
GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning, good afternoon, and welcome to the EURALO Board Teleconference on Monday, the 18th of January at 11:00 UTC.

On today's call, we have Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, Wolf Ludwig, Jordi Iparraguirre, Yrjö Länsipuro, Mikhail Medrish, Mathieu Camus, Sandra Hoferichter. From staff, we have Silvia Vivanco; and myself, Gisella Gruber.

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

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Gisella. Today, first, I'd like to thank you all for coming on this call. We have an agenda where we have to review our goals for 2016 as the EURALO board and then defining our priorities and our plan of actions, perhaps assigning responsibilities to each one of us to push one specific topic forward. Then we also have to look... Before tomorrow's EURALO call, we have to look at the special budget request for Fiscal Year '17. These are the requests that the RALOs and the ALAC and other supporting organizations and advisory committees in ICANN make for additional funding for specific projects, and these include projects that deal with printing of documentation, support. Some of it requiring travel, etc. In any case, we'll have to discuss this and see if we want to put anything through.

One thing. Due to some emergency here, I might receive a call in the middle of this call, in which case I'll have to hand the floor to Wolf.

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.

Wolf, is that okay with you? Will you be able to take over the call in case I do get the other call coming in? I'm not hearing from Wolf.

GISELLA GRUBER: We're just trying to get Wolf on the line. He'll be joining us shortly. I'm hoping that he might respond to you in writing in the chat. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, he's calling in. Yes. Okay, that's fine, then. I see Wolf is typing. Once he's on the call, that's fine. Let's get going. The Adobe Connect doesn't seem to be working too well at the moment. Let's get going, then.

Let's first look at the board goals of 2016. I've put the links to the EURALO board page that has all of the different links to the different points that everyone has made. Then we need to effectively put together... Basically, put them together and say, "Which way do we want to move now?"

I've noticed – and let's just quickly go through them. Mikhail Medrish was pointing towards the bylaws and having to do a good review of the EURALO's Articles of Association. I sent a few things forward, certainly looking out for new potential At-Large Structures in the places where we do not have any At-Large Structures. But I think that with EURALO one of the things we really need to do is for the engagement of our ALSes, since so few of them are active as such. We have to work out ways, and perhaps put together a taskforce that will look at ways to deal with engagement.

With those ALSes that do not wish to engage, and perhaps even review with each one of our ALSes, and with them if they are still interested in being an active EURALO At-Large Structure, then we've got to look at the skill sets. That was something that Yrjo was saying. If we can get the skill sets from the different ALSes, that will enable us to call upon our At-Large Structures when we have specific topics on the table. Then thirdly linking the ALAC to our ALSes. I thank the ALAC members that are here on the call so that we can work closer with the EURALO board, but also closer with the RALO in general and all of the At-Large Structures.

Jordi also had the objective of basically looking at the actual purpose [inaudible] participating in the development of policies for the DNS and seeing if our ALSes I guess are able to contribute in this matter. Here Jordi was really pushing on increasing the participation and incorporating new people in all of the activities that we have.

Mathieu also sent a note. He was looking at the public interest document. We wanted to explore the notion itself with other members. Apparently he's a good candidate for following up with Wolf on the public interest. Of course the two questions that he was asking there, how do you improve the visibility of final users in ICANN, how to have more weight on the policy making? That of course ties in with having more of our At-Large Structures engage.

Mathieu, you have your hand up. Please, you have the floor.

MATHIEU CAMUS:

Do you hear me? It's okay?

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

MATHIEU CAMUS: Yes, exactly what you said. The questions are related to the engagement of ALSes and the development of ICANN policies.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, that's cool. From what I see on the points which were put forward, I do think that we need to put together a group that will look at the ALS engagement in our region. That's a recurring tone that has come out. I was going to propose that we put together a taskforce on this. Are there any thoughts on that? I can see an agreement from Mathieu. So a taskforce... Yrjo also green light.

With regards to the taskforce, it could probably – and I'm just throwing things out at the moment and I do apologize. I'm less prepared than I should have been, but there you go. Things happen. The idea would be that we could get in touch with our ALSes one by one. I guess we do have quite a number of them, but engage them each and find out ways – perhaps even, when joining the taskforce, it shouldn't just be board members. We should get some At-Large Structures involved as well and start the work on there. I don't want to focus on what the taskforce will do, but there are tons of different ways to enhance the relationship with the ALS and enhance the engagement of the ALSes in the process.

There are some lessons we can learn from APRALO and also from NARALO. They've done some work to engage their ALSes more. Maybe

we can do more things during our monthly calls. There's a lot of different ways.

Are there any thoughts on this? Anybody would object to a taskforce being created that would look at At-Large Structure engagement in EURALO? I don't see anyone objecting.

Jordi proposes to define precise tasks for this wide objective. That's a very good point. So agreeing that we can create a taskforce. I would suggest that there are several tasks to be done. The first one I think is probably updating all of the contacts that we have for each one of those At-Large Structures. We have the luck of having had a general assembly just a few months ago – well, not that long ago – in Dublin. So we do have the names of the active contacts and it's not going to come as something just completely out of the blue for them to have us being in touch with them.

So the first thing was really engage discussion with them, and perhaps even looking at the actual skill sets that they have. I would say the first thing that the taskforce would do would be to put together a very small... I wouldn't even think it would be a survey. I think what we can do is to have maybe the basic lines of what ICANN, what the different topics are, and just ask them which ones do they have much knowledge in or do they just want to write in what they have knowledge in?

I know that we've had a survey. I'm going to turn to Wolf and ask him: did we have some of this information already given to us in the last survey?

WOLF LUDWIG: I do not exactly – well, we have conducted a number of surveys over the last year. Actually, I do not remember all details. I think the last survey was for, which was launched just before the London ATLAS II was particularly about contact details and communication tools and not much more.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Not much more, okay. So we could go to each one of our ALSes with that. It's just a one-page survey – not even that – that will just look at their skill sets specifically. That's one thing of the taskforce to do.

The other thing of the taskforce to do I guess is, once we have started on this, to talk to the ALSes and ask if they are still interested in taking part. I know that for some of them it might've been that they've changed representatives and they've changed direction.

I have a concern that we might have a few more “dead ducks” within the community. “Dead ducks” in quotes, if you will.

Yrjo Lansipuro, you have your hand up. You have the floor. Yrjo, you're speaking now. Unfortunately, I'm not able to hear you. I don't know why that's the case. It's strange.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Can you hear me now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We can hear you, yes. Welcome.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Thank you. Yeah, the surveys that were done so far in the various RALOs to implement the recommendation from the summit [inaudible] statistical exercise [inaudible] how many percent of your members are this and that, techies or whatever?

I think that now we have to get one layer or a couple layers deeper. That is to say to identify actual, concrete people who are – at least who believe they are – experts in this topics that you actually mentioned. I think it would be an excellent idea to have at least various ICANN related topics and then just ask the ALSes whether they have expertise on them. That could be actually a quite concrete starting point for our work. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Yrjo. Next is Wolf Ludwig.

WOLF LUDWIG: I'm just typing in and confirming into Adobe chat that the link Silvia provided, it was about professional capacities of our members, etc., and 19 of our members to my memory participated in the survey.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks for putting the link on the Adobe Connect chat. Yrjo was quite correct. We have here statistical responses. We do have the

answers – and I was going to ask Silvia, then. The answers we have here all seem to be just statistics, but we do have access to the individual entries, don't we?

SILVIA VIVANCO: That was completed in March last year. It was done through Survey Monkey, so I guess we could [inaudible] into the [inaudible] correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If we could build a table which had each At-Large Structure on one column, the next column would be – I guess it would be a matrix that we could have. So the next column is security, the next one is privacy, the next one is intellectual property, the next one is media, the next one artificial intelligence and computer crimes, domain names, Internet governance, and other. So across the table each column is something. Then we can put little crosses at the intersection of the column and the name of the At-Large Structure. That will give us I think maybe a first view of what the skills are, the skillsets are, across our At-Large Structures. How does that sound?

I'll open the floor for Mikhail Medrish. Mikhail?

MIKHAIL MEDRISH: Yes. I would like to mention that we have a website where all ALSes, the list of ALSes exist, but very few – very small amount of information we can find out. So I would like to think about we, all of us. To think about how to improve this part of the website. It must be full with

information, with all kinds of information. What is ALS, the contact person, the [inaudible] or maybe [inaudible], etc.

It is [inaudible] to prepare, at least. Yes, I agree. But to prepare at least and to put information on the website to be visible.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Mikhail. Thanks for this. I think there are two points in doing this. The first one is the amount of information that would be publicly available to anyone without a password. And I think that due to privacy laws, there might be some cases where we would not be able to provide the e-mail address in public and all of this. But what we can do is to have it behind a login. In other words, anybody that has a login for the confluence website, for the wiki if you want, will be able to go into that. And of course all of our At-Large Structures have logins for this, and of course we all have that, so they'd be able to go into this. But if we don't have a login, it will be picked up by search engines and then we risk breaking the privacy laws of some countries. I do know that some At-Large Structures are quite careful about the amount of information that there is about them out there.

I think it's a good project as well. Mikhail?

MIKHAIL MEDRISH: I beg your pardon. I meant that we are to have clear information about ALSes. It's not about persons. What about persons, to have a name and e-mail on the website and all other personal information can be

somewhere for our usage, not for all. But at least the contact person and e-mail must be visible.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, that sounds cool. So update and refine the current list of ALSes and make sure that it's up-to-date and perhaps we can add more information. I see this as a second small chunk of this taskforce. The first one is about the survey – building the survey to have the skill sets. The second one, separate project, to update and refine the list of ALSes.

I think that the knowledge table that we will build is probably just going to be internal to start with among us, so that we can see what we do with it later on. But certainly the list of the ALSes and the refining of this list is particularly important. As you said, part of it can be public, part of it can be private.

Wolf Ludwig?

WOLF LUDWIG: Again, I have two points. My first point is a remark on what you, Olivier, said before pointing to certain sensitivities among our members. I guess that publishing e-mail addresses would already be one step too far. Publishing the name, all right. But telephone numbers and e-mail addresses may be sensitive publicly accessible website. In my opinion, this should be in the protected area of our workspace.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. You don't think that there would be any objection to having them even listed in the protected area? Because ultimately that's just for all of the ALSes.

WOLF LUDWIG: Yeah. In a protected area, it's a different issue. If you have a kind of [inaudible] or if you need a password to this section, I think under that circumstances, it wouldn't be a problem.

My second point is I just want to recall that on the discussion about a professional background and specialization among our members. During the Lisbon general assembly in June 2013, we defined five thematic priorities that EURALO members had very particular expertise. I think we could use it as a basis. We do not always have to start from the beginning and ask our members the same questions again and again. Therefore we should build up on the input we have already from the members.

I know from the past that launching surveys is not much appreciated. A lot of people complained about too many surveys in the past, therefore before we just create another such initiative where we are asking similar questions we have asked already before, may be a problem. So let's think twice and find out what we have done already, and then let's concentrate on aspects which are not known so far. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Wolf. It's a good point you're making. And whilst you were saying this, the way I'm seeing it now then is we have a

taskforce on ALS engagement with one sub-point. So as Jordi says, let's break the cake in smaller pieces.

So one piece of the cake will be to use the information we already have to build the table of interest and competencies on a per At-Large Structure basis. That will give us a first idea of what the interests and the competencies of our ALSes are.

The second smaller piece of cake will be to update and refine the list of ALSes themselves. That's all about having more information on our At-Large Structures. I guess that small bit of a taskforce will be able to choose what part will go on the public part of the website and what part will stay on the private parts of the website. I think that's a good thing forward.

You mentioned the five thematic priorities, Wolf. Do you think that we should launch a... Well, once we process that work on the first table of interest and competencies, perhaps then will we be able to see which ones are the most popular? Do you think that there would be a chance to launch an initiative? So another taskforce that would be focusing on this thematic priority, perhaps?

WOLF LUDWIG: This could be an approach. Yes, I think so.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So I'm just putting it. Future taskforces possible. I'm calling it taskforce as a placeholder. We might wish to call it a working group or

whatever. Mikhail, you had your hand up a bit earlier. Do you wish to add something to this?

MIKHAIL MEDRISH: A little bit, maybe. You see, for example, my organization, my own ALS, the foundation has e-mail address as a foundation which is absolutely clear. It's not personal. And the e-mail address is very simple: info@[inaudible]. So it can be possible to be visible, such kind of addresses, at least. But I insist to try to find out a solution to have contacts with all ALSes visible, at least one. At least the contact address of the organization.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, if we have a private area, then all of the details can go on there, because ultimately only people with a login [inaudible].

MIKHAIL MEDRISH: No, no. I mean [inaudible] area.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, you'd like to put it in the visible area. I guess the taskforce are probably going to have to leave this to the individual At-Large Structures their wish of the At-Large Structures. It might be that some wish to have a public e-mail address that faces out and that is on our website. It might be that others might decide not to do so. That's probably the easiest way.

I'm a little concerned about mandating something like this because it's not actually in the EURALO bylaws that their address should be published. They should have a contact address. I don't think if I recall that there is a requirement for their address to be published. So it will be down to their choice.

Mikhail?

MIKHAIL MEDRISH:

And we are to think about our special address for individual, because it's not [inaudible] situation. [It's something] special. It is the problem which is a special problem. It [is necessary] to think about how to mention ALS for individuals. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. That's a good point, Mikhail. I hadn't thought about this, actually. Yes, we do have this ALS of individuals that is, I would say, semi-independent. It is run by people who are in charge of it. What you're suggesting is that we could work more with that ALS for individuals and work towards developing the ALS for individuals.

Maybe we should have another taskforce which is individual involvement in EURALO. I'm just saying this has just come out. If anybody disagrees, please shout out and give me some feedback on this. I know what you're thinking. You're thinking, "How many taskforces are we creating?" At the moment we've got two. We've got one on ALS engagement and one on ALS for individuals. Or perhaps it's

all part of ALS engagement, but with separate pieces of cake, smaller pieces for the different aspects of this.

Mikhail, again. You have the floOR.

MIKHAIL MEDRISH:

Excuse me. I would like to say about working groups. I suppose it is necessary to have a working group about adoption of bylaws. It's the main problem, I suppose. I can imagine it's from about me. But I suppose it's a main problem for the nearest future. We must adopt. We must write down a lot of new things and exclude a lot of non-working things. It's a big job and it is necessary to have – by the way, to have Rules of Procedure. It is mentioned in Articles of Association, but still not [on the floor]. So we are to make new version of bylaws and to make Rules of Procedure during this year, and [inaudible] it's necessary to have special working group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thanks for this. We've got taskforce on the review and revision of bylaws. That sounds like a good point. I think that there was some pushback. Wolf was particularly concerned that there isn't that much – or there might not be that much interest for so many people in EURALO to engage in a review and a revision of the bylaws.

But since we're now looking at taskforces, it would probably be a good thing to have those different threads, if you want, running in parallel and engage with people on the review and revision of bylaws. I see Wolf Ludwig. Wolf, you have the floor.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Just a little recapitulation of the reason part. This issue of revision of bylaws was brought up over the last two years again and again and we had different appeals on the mailing list, to create a working group people are interested.

Revising bylaws is a very touchy issue and you need, first, good people who are familiar with bylaw standards and different European bylaw standards. This is a precondition, otherwise you cannot do such a job. So be aware that it's a touchy issue.

The other point was that there was some feedback from several members who clearly said that they do not see an urgency on actual need. It is clear that there are a lot of inconsistencies, partly contradictions between how EURALO actually works and what was defined eight years ago or nine years ago in the bylaws.

But the majority of the members clearly said that they do not see an urgency for the moment and that EURALO should concentrate on other priorities. So there is nothing against trying to launch such a group again, but such a group should be composed with knowledgeable people. Also with people who know the past of EURALO, because if you do not know the past of EURALO, you cannot understand the bylaws and you cannot do much about a modification. So you need some decent background knowledge of starting such a process.

So it's [inaudible] to start another [trial], but I'm not very optimistic that feedback from our members would be much different than it was the last two years. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Wolf. I see that there's agreement from Yrjo who says, "I tend to agree with Wolf regarding the bylaws." I think from what you said here, it's becoming a bit clearer in my mind. Perhaps that taskforce, the first task of this taskforce would be just to review the current bylaws and map out the differences between the bylaws and how EURALO actually works. That would be I think a worthwhile exercise.

That taskforce could then revert back to EURALO as a whole to all of the ALSes and show the differences. I think once we have an actual review of the differences between how the bylaws are currently drafted and how EURALO actually works, we'll have a clearer idea of whether a revision is needed or whether there is no revision needed. Or maybe whether a small revision is needed to a few things which are inconsistent, but that have never affected us in any way.

It's just a mapping exercise would be a worthwhile thing, without engaging it to say, "Well, in any case, we have to revise the bylaws." No. It looks like first a review to see what's wrong. Then we'll be able to... The EURALO board and the members of EURALO will be able to choose whether they want to proceed forward with a revision.

I echo the concern of Wolf regarding... When you review bylaws, fine. It's stuff that is drafted and you just map and see what is the difference between what's on the paper and what's happening in reality.

When you want to draft bylaws and therefore have a revision and modify them, then it becomes more difficult because, as Wolf said, this

situation in different European countries might make it unworkable in some countries. So it would take a lot more time and a lot more effort to draft something new and that's another step we'll have to decide on once we've got a review of what's there so far. How does that sound, Wolf?

WOLF LUDWIG:

You may remember, Olivier, that some time ago when I still had my old computer with all my data, I sent you a copy of our bylaws where I marked in different colors what part of the existing bylaws are, in my opinion, useless because they do not apply to the realities of EURALO's functioning over the last years or since its existence.

So we are all aware that EURALO bylaws comprising more than 10 pages are too long, are too bulky. They're too much based on very specific [German] type bylaw conceptions. And as [German] bylaws are the most horrible you can imagine.

At the end, we work in a way which was most pragmatic and realistic. Therefore we didn't consider all [inaudible]. We considered the Rules of Procedures and the basics. So we had to organize one general assembly per year. So this is a bylaw prescription and this is a need you can find in different bylaw systems in Europe.

So we followed the most basic and the most important one, and all the parts into EURALO bylaws about financing of EURALO are completely unrealistic and I suggested in [inaudible] I prepared that it would be the easiest just to drop part of the bylaws which are simply useless or not realistic, to drop such parts would be probably – I don't know – would

be probably the easiest way because it would not mean a lot of modification. It would just mean to get rid of a lot of paragraphs which are not practical.

But if you change existing paragraphs, I remember how difficult it was in spring 2010 when we for the first time amended our bylaws by allowing individual users to get organized at the EURALO level. This was a very small modification, giving individuals a better standing at EURALO, and it was very complicated.

And at the end, please keep it in mind for any bylaw modification you need a two-thirds majority of the members. So if you do anything, what is not more or less close to consensus, you will never get anywhere. You'll lose a lot of time. You'll waste a lot of energies for something which will not work out at the end because you will never reach a sufficient majority of two-thirds of the members.

This is a good regulation in my opinion that for any bylaw amendments, you need almost board agreement or consensus among your members, otherwise you cannot do it.

Therefore it's not as easy as many people thought in the past, that it's just as easy [inaudible] sits together for a couple of hours and you can redo EURALO bylaws.

I know [inaudible] very beginning I remember in detail how difficult it was and we spent almost a year on discussing the creation of the bylaws, and finally to submit a bylaw version which was adopted in inauguration of EURALO at the ICANN meeting in spring 2007 in Lisbon.

So this is a huge thing. I just want to underline don't underestimate it. Don't think it's just an easy thing to do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Wolf. As you were speaking, I actually looked at our archives of the EURALO mailing list discussions, and I did see details. I just have one message from Sebastien Bachollet in 2010 that looks at the comments for some bylaw modifications. Then looking here at [2010] later on report the suggested bylaw modifications when [Matias] was still around in January 2011. Then finally a vote on the bylaw modifications. There were only three small modifications that was on the 17th of June 2011. So we're talking... That's about eight months of discussions that happened in between. That certainly seems to work with the points you've made about the complexity of drafting bylaws.

But I think it cannot hurt to do a review of the bylaws as in what is there today. What's on paper and what happens in reality? I haven't found your e-mail that you have sent on the EURALO bylaws... Actually, I have found one e-mail that you've sent in June, the 21st of June – oh, that's in 2013. That's a while ago.

But starting just to review, and then I guess the board will have to – and we will have to decide afterwards whether we want to make modifications or not, bearing in mind what you've just mentioned there.

WOLF LUDWIG: I think I sent this e-mail last year. I think it was in summer 2015. But I can raise it in my mailbox and I can resend it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, that's great. Thank you. Okay, Mikahil Medrish, you have the floor. Sorry for the delay.

MIKHAIL MEDRISH: No, no, no. No problem. I've been listening. It's very interesting. You see, I've tried to... [inaudible] in EURALO, I've tried to understand the situation with bylaws and read all transcripts from 2007 concerning bylaws and discussions.

I understand the situation, as I can imagine. But I would like to ask, I have sent four days ago an e-mail some examples of contradictions between bylaws and real life. Is it your table or not, my e-mail from 14th of January?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let me just check if it's in the table.

MIKHAIL MEDRISH: Olivier, I sent it to you and your board mailing list on 14th of January. I tried to give an example of a contradiction.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct, yes. You have sent the examples. It is on the table. It's on there, the 14th of January. Yes.

MIKHAIL MEDRISH: Lots of contradictions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, that's the first task is to list the contradictions and so on and highlight them.

MIKHAIL MEDRISH: Yes, yes. I would like to mention that, yes, I understand that it's not a very simple task to review a bylaw, but so many contradictions from my point of view absolute nonsense in today's bylaws. For example, [inaudible] of treasurer. Another example, we elected the chair of EURALO – Olivier, it's you – but no such person in our bylaw exists. We have chair of the board. [inaudible]. Surprise, surprise, surprise.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Mikhail, I don't want to start at this stage digging into the details of all the problems with the bylaws and so on. I think that this is a worthwhile discussion, but...

MIKHAIL MEDRISH: No, no. [inaudible] details. Yes. No, other details. But I would like to say that we, I suppose all of us, understand that bylaws is not in a good stage for today. It's a lot of contradictions bylaws as a Switzerland company, noncommercial. Articles of Association is from Switzerland [board]. And real life is absolutely different.

If we look at the main document of other RALOs, we will not find out bylaws. You'll find out principles, some Rules of Procedure, etc. In any case, it is our job – I mean board and main officers to think about it, to prepare some materials, and to give all others, ALSes and persons, to look at this... Our proposals, I mean.

So it is not about the total discussion. It's about working group to prepare proposals, to inform about proposals, and to collect output. So working group is necessary to organize, and in some short period of time prepare – not new document, but ideas what to do. Then second step, etc. Step by step.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. That's understood, Mikhail. Thank you. I'm concerned of the time. I was going to open the floor. The two taskforces which I saw here as being good to start up, I was going to ask whether anybody thought anything else should be started in parallel. Should we have another taskforce focusing on something else? Then I wanted to move over to the EURALO special budget request as well.

The floor is open for other suggestions. Mikhail, is that a new hand?

WOLF LUDWIG: He's typing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: He's typing, okay. Jordi has lost sound. What I was going to do, then, in the meantime whilst I keep the floor open for any other suggestions

here was to ask – well, not ask but say tomorrow’s EURALO call I guess we will be able to present the two suggestions for the two taskforces and start this up.

I gather that Mikhail would probably like to lead on the review of the bylaws. I’m sure other board members would be interested. I certainly will want to be on this. I think that Wolf has the institutional memory of this organization will obviously want to be on this, too.

There’s I guess really an emphasis here that this is a step by step process. First establishing a snapshot of where we are is probably the task of that taskforce on the bylaws and it’s something that we shouldn’t think is just a five-minute job that we’ll be able to do in a couple of days. It’s obviously going to be a long run. But I’d like to get the ball rolling on this because I have seen this issue of bylaw comes back often in the discussion. It’s good sometimes to just clean these things up a little bit.

Okay, I can see the disagreement of whether it’s Swiss or German. In any case, it’s Germanic, perhaps, we could say.

WOLF LUDWIG: No, it’s not, Olivier. Sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It’s not Germanic?

WOLF LUDWIG: Swiss bylaw standards are known to be the simplest and the [inaudible] close to Belgian bylaw standards. We have a lot of experience in the past because EuroDIG when the EuroDIG Support Association was created in 2012. It was designed according to very soft and smooth, and [inaudible] bylaw standards which give you a lot of opportunities, give you the possibility to reduce it to the essentials. So Swiss standards and German standards are completely different. I tried again and again to make this understood.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Wolf. Let's please move on then. I think we've pretty much covered three and four, definition of priorities and plan for action for 2016. Well, we've already got two huge tasks in front of us – the ALS engagement and this bylaw discussion. Let's move on to the EURALO special budget request for Fiscal Year '17. Am I still here? Am I still online?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yeah, we can still hear you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, someone else has dropped off. I thought I had dropped off. It was giving me the signal.

Let's move on over then. EURALO special budget for Fiscal Year '17. If we could change the... There's a link in your agenda which goes over to the At-Large FY17 budget development workspace. I was going to ask

Wolf, last year, what did EURALO file for? In fact, it's probably easy. There's a link next to it that looks at last year's one.

Last year, we had a proposal for EURALO general assembly at ICANN 54. That was the only request that EURALO filed and we managed to have that general assembly taking place at ICANN 54.

Next year, or the year that we have now, this year there's not going to be – or this fiscal year there's not going to be any meeting taking place in Europe. So I think it would be probably quite hard. If you want to push on having another general assembly taking place if we don't have an ICANN meeting taking place in Europe. But there might be other projects that we might wish to ask for. I open the floor for suggestions. Wolf Ludwig?

WOLF LUDWIG: Actually, we had two requests last year. One was in the official budget context asking for the face-to-face general assembly in Dublin, what you mentioned already. And then in the CROPP context we had another submission. We had another request asking for travel support for five travelers to join EuroDIG in Sofia.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That was a CROPP request.

WOLF LUDWIG: The second one was a CROPP request. To my knowledge, we have the same possibility this year for CROPP and I would still suggest to continue

with sort of perspective what we did over the last years to allow five people to join EuroDIG in June in Brussels regarding the official budget request. I agree it makes no sense to ask for a face-to-face general assembly because there won't be, to my knowledge, any meeting in Europe this year. I think after we have had three subsequent face-to-face meetings supported by ICANN 2013 in Lisbon, 2014 in London, and 2015 in Dublin, we won't have any chance for any demand for any requests to get a next face-to-face general assembly funding now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yeah. Thanks for this, Wolf. In fact, I'm going to put a thingy on there. Rotation of GAs. The Finance & Budget Subcommittee has been working on a sheet. I put the link into the Adobe Connect – that has the rotation of general assemblies in there. In fact, there will be actually an ICANN meeting in Europe in March 2017 which is part of the Fiscal Year 17.

The only thing, though, is that since we've already had a general assembly in Fiscal Year 16 and we're looking at having a rotation of general assemblies next year or fiscal year '17 would be a general assembly for NARALO and a general assembly for AFRALO, which of course stops us from having a general assembly. It's physically impossible to do three general assemblies in a year because of all the preparation required, primarily by staff, and having to do things in parallel is pretty much quite impossible when you've got some meetings that are very close together, like the March and the June meeting being only separated by a few – less than a handful – of months.

We can't ask for a general assembly next year, but are there any other suggestions? As far as the CROPP is concerned, Wolf, that will be I think a separate discussion that we will need to have, and to also receive the feedback on what the successes were where [inaudible] with the people that we have managed to send to EuroDIG. But that's certainly, without any doubt, a separate discussion we can have on that.

For those if you who are concerned, it is 12:00 or it's 1:00. So it's 12:00 UTC at the moment. We've got an extra 10 minutes if that's okay with you all to finish up this discussion. We have a couple of more things to discuss immediately after this.

Anybody else have suggestions for something we might wish to apply for as far as special budget requests or concerns. I know I'm putting you on the spot right now. We do have a EURALO call tomorrow and we will have one section of the call that will deal with this. So if you can think about something, it would be great. Come back to us either on the EURALO mailing list or tomorrow during the call that we will have, the EURALO Monthly Call.

So that's one. This process, by the way, we are in a little bit in a hurry now because I think that we have until... Is it the 22nd or 27th that we have to file a request? Silvia, what's the timetable on those filings?

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Hello, Olivier, [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. In the meantime, let's move on to any other business. We've got a couple of things to decide on. First, do we find that this board discussion – EURALO board discussions – are helpful? And if that's the case, how often do we want to meet? I don't know. I'm not going to say every week. I think that's too much. Should we have two calls a month perhaps, or one call a month? Mikhail Medrish?

MIKHAIL MEDRISH: I suppose two calls a month is good, but first of all, I think that we are to adopt plan of actions. And [inaudible] discuss the results, or no results, of [actions]. Twice a month is good enough. [inaudible] plan of action.

I would like to mention that [inaudible] definitions or priorities and plan of action for 2016. So would like to have a plan in the nearest future. Maybe next week. Maybe two weeks later. But to discuss and to adopt a plan and then we will be free to have a conference call twice a month I suppose.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Mikhail. What I was going to suggest was as follows. Tomorrow we will be able to report on the discussion we had today, and on the two proposals – the creation of the two taskforces and the small chunks of cake for the taskforce that deals with At-Large Structure engagement.

We will also be proposing – I mean, we don't have a plan of action as such, but I think what we will be looking for tomorrow is some feedback from At-Large Structures and the members present there. We will also

of course be sending the proposal over to these two taskforces to the mailing list collecting some feedback, and then two weeks I would say we can then have our next call and there we can then decide what our plan of action is based on the feedback we received from our ALSes.

We have to remember this is bottom-up. I'm a little concerned about the EURALO board making decisions like this and saying, well, now we're going to have these two tasks force, we're going to do this, we're going to do that. Then imposing it on our At-Large Structures who might not want any of this stuff. But I think that they do want because we're well integrated on our community to know what they wish to have, and we do have to ask and get the feedback.

Maybe at the moment we'll just have a Doodle in two weeks' time, and then we can decide after that if it's helpful to have a call twice a month maybe at a set time, maybe just a day before the EURALO call so we can prepare for the EURALO call or something.

I think that was the next thing. I noticed in the chat that Silvia has put the deadline for special budget request as the 22nd of January, 2016. It's only a few days away. I was going to propose that we ask our ALSes tomorrow on the call if they have any suggestions for extra budget requests, and in the meantime as I mentioned to you all, if you can think of something until tomorrow, please feel free. So we have until the end of the week to file something. It's usually just a page to file a budget request. Obviously it needs to be researched properly and put into the special format, but having a few days for this, it's okay. That can be done.

These were the two things moving forward. Are there any comments on anything else that we need to touch on? We've got another three minutes until we're ten minutes past the hour.

Mathieu, majority, any thoughts, Sandra, Ariel? Gisella, you have your hand up. Please, you have the floor.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, Olivier. [inaudible] on mute.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was wondering if I was still on the call it was so quiet. Go ahead, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Could we just touch on the Marrakech schedule and whether you wish to hold a EURALO meeting there because I need to know [inaudible] today.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for reminding me of this question, Gisella. That's a very good point.

GISELLA GRUBER: Just to add to that, why I'm stressing this point here is if you see real value in having a face-to-face meeting in Marrakech. I'm just trying to emphasize again that we are going to be extremely pressed for time and

we don't have the accountability schedule out yet. So I will do my best to schedule a meeting if you do wish to have one. The main point here was whether there was real value in having it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Gisella. Any thoughts on this? Shall we go for a face-to-face meeting? Wolf Ludwig?

WOLF LUDWIG: It was always a similar question in the past. I personally think under the dense meeting and timing situation during an ICANN meeting, it doesn't make a lot of sense to have this kind of formal meeting. When we invited in the past members then to join online, there was not a lot of response. I would therefore suggest let's try to organize those people from EURALO who will be present in Marrakech to organize the sort of informal meeting there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Wolf. I must agree with you. I think having a formal meeting of EURALO, because we don't know how many members will be there and we might just have a handful of members there, I don't think it's going to be 20 people in such a meeting. We have five people that are going to be there, because bearing in mind it's only the people that are funded or have other means of funding through their organization. Then we'll be able to put something, an informal discussion on things. But at the moment I don't see the worth of taking a slot and taking staff time for three of us to sit around a table,

or four or five perhaps to sit around a table. Thanks for this. Unless anybody else objects and really thinks we need to meet face-to-face in Marrakech, I'd say that we don't need a lot. That will probably be helpful with regards to the schedule as well.

Mathieu said he'd prefer a face-to-face meeting, but he will not be in Marrakech. I suspect that will be the problem with many people. That's one more thing.

I think if we want an informal meeting, staff could always arrange a room or something on short notice. We can decide once we're there and see who is there. If we have a lot of people interested, we can do a quick face-to-face meeting like this.

Any other business? Yeah, Mikhail will not be in Marrakech, too. At the end of the day, many of us will not be there. It's probably better to have a conference call the week before or the week after or a couple of weeks after and look back on Marrakech remotely.

Thanks, everyone. I don't see anyone put their hand up. Apart from Gisella who still has her hand up, is there anything else that I've missed, Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER:

Sorry, Olivier. My hand is going down.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. With this, apologizing again for my lack of preparation, but I'm covered with dust here having had part of the ceiling collapse. No worries. No big deal. It's a ceiling. It's down now, so that's fine.

I'd like to thank you for being on this call. I look forward to seeing you all tomorrow on the EURALO call and following up with what we've been discussing here. Wolf and I will be working together to build... You might have seen the EURALO call agenda is not up yet. We'll be working on this shortly. As I said, the two points in the EURALO meeting tomorrow will be about what we discussed today, and also about the EURALO special budget request.

With this, I'd like to thank you all. Speak to you soon. Have a great day. This call is adjourned.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you. The meeting has been adjourned and the audio will now be disconnected. Thank you for joining today's call.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]