection and with the geographical selection, as well. So let's say the better score for the candidates for this region, let's say, and same for males.

So like this, we can absolutely have the perfect gender balance and geographical balance, as well, and I know it's done more like the same way during the max selection for the global IGF, as well. So thank you for this.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Yuliya. The only thing I can see is if one starts tampering with results. There is a hard – well, there's a wall here which is that at the moment, the nominations only have two women, that's Annette and yourself and so if one is to say the board should be composed of five and that would be three male and two female, that effectively just puts – there is no need to even be a vote for you and for Annette. You're automatically in there and the three remaining seats

---

would have to be contended between the remaining candidates that are all male.

That's where I do have a bit of a question as to how one is able to mix the gender balance whilst mixing also the geographical balance and mixing the election as such. Looking at this, I have Jean-Jacques and then Yuliya again. So Jean-Jacques Subrenat again.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you, Olivier. It was just to react to Yuliya's comment. I very much agree with her reasoning, which is that there is a necessity to provide more balance and variety. On the other hand, as someone who has followed electoral matters, the voting matters for a long time [professionally], I can say that there is also a degree of difficulty lying in the proposed method, which is that if you start adding criteria, then at some point, either spontaneously or because the method will be challenged by someone, we will have to establish an order of priority among the additional criteria, gender [inaudible] or region or country or experience or length of service already on EURALO or what.

So if I may say this as someone [inaudible] the average on this call, I would suggest that we go for a reminder by the Chair of EURALO at the beginning of the vote noting all the desirable criteria, but I really think, Yuliya, that it's actually quite difficult to ensure a completely fair and spontaneous electoral process by stipulating the criteria you have mentioned and for the reasons I just [inaudible]. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Jean-Jacques. Next is Yuliya Morenets.

YULIYA MORENETS: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. Well just to follow up or just to take the floor once again, just to follow on what is said about the two female candidates, already this is the [inaudible] case, well, from my personal perspective, ICANN is the community will think so, again, personally, [inaudible] candidates and my application to be board member, but I do think this is very important to have the geographical balance as we have already the board, these are the leadership presented by, which is the various leadership, but we have already two male representatives from one region. I think it will be essential to have at least particular the Eastern Europe and the female representatives being board members in order to have also the diversity of views and the new [inaudible] and the new suggestions to be brought into the discussion.

So I think this is obviously will be quite difficult to achieve but I think this is essential and this is the [inaudible] principles of the ICANN and of ICANN selection, so I definitely think we can and we have to work on this and even if it's quite difficult, definitely to achieve. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Yuliya, and I don't want us to be stuck in just on this agenda item. We do have only ten minutes remaining to this call because we have a hard stop immediately afterwards. I wanted to get moving and we can certainly continue the discussion by e-mail afterwards. I don't see a consensus yet on this point.

---

Roberto, you've just put your hand up. Let's have Roberto and then move on in our agenda. Then we can continue certainly the process and the discussion by e-mail.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

It's just a quick thing. I think that the reason why it was proposing country as one of the factors to be taken into account is because I'm feeling just one thing, that depending on how we do the voting, there might be one block of At-Large structures that may end up in electing a wide majority, so to speak, of the board. And that will be sort of an unfair thing. We have to consider that our At-Large structures are divided by, belong to specifically to a country with a few exceptions.

So that, the distinction by country is something that tends to be more prone to tilted voting than distinction by gender or distinctions by region, and that's the reason why I was proposing the country but not the gender in the region that I consider also equally if not even more valuable as distinctions. But at this point in time, probably a little bit premature. Thank you.

OLIVIA CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Roberto. As I said, we're going to continue this on the e-mail, and let's move on to, well, just to summarize on what we've discussed here. So I'll be forwarding an e-mail to the EURALO mailing list based on the discussions that we've had today, and I note that there has been no objections to the five members of the board plus two ex officio, it seems to be, so we basically have five slots to fill, and I also note that there has been no objection to the geographical diversity.

The only point at the moment of disagreement or various points being expressed is to do with the gender diversity criteria, but there's also, at the moment, agreement that we should have an open election that would be using secret ballot and what we might wish to do to perhaps even ask each one of the candidates to write a few words about themselves because I'm not sure that everyone knows everyone.

Certainly, most people know the candidates, having met at the General Assembly, but in some cases, the voting member of the At-Large structure was not the person that traveled to Dublin, so they might not really know much about the person themselves.

That's the current summary and we'll have, I was thinking about, perhaps, a call with the candidates, but we haven't had the chance to discuss this, so think about whether we want to have a call with the candidates. I'm not sure if there's that much interest into having a full electoral process, but I'll be suggesting this on the follow-up e-mail.

Right. Let's then move on and the next thing is the discussion of the public interest. There was a document, which was discussed during the full second time [inaudible].

WOLF LUDWIG:

Olivier, [inaudible] a point of order. As we are running short of time, we have four minutes left, I suggested in the chat to postpone the discussion of agenda item five of the Public Interest Document to the next call. I see urgency at the moment to have this discussion settled tonight, so we are a little bit late already. So my suggestion would be to simply postpone it to the next call.

---



OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Wolf. That's a good point. Thanks for suggesting this. I'm fine with moving it to the next call. I just wanted to let you know that there was a discussion about the public interest that took place at the Internet Governance Forum, and perhaps an action item would be to forward the recording of that – the [inaudible] to the recording of that session of the Internet Governance Forum for our members to consider and watch in their own time, and then we can discuss this during the next call.

WOLF LUDWIG: That's a good idea.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible], Sebastien. Okay. Thanks. Well for this, I note that Sebastien Bachollet has puts his hands up. Sebastien, you have the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, but thank you very much, Olivier, but it was on the point before and I really feel that you changed topics. That will be next time. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Sebastien. Now for the last few minutes, we have to look at the work that has been done or that is currently being done by the ALAC, the current consultations. I know that we have Alan Greenberg on the call. I don't know whether he's able to take us

---

through these very quickly, Alan Greenberg being the ALAC Chair. So welcome, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Unfortunately, I'm leaving right now to chair a webinar, which is starting in two minutes. So I'm afraid you're going to have – someone else will have to do that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Alan. And so fine, I'll take you through these recent statements approved by the ALAC. There was a preliminary issue report on the new gTLD subsequent procedures that the next round of the new gTLDs, the process is starting, the statement was adopted by the ALAC. There is also one on the – so the statement was adopted by the ALAC. There was also a statement on the use of country and territory names of those top-level domains, the ALAC ratified this. You have the link to each one of these statements in the agenda.

There was a new gTLD, so new generic top-level domain [auction] proceeds discussion paper that was published, and the ALAC also comment on this. Currently, there are two statements that are being drafted, one on the implementation of the registration data access protocol.

This is a protocol that goes a little bit further than the current system, which is called the WHOIS system, where everyone has access to every single record. The new system would have several levels of access that would be possible. They then invented a new acronym, RDAP. Well, so

there is currently a statement being drafted. Please have a look at the planned implementation paperwork and documentation and the public comment period closes internally in two days' time, but it's still time to quickly jot down in your notes on this. The internal comment period closes in two days' time, and it's time for you to just have a quick look.

And again, secondly, there is the dot-meet, yes, M-E-E-T, dot-meet registry has asked that they could remove their searchable WHOIS service and there's some, Harold Arcos is currently drafting a statement. If you have any points on this, please note it.

Secondly, there's a statement that seems to be stalled at the moment, that's the IAG initial report and proposed revisions to the ICANN procedure on WHOIS conflicts with privacy laws. We're very strong about privacy in Europe, so if our champions could please have a look at this, the statement was due to close on the 17<sup>th</sup> of November, which was yesterday. If anybody feels like saving this from the abyss, then please jump on that and have a look at it.

There are new public comments coming up at the moment, the preliminary issue report for Generic Names Supporting Organization policy development process to review all the rights protection mechanisms and all the generic top-level domains, it's a mouthful. It's all to do with rights protection mechanism, intellectual property rights, and I know we've got some champions in our region on this one, so if you could please have a look at that and if you want to get involved, you're very welcome to do so.

---

The new generic top-level domain program implementation review draft report, it's the first review of the program implementation and what went well, what went less well, what was a total failure, and what was a total success. There's some time to respond to this. Please have a read through that.

Guidelines for developing reference label generation rulesets for the second level. That's to do with the internationalized domain names, much more complicated than just reading simple reports. It gets a bit technical there, and if you haven't been in this, I wouldn't recommend that you look at it, but if you have been interested in internationalized domain names, and we do have some members even present on this call who have been following this, then please, have a look at that and comment on it.

Proposed implementation of Generic Names Supporting Organization policy development process recommendations on inter-registrar transfer policy part D. My goodness, there are enough letters in this. It's, again, something quite complicated related to the transferring domain name from one registrar to another registrar. I cannot remember, for the life of me, what part D is. It's just one of the several subparts of the problem.

If you have had an interest in this in the past, please have a look. If you have never even read about this, I would say it's a little complicated and a bit difficult. But you could still read this as a sort of bedtime reading. And finally, the gTLD marketplace, so generic top-level domain marketplace health index proposal, a call for comments and volunteers. Please have a look at that and respond. We still have some time.

---

That's the policy development going on at the moment. I'm told that we are two minutes over time, which means that we're going to have to end this call. But before ending this call, I just wanted to let you know of one thing that is starting at this very minute. Right now, yes, and that's the capacity building program about the GNSO policy development process, the PDP.

It would be great if someone could put the link to the Adobe Connect room in the agenda, sorry, in the chat, because if you're interested in this, it should be starting imminently and it's something that's quite interesting. It will tell you. Rather than having to read about it, you can watch it, and someone will tell you how the policy development process takes place and how you can take part in it. That's it from me. Is there any other business?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so I hope to see you all in a couple of minutes in the capacity building webinar. And I thank you for your attendance. Thanks our staff, who has run this call, and let's, as I said, follow up on the e-mail. I really look forward to having EURALO being a vibrant part of At-Large. So let's work together on this. Thanks and this call is now adjourned. Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks. Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]