YESIM NAZLAR:	Welcome to today's EURALO Monthly Teleconference taking place on Tuesday, the 19th of January, 2016 at 19:00 UTC.
	On today's call, we have Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, Oksana Prykhodko, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Yrjö Länsipuro, Stefano Trumpy, Mikhail Medrish, Sandra Hoferichter, Pedro Veiga, Sebastien Bachollet, Matthieu Camus, Alan Greenberg, and Lianna Galstyan. We have just Wolf Ludwig joined as well. We don't have any apologies for this call, and from staff we have Silvia Vivanco; and myself, Yesim Nazlar.
	I'd like to remind everyone to state their names before speaking for transcript purposes. Over to you, Olivier. Thank you.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much, Yesim. Apologies for the start of this call being a little bit late, by ten minutes. We are going to run over because it's a very packed agenda that we have today. Thankfully, Silvia has put back the agenda that I had originally put together. Let's get moving quickly.
	Let's start with the review of the action items from our last call. There were three action items. The first one was about the newly appointed board members, Jordi Iparraguirre, Yrjö Länsipuro, Mikhail Medrish, Annette Mühlberg, Mathieu Camus to e-mail the EURALO mailing list on their goals for the next couple of years.
	We actually had a discussion on the EURALO board mailing list and there was a conference call that took place yesterday. We'll be going into this in a few minutes.

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.

Gisella to coordinate EURALO chair on the date to hold a EURALO single issue call in the second or third week of January on the issue of At-Large CCWG Accountability draft proposal on work stream 1. That's pending at the moment. We will find in a moment why.

Thirdly, Wolf Ludwig and Silvia are to circulate the public interest document to all the RALOs. This is also coming up. We've got an update of this on the call. I suppose we could probably go directly into the ALAC consultations and initiatives agenda item #3.

If you have loaded your agenda a while ago, you can refresh and you'll have the latest agenda there.

With regards to the current statements, I believe [inaudible] work on the direct policy page, policy advice development page. There's a link on the agenda which sends you to there. I don't know which ones we should go for that are recent, but the current ones being drafted, the final report recommendations of the geographic regions review working group. Tijani Ben Jemaa is holding the pen at the moment and being assisted by Jean-Jacques Subrenat and Narine Khachatryan. Something that's quite important for our region because this is about redefining the geographic regions in ICANN due to a few inadequacies, I think one could call it.

In Europe, in particular, Armenia is a country that is currently in the Asia-Pacific, Asia, Australasia and Pacific Islands regions and might be interested. Knowing that we have our Armenian friends on the call, might be interested in joining Europe instead. So that's one of the things, one of the proposals that's in this proposal that some countries

could choose which region they would like to be in. So if you're interested in contributing to this or having [inaudible] development process, you can click on that link.

Next, the proposed implementation of GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization), Thick WHOIS consensus policy requiring consistent labeling and display of RDDS, otherwise known as WHOIS output, for all generic top-level domains. As you will have seen by the number of acronyms on here, it's quite an involved story. It's also quite a long story. It's all to do with WHOIS records. When you have a domain name, finding out who the owner of that domain name is or who the registrant of that domain name is. that's what WHOIS provides.

There are some changes being made at the moment on this topic with the WHOIS output being put into some kind of… What they call Thick WHOIS. Thick WHOIS is when all the databases in one location. Thin WHOIS is when the database is distributed amongst the registry, the registrar, and perhaps other organizations along the ladder.

Quite involved. It's open for comments at the moment. There is a… What is it? I think there is a first draft. I haven't checked. But it's open for comments until the call for comments close the 22nd of January. So you've got a couple of more days to look at this.

Next, Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP). Operational profile for gTLD registry and registrars. That's a very technical thing. There is a statement that was drafted by Holly Raiche and Carlton Samuels. If you're interested in this slightly more technical thing, you can have a

look at the statement that was drafted. It's over at voting stage on the ALAC already. It's a little bit late to comment on it.

Finally the notice of preliminary determination to grant registrar data retention waiver requests for [Ascio] Technologies, Incorporated, Denmark; [Filia Levasco] Technologies, Incorporated, USA. Now, this is one of these public comment requests that comes in quite regularly. It's to do with the amount of data that a registrar has to provide to ICANN about registrants and about their customers.

Now, in Europe there are privacy laws which do not allow for a company based in Europe to be able to do something like this. So they need to obtain a waiver from ICANN because the current policy in ICANN is that all of them, everyone, is in the same base and every registrar has to provide all of these full details, except if you get a waiver. It's quite inefficient because every single – not every single registrar, but many registrars from Europe have had to apply for this and [inaudible] public consultation, etc. And you end up with this repeated request for a consultation request for comments on these things.

I know that Roberto Gaetano had said he would be maybe drafting something that would look at all at of these requests and just say, look, let's just have a separate way of doing things in Europe, so you could have a different type of contract that Europeans could write. I hope I'm paraphrasing this correctly. I don't see Roberto on the call, unfortunately.

If you have an interest in these things, please get in touch with him or send you comments on the policy page that is related to this.

I think that's all the ones that are currently being developed. And don't look at the list that we currently have on the screen because that's the old public commenting system. That was the one from last month.

Any comments or questions on any of these? We'll just put the link. The ALAC policy development page is here. You can see it in the chat now and you can see how things are being built up with time.

Sebastien Bachollet, you have the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much, Olivier. As you say, we are, as ALAC is supposed to finalize the votes about the – what is the acronym [RDAP]. I am, as usual, [inaudible] my comments on all that, but I have a question and maybe we can have this discussion here at the European level.

I have the impression that a lot of things are done here to replace the WHOIS at the level of the gTLD. That means that if we go in that direction, we will have as end user [inaudible] for the ccTLDs or any subset of that and we will have a [new] tool for the [ccTLDs]. That means that we will be as end users quite in trouble with the different tools, different things.

How we can address these questions? Because today I don't think it's taking care. I don't know. I am not sure that you all have read the comments, but here is my question. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Sebastien. Are there any thoughts on this? Sebastien, personally I don't know. We haven't got any specific view on that. Do you wish to try and send this over to the mailing list and see this? Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I get your point. It's now five days I wanted to write a comment in the chat, but as you know I am not really able to do all what I need to do. I don't know if I will be able to do it and I need [inaudible] by tomorrow. It's a tricky question.

But I will try to write something maybe tomorrow morning. That's one point I would like to [make]. Yeah, the other point will be in point five. Okay. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Sebastien. I gather with such a complex issue, it probably would be better to have it written and then people can think about it and digest it a little bit, privacy issues, etc.

Let's then move on if there are no further questions on this. We now have an update on the public interest document next steps. If you recall last month, we were looking at the public interest document which Wolf had drafted for our last face-to-face meeting that took place in Dublin last year.

The process is moving forward and I just want to give a chance to wolf to let us know what's going to happen next. Wolf Ludwig?

WOLF LUDWIG:	Okay, thanks a lot for giving me the floor. As you may recall from our Dublin face-to-face general assembly part one, we presented this input paper and discussed it, and at the end we realized board approval to the substance and to the importance of the issue and it was not really meant as a one-day issue. Just to fill up a part of our general assembly. But it was meant to be a topic which needs to be followed up because, as you all know, the public interest is a repeating or upcoming term in ICANN debates, and it's a term which is fairly disputed depending on which constituencies you look in.

It's sort of a common understanding as far as I've realized in the GAC and the GAC is always in their consultations and statements pointing to the importance of public interest. We have seen from EURALO side there is a strong sensitivity among our members to bring this issue up again and to continue discussions on it.

So at the end there are two options to create a working group at the EURALO level, what I take more or less for granted because I received a lot of informal responses from some of our members that they are strongly interested to participate in such a working group. So I think it will be an easy effort to create such a working group. Silvia Vivanco has already created a sub-page on the EURALO workspace. She published the links in the chat.

There you can find the document again and the sub-page [can figure] as more or less the working platform for the working group where you can post comments, etc., post other inputs, post other references, etc., because there are quite a lot of references if you make a quick research.

An alternative step would be to bring it up on the ALAC level. There will be next Thursday a secretariat call. Silvia organized it. There will be an agenda item at this secretariat call as well. I will bring it up. I will ask other RALO leaders whether they are interested in the issue, whether they think it would be worse to create an ALAC-wide, At-Large wide, working group on this issue so this could be complementary ideas.

So far I take it more or less for granted that we will follow-up in a EURALO working group, but it's still open whether there will be enough feedback response interest from other RALOs, and then we could discuss the issue on a broader level.

It would be interesting to hear from other regions whether there are similar traditions in other regions, other parts of the world, whether it has similar historical connotation in their parts or whether public interest is more or less what some people say, rather European term and definition.

These are the still open questions and as far as I got to know, there will be an ICANN-wide meeting in Marrakech where the issue will be brought up as well. There was also a meeting on the public interest at the last IGF in Brazil and it will most probably become also on the ICANN level a standing item on the agenda. Therefore, our efforts in this direction following up this issue comes at the right moment I think. Thanks. That's all [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Wolf. Yes, that could be a link to the schedule of the Marrakech meeting on the Monday, the 7th of March in the

afternoon with local time 15:15 to 16:30 exploring the public interest within ICANN's remit.

Could I perhaps suggest that staff helps you to get in touch with whoever is in charge of this session and find out what is it about and whether you could take part in this. If we have something that is doing this, then I would really hope that we are invited to be part of this session rather than having At-Large not involved at all in it. Perhaps Alan Greenberg would know whether we are already involved with this session. I don't know. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. We haven't invited to do anything, so I don't really know what exactly will be happening. I suspect it will be a panel. I suspect sometime in the next month or so I will receive an invitation.

The session in the IGF was interesting in that the general conclusion the group came to – or at least my view on the conclusion – is that you can't and don't want to define it, but we need to be thinking and talking about more. But it's not clear that a formal definition is really the end point, even though that's the way we've referred to it at this point. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Alan. So we have an action item that's in the list. Alan is the chair of the ALAC. You don't mind if we get directly in touch with [inaudible]. Or do you want to go via you to find out what this public interest is about?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I have some idea what it's about, but I will ask our staff to find out exactly what they're planning and whether we will have participation or not.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right. Thank you. Wolf Ludwig?

WOLF LUDWIG: I received an invitation or a pointer to this session by the person in charge at ICANN, but it's just general info pointing out that there will be a session in Marrakech and pointing to more background info like the panel in Brazil. I guess on the panel in Marrakech there will be some of the usual suspects like Bill Drake or Olga Cavalli, etc., and some more people.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this.

WOLF LUDWIG: It's probably helpful if ALAC could be part of this effort as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Wolf. I think it's mandatory for At-Large to be part of this, so let's hope we manage to make contact. I'm really sorry, we already are running out of time. We started a bit late. We were

supposed to have five minutes on this. We have to move on to the next agenda item.

WOLF LUDWIG: Just [inaudible] call. I would like to ask all members at the call here tonight to give me a hint or reconfirm their interest that we can create this working group as soon as possible and that we can start from the next call onward. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Wolf. You want this by e-mail or just…?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, it will be – well, by whatever means of communication, e-mail or smoke, just to let me know who will participate in this working group. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Wolf. Carry a pigeon. That's quite an ecological way.

WOLF LUDWIG: It's another way.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's move on. Agenda #5, CWG IANA and the CCWG Accountability. As you know, we've just looked at the action items. There was supposed to be a EURALO call with the latest developments and the ability to let

everyone in EURALO or At-Large Structures in EURALO to know a lot more about this and to agree, come up with some kind of green light for this – to get our ALAC members to support this.

The problem is that there is yet more delay. We've not reached the point yet where there is a final, final, final CCWG Accountability report. Actually, we have the luck of having Alan Greenberg who has been spearheading the ALAC's work on this. Alan, could you summarize in a couple of minutes where this is going and what are we to expect.

ALAN GREENBERG: I wouldn't dare predict where it's going and what to expect, but I can give you my impression. The group is slowly working its way through all of the issues that have been raised in the public comment and things that there were strong indications need to be adjusted, paying a lot of attention to the board issues, because ultimately the board has to agree or the bylaws don't get implemented. But there's a fair amount of substance from other groups as well. We're working our way through it.

There's been a lot of progress made. We've gotten to closure on some tough issues. There are others that there are people in the group that are really diametrically opposed to each other. It's not clear how we're going to come to closure on some of those, but we have seen progress that I probably wouldn't have predicted a few weeks ago. So we're working.

At this point, we still have not heard formally from the GNSO or from the GAC, so it's hard to put things to bed completely without two of the major players really having spoken up.

In the case of the GNSO, we know what their individual components have said, but we still need some indication of the group as a whole. And there are a few places where the GAC is still a complete unknown. But the progress is being made.

What the timeline is is not clear. Until we know when we're going to hear something from the GNSO and the GAC, it's hard to put a real timeline to bed. The presumption is we will have either a new proposal or an update to the current proposal sometime in the next few weeks. And we, the ALAC, along with the other chartering organizations will be called upon to approve it not, preferably before Marrakech, but my guess at this point is it may well not happen until Marrakech.

So what that delayed timeline does, by delaying for two months, what that does to the overall transition plans is anyone's guess.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Alan. Just to let you know, as the GNSO liaison for the ALAC, I've followed very closely what's going on in the GNSO. The next meeting, which is supposed to take place the day after tomorrow I believe on the 21st of January has an agenda where there is an update and discussion about CCWG Accountability.

There was a special call last week that was supposed to yield some input for the chair of the GNSO to be able to draft a document over the weekend and present it on Monday/Tuesday of this week and it doesn't seem to have appeared yet on the GNSO mailing list. So still don't know where we're going.

Let's have Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. I have a question and a remark. I'm rather worried as a member of the ICG speaking privately here, but also as one of the two representatives chosen by the ALAC to work in the ICG, I'm rather worried about the slippage in the timeline in the dates.

And working backwards, I see two big dates looming in the future. One is of course the termination of the current contract with the IANA [transition] at the end of September 2016. And the other date is of course [inaudible] selections a bit after that.

So if we take those two things and we move backwards, we're barely within the possible timeline to achieve anything with transition in time.

Again, speaking privately but as a [former] of the ALAC and as one of your representatives of the ICG, I'd like to ask both you and Alan if you think it would be possible to express perhaps more forcefully within the CCWG the concerns we might have. And when I say we, I mean the At-Large about the slippage, because the ultimate goal is not just to send a document to NTIA. It is actually to make transition possible. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Alan Greenberg, any comment or response?

ALAN GREENBERG:	To be quite blunt, I don't think it's going to make any difference at this point. Those of us who are really worried about the dates have expressed that concern repeatedly and asked for updates and trying to encourage targets being set, and there are other people who are absolutely adamant saying there should be no external pressure, we'll work at whatever rate we have to work to get the job done.
	Now I'm as worried as anyone about getting the job done properly, but at the same time there is outside impact of this. So saying it again I don't think will make any difference. I've been one of the people who has asked the embarrassing questions about what's the schedule and what's the target and when are we going to hear anything. I can't counter the argument saying how can we set a schedule when two of the major chartering organizations are still being silent on what they think about this. We have competing forces going on here and I don't think that one more person saying once again that we need to work faster is going to change anything. I think the co-chairs are well aware of the situation. To some extent, they're the ones who are going to look awful bad if we can't come to closure on this, in some people's minds anyway.
	So I think the pressure is there. I don't think making one more comment is going to make any difference.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you, Alan. Colloquially, one could say that this has somehow turned into an arm wrestling contest. Let's have Stefano Trumpy next. We're not able to hear you at the moment, Stefano. I don't know if your

EN

microphone is properly set up. Stefano is using the Adobe Connect. He is not muted, but it doesn't seem to be working at the moment.

In the interest of time, let's go to Sebastien Bachollet, and we'll come back to Stefano Trumpy if staff can please in the meantime try and work out how Stefano has to set up or what's not working. Sebastien Bachollet?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Olivier. Stefano, welcome, and we will be able to hear him. I'm not sure that the discussion about the timing is going somewhere. I can understand that we want the transition, but for the moment we spent already two meetings of three hours each week to go ahead. There are people working a lot, some less, and I don't see how we can go faster. We need to have all those discussions. Even on some topics I'm not sure that the closure is a good one for At-Large. We will have to have this discussion also.

I really feel that it would have been a good way to go to have a real discussion at one time with the board in depth, and [inaudible] CCWG [inaudible]. Now we are delaying. We may ask the US to postpone their presidential election like that. We would have more time.

I will leave Stefano to talk, but I have one question – a specific question – about the current work and I would like to have your advice or your idea on this. It's also a tricky question from my side, but I will come back when you want, Olivier, on that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sebastien. We are running very late on this. Was it a long question on this topic or…?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, it's not a long question. I need to find a place where we can have this discussion about what we call the IRP and the way it's set up today in the proposal. I have really the impression that we are going – even if I get some answer today at the CCWG call, [inaudible] we are going against the multi-stakeholderism in doing what we are doing. But maybe I'm wrong and I would like to have your point of view. Or I'll wait for the IANA stewardship transition ALAC or At-Large discussion tomorrow. I can do that, too.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Sebastien. I believe that the venue tomorrow indeed would be the best way forward and the whole working group will be able to discuss this. Since Alan is on the call and the agenda will be shortly updated, Alan can take note of this.

Can we have Stefano Trumpy now, please?

STEFANO TRUMPY: Hello? Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can hear you, Stefano. Welcome.

STEFANO TRUMPY: Okay. Following Jean-Jacques, of course. I'm worried about the timing, because we remember that also in Dublin, the goal was to try to finish the work by January and January is already almost past.

So I think that the Marrakech meeting may be the last time [inaudible]. The ALAC should be very strong indeed, at least to say, look, people, we have to make things more simple and not so much complicated. This is a role that we have to follow.

Finally, I wanted to say that in the working group about public interest and other things, my role for 15 years in GAC may be helpful for the [inaudible]. So I'm a volunteer in also dealing with the relations with the GAC. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Stefano. It's a good point. Let's take note of this. And you might have to mute now because we can hear.

STEFANO TRUMPY: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's great. Let's move on then. I'm really sorry the time is really rushed today. The next thing on our agenda is the EURALO board conference call that took place yesterday. We had a very productive meeting, and the discussion was that—

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I'm sorry, Olivier. Before you close this item, I would like very much that even if we don't have schedules, when EURALO will have an in-depth discussion about CCWG on Accountability to take into account by the ALAC member coming from EURALO.

                         I think it's important that we just don't bring our own point of view. That's [inaudible]. But the point of view of the regions. I would like to see how we can organize that. Sorry, Olivier, but…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Sebastien. We have an action item to set up a single-issue call for EURALO. The question is when? When would it be productive for us to have it? If we have it tomorrow, then I would believe it's probably a bit too early because so much is changing. Of course we also have to be careful about not having it too late.

                         Could I perhaps ask you to work with staff and with the CCWG – sorry, with the IANA Issues Working Group – and finding out when would be the best time to have a snapshot of what's going on and let our ALSes know about this? Is that okay? Excellent. I see a green tick from Sebastien. Excellent. It was an action item anyway. It's still in the pipeline.

EURALO Board Conference Call. Yesterday was very productive, very helpful. We discussed a number of issues. The process was for each board member to share with the others what their goals were for their tenure on the EURALO board. These are actually linked to… You'll see a link in the agenda over to the EURALO board members page. That actually has some details on there. It's got their goals listed below. I think it might be slightly incomplete, but that's the main goals.

We had a bit of a discussion on finding out what we should start with because there are so many different topics that we need to address simultaneously. The idea was to create two taskforces, the first one being a taskforce on At-Large Structure engagement specifically for our EURALO ALSes.

As you know, we haven't got that great of engagement at the moment. There's much improvement required. So that taskforce's work will be primarily focusing first following up on the At-Large Structure skill sets. We did have already a survey that was sent quite a while ago that provided us with some answers. But the work would involve taking this as a starting point and then expanding it and relating to it with our ALSes to build a fuller picture of what not only the individuals that we have taking part in processes are interested in or know about, but also what kind of skill sets they have within their At-Large Structures. So we have a more active community that can engage in a lot of topics that are related to ICANN.

Second work of that proposed taskforce would be to update and refine the list of ALSes that we currently have on the website, but also have contact points and other details that would be behind a login, so that

each other – each ALS – could actually network with the other At-Large Structures out here.

We are a community at the end of the day and we are not taking advantage of that opportunity to be able to relate with other like-minded organizations in Europe. That was the first taskforce.

The second proposed taskforce was on a review and revision of the bylaws. The first task would be to map out the differences between the bylaws that are currently drafted and how EURALO actually works.

Once that mapping has been done, of course fully taking into account the work that has already been done in the past. It's not the first time that we're looking at this. Taking into account all of the current data at hand, the taskforce would revert back to EURALO At-Large Structures with their results, and at that point, there would be a decision by EURALO ALSes to see if we would proceed forward with making bylaw amendments. Bearing in mind, once you start touching bylaws and amending things, it becomes very, very complicated and it's a heck of a lot of work.

That's the plan on first step and second step. There is a call for participants if you are interested in these taskforces, but prior to calling for participants, the call here is meant to obtain your feedback about these proposals. The floor is open. Mikhail Medrish, you have the floor.

MIKHAIL MEDRISH: Hello, everybody. I suppose it is necessary to start the job with a small working group reviewing bylaws. I mentioned in my e-mail to the board

some contradictions – real contradictions – in n real life and what is in bylaw. It's not bylaw. We have Articles of Association, the name of the document. Individual association established in 2012 [inaudible] EURALO bylaw. It is necessary to do. [inaudible] correspond to real life. So the procedures are not established in bylaw.

It is written that Rules of Procedures which should be adopted by board, it's [inaudible]. So no Rules of Procedures. We have procedures, but we have on procedures on paper.

So it is necessary to review in two steps. I suppose first step to think about what to do and to discuss this and then to do. I suppose half a year between half a year and a year period of time will be good enough to make changes.

By the way, we have bylaws. All other RALOs have different documents, not bylaws procedures – not bylaw as a legal entity as we have. So maybe to think about changing – fully changing – the document. So it is not my decision. It's only some ideas about it.

I would like to start this because it is necessary to have a document [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Mikhail. I see there's only positive replies so far. I don't see anyone objecting to any of these taskforces. I'm going to give you the floor in a second, Sebastien, but I was going to say that the way things work is that taskforces are created and then the taskforce selects their chair of the taskforce once the taskforce is created. Of

course to create a taskforce, there needs to be a call for participants, a wiki page, and a mailing list set up. Sebastien Bachollet?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, I am sorry. I apologize. I was not able to participate to the board call yesterday, but I have two [inaudible]. The first one is that as much as we can [inaudible] with the other RALOs who have some common ground on how the RALO are working will be great. I don't know how we can do that, but as their secretariat call of the RALOs, it might be a good way to have this discussions started.

The other point is that we have to take into account the fact that we will go through review in the next month and I guess that will be part of the review, too. We need to have that included in our work. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Sebastien. I gather by your interest in this you would probably volunteer to be one of the participants in this specific taskforce. Any other comments or questions? No? Okay, let's move on. I'm told by staff that we have a 15-minute extension because we did start a few minutes late. I hope that you can all remain on the call 15 minutes and I'll try to stick to the new timing. So let's have an action item here which will be to issue a call for participants for both taskforces, please.

And we move to agenda item #7, the Fiscal Year '17 special budget requests. We also discussed this yesterday on the EURALO board call.

The question was whether the EURALO wishes to file any special budgets this year.

The way that it works is that ICANN has an overall budget that they publish every year and then each supporting organization, advisory committee, constituency of the GNSO and also a Regional At-Large Organization can file some requests for additional budgets.

One of the requests, the one that we did last year that you will see linked to At-Large FY16 Development Workspace was one that was asking for the general assembly that took place in Dublin. Of course we've now had our general assembly in Dublin this year – or last year – but we have not had any other type of requests last year. This year I believe we're not going to have something happening in Europe. In fact, asking for general assemblies two years in a row it's quite unlikely that we would get anyway.

So at the moment, we pretty much have nothing on the table to present as request for additional budget. Now that's of course aside from the At-Large Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program, which has been used in EURALO so far to send potential At-Large Structure representatives to EuroDIG, the European IGF conference that takes place yearly.

So we shouldn't make any CROPP requests under these special budget requests. We have to think of other things. Time is of the essence because the deadline for making those requests is the 21st of January, end of the week. I therefore open the floor.

EN

I did ask other board members whether they were interested – whether they could think about this until today and I wonder whether anybody has had any great idea during the night. The floor is open.

Nothing at all. That's a bit surprising. This is money. This is about requesting funding for activities. I'm quite surprised. Some of the activities that other RALOs have been filing are activities based on the Internet Governance Forum and staging a workshop at the Internet Governance Forum. I know that APRALO and AFRALO have done this on several occasions in the past and have been funded to stage that workshop.

At the moment, there are requests – well, the only published requests are ones from NARALO to ask for a general assembly at ICANN 57. I don't see any other requests so far, but they might be added in a couple of days.

Let's open the floor. Yrjo Lansipuro, you have the floor.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: [inaudible] asking [inaudible] workshop at the next IGF. The other thing is if we don't find anything to ask for the budget, it could be an end and no money for the CROPP. That is to say we could have more people assisted to go to the EuroDIG. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Yrjo. This feels very much like the common agricultural policy, isn't it? If we don't grow crops, can we get money for this? I can't help thinking that. I don't think it works like this,

unfortunately. That's my feeling. I don't know perhaps, Alan, would know better but I certainly do not think that this has been done in the past. I think that they are seeing these as being two separate budgets, so they're somehow separated.

Let's go down the list. Maybe somebody else has an answer to this suggestion. Sebastien Bachollet?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Olivier. Maybe we want to do some [biological] agriculture and not anymore the old way of doing it. I would like very much that we thought about how the ALSes can benefit from that.

We used to take this money to organize a meeting of some people, but we need to go down to the members of our ALS I think. We need to find a way to have something to do with them about ICANN and At-Large. If we don't have ideas, we don't need to spend the money. We are not here to spend the money because they have money. If we have an idea, if we have a project, yes. But not the reverse. The goal is not to spend the money. It's to have a good project.

I would like very much that we find something going to the roots of our organization. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Sebastien. Perhaps that could be another task for the taskforce on At-Large Structure engagement. It seems like the right thing to work on. And of course if we don't make any requests this year, hopefully we'll have some potential requests for next year.

Wolf Ludwig, you're next.

WOLF LUDWIG: I just put a note in the chat and we have tried it so many times in previous years to get at least some of our members supported or funded to participate at the ICANN [inaudible] and it was always rejected with sort of strange argument that ICANN [inaudible] has nothing to do with ICANN. But if there's some kind of a job because ICANN [inaudible] is almost as old as ICANN and became over the years a very well-known opportunity, particularly for most people, academics. It has a long tradition and some of our people on a private basis have participated already. But it was never supported by ICANN so far.

And I think before asking to send some of our people to the next IGF, what to my knowledge will be in Mexico, I think it makes more sense to concentrate a budget request on an event which is quite established, quite well-known, and we simply have to remind them then that meanwhile Fadi has over the last three times participated, etc. So by now it should be known at ICANN staff, and meanwhile they should have realized that it has a lot to do with ICANN and it's well related. So I think it would be [worth it] to give it another trial.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Wolf. As you're mentioning this, I was reading the FY17 ALAC criteria on special requests. One concern I have… By the way, I know that we have applied for this in the past and it's been rejected because it was thought that the ICANN [inaudible] has

nothing to do with ICANN, which I thought was quite funny actually on the time.

On that occasion now the current criteria mentions that if any request is made on outreach it should probably go through the CROPP program and not on this special request process. That's the only concern I've seen and something I've noted in the current rules of the CROPP. I'm not really sure what to say or to do. We could file and be told this has to go to CROPP. Or maybe it will be funded.

Wolf Ludwig? And thanks for putting the link, Silvia. Wolf Ludwig, you have the floor.

WOLF LUDWIG: I think while we can also consider it for the CROPP program, I think over the last year basically on principle it was useful to submit CROPP requests related to EuroDIG and we always had a more or less special emphasis for this CROPP request to sponsor people from Eastern Europe in countries to attend EuroDIG events who would, without special support funding, not be able to participate in a EuroDIG.

It will be the same questions, the same issues, for this year 2016 in Brussels. Therefore in my personal opinion, I would like to prioritize the CROPP for EuroDIG and I will try again a special budget request as we did in the past, even if it was refused. So let's try it again for ICANN [inaudible] because ICANN [inaudible] is broader than EuroDIG. So it fits better into ICANN fiscal year requests than something which was very typically regional, what is EuroDIG. So EuroDIG fits, in my opinion, much

better to the CROPP program and outreach, etc., initiative. It's just my personal recommendation. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Wolf. I note that Alan Greenberg has put his hand up a bit earlier, but then I'm not sure whether he put it down willingly or whether it just went down.

ALAN GREENBERG: It wasn't really important. Just to note that the financial request [inaudible] probably, because we really do not think that there's going to be a lot of travel type things funded under the special budget request. Nothing stops you from putting it in, but the message that we've received is that the focus is not likely to be on travel type things. Given that, you can then make your decision as you wish.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. Wolf, do you have the ability to file the request? It doesn't cost anything to file it, but it will be looked at afterwards and evaluated by the committee and we'll see if it goes in or not.

WOLF LUDWIG: Well, until the end of the week it has to be submitted until Friday?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct, yes.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. We will probably meet on Friday. Let me suggest I just go over it for couple of minutes and send after [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. Yeah, that's fine. Works with me.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. So it's already, let's say, coordinated between the two of us.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Good. I note from the chat, I note that Oksana Prykhodko is making a comment on how we can use this opportunity to strengthen horizontal ties between ALSes from Eastern Europe, for example. I don't have an answer for you, Oksana. I don't know. And I think that it's another discussion which will need to be taken on by the taskforce on At-Large Structure engagement.

Time is ticking. We've only got a few minutes left on this call. I'd like to move to the next item. That's #8. Just to first remind you of the capacity building webinars which are being put together by the At-Large Capacity Building Working Group.

You have two links in your agenda, one to 2015. It's got a link to a number of excellent webinars that are there. The recordings are in English, in Spanish, and in French. There's transcripts in those. There's a presentation for each one of these. It's really a great resource. It's got

discussion on IANA stewardship transition. It's got discussions on CCWG Accountability. It's got a presentation on security and stability, a topic very important for end users. It's got even a whole topic about working groups for At-Large, the ALAC working groups and the cross-community working groups. That's a lot of valuable information for your colleagues in your At-Large Structures.

If you go to the capacity building of 2016 page, you will find that the page is empty. That's because we have been asked to provide suggestions for webinars. This is a call for suggestions for webinars. You want a webinar on Topic X, then the working group will work on it. We'll find the right experts on this and we'll then stage a working group for you.

I can open the floor for a couple of minutes. What we can do is to forward this call for requests for topics over to the mailing list and it would be interesting to get feedback from you. What do you think you want to know more about? What do your colleagues want to know more about? What's confusing in ICANN? This sort of things. Any comments, or questions, or suggestions that come off your head right now?

I see nobody putting their hand up which means that I've either put everyone to sleep or everybody wants to go to sleep or everybody's waiting to have dinner. Let's move on swiftly then.

Agenda item #9. That's the outreach and engagement calendar. This is also just a little tip for you. There are calendars out there that are there for you and you ALS colleagues to help you finding out events that are

taking place near you or to also note, tell, everyone else that you are holding an event that will involve some outreach that is ICANN related.

There's two links here. The first link is one which links to the ICANN At-Large community. The link that says "teamup.com" and then some undescribable string here. You'll notice that this calendar is completely empty. Why is it empty? Because it's up to us to fill it out. That's one link. If you have any suggestions as to what you'd like to put in there, please fill it up.

Then what happens is the ICANN stakeholder engagement department then has the ability to see the events that we're having here and add them over to the engagement interface, which is the second link that you have on your agenda – the ICANN events near you. If you click on Europe, you'll find there are five events at the moment that are listed. It's the civil society on Internet governance event Berlin series that took place today. There is on January the 27th a CDPP, Computers Data Privacy and Protection conference. I don't know where that is. That's somewhere in Europe. There's the Multilingual Internet (MLI) Global Summit that's taking place I believe in London on February the 1st. There's Internet and Regulation, who rules the Internet? Another conference on the 2nd and there's one on the 22nd of February. The well-known Mobile World Conference is huge and taking place in Barcelona every year.

But there is nothing from the At-Large Structures in our region. So please contribute to this via the outreach calendar and hopefully we can enable more cross-pollination between our different ALSes and certainly more value for our At-Large Structures.

Any comments or questions? There is total silence here, which means that I've probably put everyone to sleep.

Let's go to agenda #10, any other business. I don't see anybody putting their hand up.

I'd like to thank all of you for having been on this conference call and to thank staff as well for agreeing to extend this call by 15 minutes. To this, I look forward to following up on the mailing list and to following up with the different action items that we have for this call. We'll be forwarding these to the mailing list immediately after this call as soon as we've reviewed them. And let's get going. Let's get this moving.

Thanks everyone, and this call is now adjourned. Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, everyone. Thank you, Olivier and Wolf and everyone Bye-bye.

YESIM NEZLAR: The meeting has been adjourned. The audio will now be disconnected. Thank you for joining today's call.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]