
TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the EURALO bylaws taskforce, taking place on Wednesday the 27th of April 2016 at 20 UTC.

On the call today we have Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Wolf Ludwig, Mikhail Medrish, Roberto Gaetano, and Oksana Prykhodko.

I show no listed apologies for today's meeting.

From staff we have Silvia Vivanco and myself Terri Agnew.

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

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Terri. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Have we missed anybody in our roll call?

Nope. Okay, so everybody is here. Welcome everyone. The second question I need to ask you is whether you can hear me well? This is, the microphone is right under my chin, so we should be okay. [CROSSTALK] Okay, excellent, thanks Wolf.

So we have an agenda today going through our revision of the bylaws, and the suggestion was to just pick up where we left off last week. The problem we had last week, of course, was that we were working on the wrong version of the bylaws. Now we have a more full version of the

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.

bylaws. My hope was that we would be able to look at the specific parts of, here we go, parts of point A and point B from Mikhail Medrish's review.

And the part A and B are the first one, the first one, is to do with the Euro Individual Association, and B is to do with the governing bodies EURALO officers and their functions that do not correspond to the real life. So the idea is to try and go through these two points.

Any amendments to the agenda at this stage?

No amendments, okay. So let's then move on. First we have to look at the review of the action items. Okay, it's a brief reminder of the process, we we've all... I think everyone was on the call last week, or maybe a couple of people were not.

So what we're going to do basically is to follow the list of tasks that we have to do on this, starting with mapping out the differences between the bylaws, as drafted, and how EURALO actually work. And Mikhail has actually done this, so the first thing has been pretty much done. And the taskforce will refer back to EURALO ALSs with the results. So what we're now basically doing is to look at the difference between how the bylaws are drafted, how EURALO actually works, and to present some recommendations over to the EURALO ALSs on this.

Says here, in order not to reinvent the wheel, many information sources will need to be accessible on the taskforce page. And this is where we have all of the documents, and it also mentions that we have to define what EURALO wants to do at that point, and then check if this is

possible. Moving forward, whether the bylaws should be revised or not, or what revisions there should be in there.

Anyway, that's the overall process as we can see here. I think I need to spend some time re-reading this process because the sentences don't make sense. Maybe it's me, the time of evening, I don't know. Anyway, let's move on.

Let's go to the review of the action items from last week, last week's call. We had several action items. The first one was for Mikhail to share with the mailing list the suggestions regarding the EURALO Individual Association. And in there, it said that the EURALO Individual Association was not included in the bylaws. The current laws only show one kind of members, and that is the ALSs.

That of course was based on the wrong bylaws that we were looking at, so we'll look at this again today. The next thing was next call we'll focus on the EURALO individual association and its bylaws, depending on the progress, the review will continue to governing bodies. Okay, that's what we're doing, basically, and the third one we're getting to spend the Doodle.

So, I could say that the action items are dealt with. We can go straight into the item A, which is effectively the Euro Individual Association, established in 2012, and as Mikhail's review shows, still not institutionalized in the EURALO bylaw.

So the document that I'm basically looking at is the document under 4B, EURALO bylaws review.

And yeah, so we can briefly look at this, yeah, so there we go. So EURALO bylaws review. So this year, the paragraph three of the statutes, Euro Individual Association, says that financial resources in order to EURALO, Euro Individual Association can count on resources, the capacity of EURALO, such as the secretariat. And does not need financial resources or administrative facilities.

There are no corresponding obligations in the EURALO's bylaws. This raises the problem of the resources used. It doesn't show any of this. Let's then flip to the bylaw and see what we now have in the paragraph, I believe it is, 3D or something? [Inaudible]

I'm sorry, it just takes a little time for me to open this up. Just when you need it, your internet slows down.

Okay. So, paragraph three is, sorry paragraph four, here we go. Membership part D, membership for... In 4.6, it says a new European ALS will be created to collect unaffiliated individuals from the region. This ALS would be part of the existing EURALO structure, and would need to fulfill the minimum ALS requirements according to the ALS information framework, linked to the framework, and also ICANN bylaws, and we've got a link to the bylaws.

Once it is an integral part of the EURALO structure, this ALS would have the same rights and responsibilities as any other regional ALS. I open the floor now. I wondered, because this was done under Wolf's leadership, if Wolf could say a few words as to why this is written in that way. And then what I would like to hear from Mikhail then is that this is satisfactory, well we'll start a discussion then at that point from this

point onwards. And then I'll get Jean-Jacques Subrenat after that. So first, Wolf Ludwig please.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. Thanks for the floor, Olivier. It's Wolf Ludwig speaking for the record. This formulation is the result of a month long discussion we had at EURALO at the time. It started in 2010. And to do any bylaw changes, or amendments, it was clear from the beginning that we had to convince a vast majority of our community at the time.

And many of our ALSs, they're not in favor of doing any changes at all. This was more or less a starting point. When we discussed the details, whether it should be wishful or useful to better include individual members, and to give them their chances of participation at EURALO. Some of the members, okay, then said, okay, it reduces [inaudible], let's talk, let's discuss about modality. How we can do this.

And then we came up with different scenario. I have explained this, by the way, last week in the mailing list of the taskforce. We came up with different scenarios, and options, and finally, after a long discussion, the monthly calls. We came up with a conclusion of this sort of compromise that the former option would be most likely the most acceptable, and the option B at the time was that the EURALO individuals would have to create their own ALS and like a user At-Large structure, to become a regular member of our community.

And it was also more or less clear and part of the compromise at that time that this ALS should not have any special privilege or special status, special role once they would create [inaudible], organizing themselves

would create their ALS. They would apply by the ordinary process, as a regular process, to become certified At-Large structure, and that was finally when the bylaws, the bylaws were drafted, and the bylaws were accomplished.

It was Roberto at the time who pushed this process by applying via At-Large, etc. and that the way they became certified as any other ALSs. And the formulation we now have on the modified bylaws, in article 4.6 is reflecting the compromise, under which our bylaws could be amended in the voting process we conducted in Spring 2011, a couple of weeks prior to the Belgrade General Assembly.

These are, again, some recapitulation to make it clear why this formulation 4.6 was that, was done in such a manner and more or less reflecting the results of a month long discussion among the members. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Wolf, it's Olivier speaking. Was there any opposition to this ALS having any special position?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, of course it would have been... There was always, from the very beginning, then EURALO was created. In the process we drafted the EURALO bylaw. And there were a couple of members when we talked about individual members who are not a part of an existing At-Large structure, there was a strong feeling here of potential [inaudible]. If some hyperactive individuals by their special activities, and by the

knowledge, etc. would somehow bypass regular ALSs, and therefore for this year of [inaudible], in the original EURALO bylaws, they didn't have the same status as an ordinary ALS.

But then after, why we find out that this is unfair. And then we had to discuss modalities, how, in which way how to include them. And by discussing this modalities or scenarios, it was the only way what we could compromise with those members who were not really enthusiastic about this idea.

We had to find a way and a compromise, which was extremely difficult and time taking at the time. How we could include such individuals, and the outcome was the option B understood. They should have not have any thought of special status, because already the mentioning something like a special status would have completely destroyed the process, and we would not have got two-third majority, and there is a condition or under the prediction that this new ALS organizing individuals would have special status.

Therefore the special, the term itself, special status was point of objection and confusion at the time.

[CROSSTALK]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, it's Olivier speaking. Let's go over to Mikhail Medrish, because of course, we didn't have this 4.6 in front of our eyes last week. And I'd like to hear now from Mikhail as to what his points

are on this, and what do you suggest doing with this, and whether this is satisfactory or not. Mikhail you have the floor.

MIKHAIL MEDRISH:me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, we can hear you. Go ahead.

MIKHAIL MEDRISH: [CROSSTALK] Okay, thank you. It's Mikhail Medrish. Thank you Olivier for the floor. First of all, I would like to say that I agree there might be a new ALS for individual users, because... It is...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND Is Mikhail breaking up or...? Have we lost Mikhail?

SILVIA VIVANCO: It looks like we lost Mikhail, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We have lost Mikhail, okay. I think that Mikhail is calling through the Adobe Connect, perhaps it would be better he was dialed out too or something, because the internet in the evening sometimes is a little unstable. Let's just, for the time being, we can't hear him. For the time being, oh, he's fallen off the Adobe Connect now, ouch. It's a bit of a problem.

Obviously it's an Internet problem. Let's have Jean-Jacques Subreant. And Mikhail, welcome back. We had lost you Mikhail, if you can hear us. Let's try and see if you can arrange with staff [CROSSTALK]...

MIKHAIL MEDRISH: Is this okay? No?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, okay. So okay, let's try again with Mikhail one more time, if not we'll have to call you on your phone.

MIKHAIL MEDRISH: The phone, it's not good. Okay. [Inaudible] point B is okay for me. I agree with ALS, so no problem with this. I not agree with that it must be not, no privileges. No privileges, but it's necessary to mention that we have special... ALS...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Breaking up again. We lost you again Mikhail. All we heard is that you think that [CROSSTALK]... This is going to be a hard call if we have these technical problems.

And he's dropped off again. Okay, let's go over to Jean-Jacques Subreant please, for the time being.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBREANT: Thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes we can hear you. Go ahead Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Good. Good evening, good day all. I have issued remarks, having looked at the work by EURALO over the past few weeks. I have actually mainly two remarks. I'm struck by the fact that in the discussions, we should, Wolf referred to, thank you again Wolf for the very precious reminder of what we've done over the years.

I find that we term special status, and even more, the notion of privilege, or privileges, is a misnomer. I think that [inaudible] initiated this idea, mainly Roberto, was certainly not looking for any special status or special privilege. So I actually think that, whoever brought up the idea of using the term special status or privilege in the past discussions, perhaps did not use the most appropriate term.

The only specialty, as it were, of the association of which I am the chair of the board, is that it has no country specificity. It is open to either residents or citizens of a European country. That is the only distinctive feature. So rather than special status, I would say, distinctive feature. So that was my first point.

The second point is a wider point about law. And as you know, in law, in most countries, there is the notion of acquired rights, and also the notion of fairness. Now I appeal to you on this because I note that the EURALO individual users association was approved as an ALS, it was certified. That's something which is a very strong positive point.

And the second point in this argument is that [inaudible] to be EURALO Annual General meeting in Dublin in 2015, Roberto on behalf of the association of individual users and myself, we presented the association which was created that same day. And an election was held for the third time.

So the problem is that, seen from the outside, today, it seems that one of the choices, or one alternatives would be to shut down the individual users association on the grounds that something was not properly reflected in the bylaws. But for the point [inaudible] then is, I would argue that the only way forward is actually if necessary, if absolutely necessary, to change the bylaws.

But not certainly to discontinue an ALS which has already been approved and certified by the ICANN [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I don't think that there was any intent by anyone, or it hasn't been mentioned, that one should discontinue the ALS that has been created to collect unaffiliated individuals from the region. Quite the contrary, this is actually something that we have to do... We need to keep that ALS and we need to cater for individual users, as this was a part of the ALAC review, part of various different pieces of work that took place in reviewing how the At-Large community works.

But going back to this clause, 4.6, my feeling... I'll share my feeling on this is that, it does need to be revised in the way that, at the moment it says, a new European ALS will be created to collect unaffiliated

individuals from the region. Well, that has been created. So we should change this to has been created to collect unaffiliated individuals from the region.

So there are a number of things here which say, well these are the things that need to happen, and it actually also has some links to the At-Large website, and links to the ICANN website, which are very likely to not work anymore, and I would actually suggest that we don't put any links in bylaws, because as we know, websites change and so on.

So this needs to be cleaned up effectively. And then need to come up to this discussion as to... I understand certainly the opposition for this ALS to not have any actual privileges. In other words, it has the same voting privileges than any other ALS, it has just one vote, and it follows the whole thing of what ALSs do.

However, we do need to, I think, maybe put that... There are, I think, two differences between this ALS and others. The first one is that this one is non-geographical, so it covers all of Europe. That needs to be put somewhere. And secondly, that there might be some provisions for this ALS to obtain funding from ICANN in a certain way or other, as this is something that is...

But I'm not sure how that can be worded yet. So my feelings as to this. But certainly no special right as far as decisions or voting is concerned. Mikhail, let's try you again please.

MIKHAIL MEDRISH: I will try. First of all, I absolutely agree to exclude URLs, because you are absolutely right. It can be changed, not in bylaw because of this. Second, I absolutely agree to [inaudible] created [ASL?]. And I would like you to think about add one phrase, that information about this ALS might be clearly created on the first page of EURALO website to show all individuals the way to take part in the EURALO, as a bylaw requirement.

It is so, now, but I suppose it will be useful to have such phrase in bylaw. So to add, the necessity to have information about this, [inaudible] first page of EURALO website. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much for this Mikhail. We heard you a lot better, so much nicer to have you there. Now I saw earlier, Roberto Gaetano had put his hand up. Roberto, did you wish to add anything?

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes. This is Roberto. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very well.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yeah, I just wanted to point out that when I was working on the creation of the organization, I was well aware of the difficulties and the thin line that we had to follow. So, we were particularly careful in building the association in a way that could comply with all the requirements for an

ALS. We have only one exception, which is that the rule of EURALO, and I think in general for ALAC, for the ALS, is that they have to be financially independent and not require any support from ICANN.

This is by and large true in the sense that we are, through voluntary contributions, we are funding the website, the domain name, and everything. However, as Jean-Jacques has hinted, we had a General Assembly in Dublin, and at that point in time I needed help from ALAC staff for the instance to reserve a room, or these kind of things. That are not financial provision for our organization. We are financially independent.

But in order to support also the advertisement of our activities, we need to link with ICANN staff, for instance, for having a meeting space when we have a meeting in Europe and I'm in contact with Jean-Jacques Sahel for exchange of information on European activities and so on. So this is something that in my opinion, is not in contradiction with the bylaws.

But if we want to make sure that this is not in contradiction, I mean, since we are revising this, I think that I would like to have a situation by which this is not going to become a problem in the future, that somebody can raise because, I don't know, we get a one hour meeting room in the framework of the RALO meeting rooms when we have an ICANN meeting in Europe, or such kind of thing. That's all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this Roberto. That's very helpful. Now I'm also reading the chat, and I note that Jean-Jacques mentioned that he preferred to suggest not specific to one European country. But I note that Wolf said

that the geographical question is an issue for the EURALO independent bylaws, but not as a specification for the EURALO bylaws. Could you expand on this please Wolf?

You might be muted.

Okay, everyone is writing at the moment. Yeah, we can't hear you Wolf.

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, but I'm still here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, you are here. Okay, you mentioned on the chat that you thought that the, well you felt that the geographical question was an issue for the EURALO individual bylaws, but not a specification for the EURALO bylaws. And I asked whether you could please expand on this. Why not for the EURALO bylaws?

WOLF LUDWIG: Well, following the logic of what I explained before, it would have specified any special considerations for the EURALO individuals. It would have created another problem or handicap for the EURALO bylaws amendment at all as such. Therefore, the logic was okay, we need to specify on the group of individuals will be organized and draft their own bylaws, then in their bylaws, they have to point out to this special particularity that unlike other, usual EURALO ALSs, this particular ALS of the individuals is not based in a single European country, but is

more or less cross-European, and this was the most elegant way to avoid further confusions.

And therefore, it's logic that you point out this particularity in the bylaws, in the bylaws of the association itself, but not in the bylaws of EURALO. This is a more or less logical consequence from the discussion process and the compromise we had before. The other point Roberto mentioned, but we also discussed that some or most of the individuals will meet from time to time during regular ICANN meetings, and they may wish to organize side meeting for themselves to discuss the issues.

So this is a practical, logistical question which is also not needed to be specified in the bylaws. If you just for, in my opinion, an absurd example, then you could amend the EURALO bylaws as EURALO individual association has a right to a meeting at each ICANN meeting, or as a EURALO ALSs on [inaudible] would have the same rights. This makes no sense if you think it to the [inaudible].

Therefore you do not regulate such practical issues and bylaws. This is an operational question. Since we did in the past, and this we can do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks Wolf. Mikhail, you have the floor.

MIKHAIL MEDRISH: ...possibly to individual unaffiliated users, unaffiliated persons from Europe.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry Mikhail, you're... Sorry to interrupt. You're going to have to restart your sentence because I think we started hearing only halfway through your sentence.

MIKHAIL MEDRISH: Okay. It's our ability to give a possibility to unaffiliated individuals from Europe, to take part in the process, in ICANN process, At-Large ICANN process. It's our ability. We [inaudible] thinking about it and decided, and make a choice, and voted that the best way is to move in the direction of an organization of an ALS. A special ALS, cross-border for individuals all over Europe.

And I suppose it is necessary to move this logic further, if it is so, if it is our ability, it is also our ability to help this service because it's special, it's not legal entity from the very beginning side of ICANN. It is organized specially to be in ICANN as a mechanism to collect individuals. So we are to have this mechanism to be healthy, wealthy.

So we are not to give them money, but to help them in some organizational processes. I agree with Roberto that we are to help them in Adobe room, and maybe something else [inaudible], but it's resources, it's money in any case. It can be not... It's not [inaudible], it's money, it's resources. So we are to mention this in bylaw. And five years ago maybe a lot of ALSs were against this, but five years have passed.

Maybe today it will not so. Wolf, you are saying that it is very hard to remove this idea through the EURALO ALSs. I suppose not. I suppose

we are to explain and maybe all ALSs will agree. Why not? It is necessary only to try. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Mikhail. It's Olivier speaking. And let's turn it over to Wolf. Wolf Ludwig.

WOLF LUDWIG: Just a short one. It's Wolf Ludwig for the record. Just a short reply on the last statement by Mikhail, that I'm always describing the feelings among our ALSs from the past. You can believe me, in the last couple of years, just inherit with my function, I had regular and intensive discussions with many of our members.

And the last opportunity, I met many of our members was during the Dublin ICANN meeting when we had our General Assembly. And there again, I got the impression, I can tell you honestly, we have around 10 member ALSs in Germany, and for any demanding bylaw amendments, you would not get support from their side, but practically or simply means, if only the number of German ALSs will abstain or object to any further going bylaw amendments, you will never get a true majority.

It's a simple mathematical calculation, and it's not because I'm in any way an economist, or person who likes to always refer to the past, it still reflects the sentiments and feelings of many of our members. And when I discussed with members in that plane, many of them said we do not see a necessity for such bylaws discussions, but then it was a waste

of time. It's a vote from October last year, and not from 2011. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks Wolf. It's Olivier speaking. I want step out of the whole overall discussion, whether the bylaws need to be changed or not changed, or whether it's going to pass or not pass. I see Mikhail had put his hand up, I can give you the floor Mikhail for one last thing, and then I was going to make a proposal.

MIKHAIL MEDRISH: Okay, very brief. Wolf, I understand you, but if you try to calculate, as I can imagine, we have more than 30 ALSs, more than 30 minus 10 is more than two-thirds. So, and you just say you recommend proposals ALSs, maybe it is not. Maybe they're not, all of them will again, against. So my opinion is we are moving in this direction, and our ability to give a possibility to individuals all over Europe to be in ICANN process and At-Large.

So we are to have this ALS, it's non-commercial for some reasons, a special ALS, a special need for this purpose. As I can imagine, maybe I'm not right. If it is so, we ought to have them with some special activities, which is necessary. So it's not bad.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much for this Mikhail. Now, I'm going to suggest then the following text, and see how that flies around with everyone. I'm going to place it in the chat, one line at a time, or one paragraph at a

time. The first one says, 4.6A, the new European ALS has been created to offer a home to unaffiliated individuals from the region.

This ALS is part of the existing EURALO structure, and needed to fulfill the minimum ALS requirements according to the ALS formation framework and ICANN bylaws. That's effectively saying the same thing as we have at the moment, but putting it into the present, rather than saying this needs to be created in the future.

And the next line, B, is this. This ALS has the same rights and responsibilities as any other regional ALS. And then third one is C, this ALS is not specific to one European country, and is [inaudible] across European entity. And D, I think that needs to be said. Only one such ALS can be created. We don't want competing ALSs that are there to offer a home for unaffiliated individuals.

And E, information about this ALS needs to be displayed on the first page of the EURALO website. And by the way E, I think we might not need to put there. I know that Mikhail is asking for this to be there, but I'm not totally convinced that it needs to be there. I don't think it's something that would be, that would kill the deal.

But there might be some people that decide to object to this, because they say well, why is the one for individuals on the first page of the EURALO website when our own At-Large structure is not on the first page of the EURALO website? And I can understand the thinking behind that.

So I'd like to get some feedback on this, how you feel about this. And whether this satisfies, or at least eases Mikhail's concerns, and whether

this is something... And Wolf, I'd like to hear you specifically, since you are our memory in this, whether this might be something that will fly. And also, of course, from Jean-Jacques and from Roberto to see if they're happy with this.

I can see that Jean-Jacques is saying, agreed on all except E. So, that seems to be fine with Jean-Jacques Subrenat. Now is the rest of it, basically.

Yeah, I see from Wolf, so not E, because otherwise the other ALSs will request the same right of highlighting on the website. Mikhail, what do you think about it?

MIKHAIL MEDRISH: I not insist, I not insist because if individuals are not insist, okay, okay, it's yours, no problems. I not insist.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: What about the rest of the proposal? A, B, C, and D.

MIKHAIL MEDRISH: I agree. I agree.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So this, I mean I'm not seeing anyone object to A, B, C, and D. So staff, I don't know who is taking the action items or the notes, if you could be A, B, C, D, yes, and well also do put down E, but please write down that there were objections to E being there.

And so we would probably have A, B, C, D. The way that we can then propose it to EURALO ALSs is to propose it with A, B, C, D, and E, and always say that we're ready to take E away, as there were objections. Jean-Jacques Subrenat and then [CROSSTALK]...

WOLF LUDWIG: Olivier, just a short point. It provokes unnecessary discussion if you include E.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so take E out [CROSSTALK]...

WOLF LUDWIG: It's technically wrong to make a proposal where you can assume that there will be broader resistance from other members, like I pointed out, otherwise ordinary ALS may insist the same right of being highlighted on the website. So take E out, [inaudible] any discussions, concentrate on the essentials, A, B, C, D, and try to carry it on and convince a majority of our members.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks Wolf. We have a queue now. Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, Olivier. Thank you. This is Jean-Jacques speaking. So Olivier, whilst listening to your presentation, I was agreeing with everything, and also I agree with Wolf that we should take away E. I see that has been done.

But just, I had the idea that under B, it might be useful to add the data regarding the certification of this ALS, because the reader of this text may wonder if perhaps someone had omitted asking for the certification, or indeed for ICANN to grant it.

So I would ask staff to dig up the references and perhaps just to say in the briefest possible way that this ALS is certified. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm sorry Jean-Jacques, I lost your last sentence that you said. And say in the most appropriate way that...?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: That... Thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. To say in the briefest possible way that this ALS was certified and add the date of the reference. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. So that's the proposal. Any other, are there any objections to this? Perhaps mention it in brackets says Wolf. Okay, that's a good idea then. And there will be, [inaudible] this was certified, staff, okay, thank you. Mikhail Medrish.

MIKHAIL MEDRISH: ...information about the individuals in the first stage of our website today.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, there already is, yeah exactly. Thank you. It's Olivier is. So there already is, but I guess if we put it in the bylaws, some people will go, hang on, why is this on the first page? Why is our ALS not on the first page? Well if we don't put it in the bylaws, they won't notice that it's on the first page.

I think that's what, you know, not wanting to wake up a sleeping dragon is what Wolf was trying to say basically.

It's a funny world, and it's all about consensus and trying to find this thing of having balance basically. So okay. All right. So that's one thing. We have another five minutes until the end of this call. I wanted to perhaps look and seeing if we're okay with this, then the first point that Mikhail is making, EURALO individuals association, and if everyone is fine with this proposal, then the next thing we're going to have to work on is the governing bodies, the EURALO officers and their functions.

That does not correspond to real life. We've got EURALO chair, we've got the articles of association. I say there is a chair, there is a deputy chairman. There is a statute for a secretary. There is a position of a treasurer, and there is a position for an advisory council. And none of these have existed according to Mikhail's review. And we will have to discuss, I guess now in our next call, since we only have four minutes on this call, we will then have to start thinking and discussing as to, I would say, why those positions are there.

Why they are not filled at the moment, why they don't reflect the current structure of the EURALO. Whether we wish to change the structure, the current structure of EURALO to reflect what's in the

bylaws, or whether we want to align the bylaws to what we're doing in the real life.

So, I see that Wolf Ludwig has put his hand up. So Wolf, you have the floor.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Yes. Thanks Olivier. It's Wolf Ludwig for the record. I agree on your last suggestion, that some of the functional aspects like rules, etc. role of the board, this has to be looked at in our next meeting. I just want to note for the record here, when we drafted the EURALO bylaws in 2006, I was from the beginning, against putting point E, part E, financial matters of it, because I was already convinced at the time it would be sort of wishful thinking.

That the typical German approach, and by the way, it was a German who pushed this part E into the bylaw, it will practically never made any sense. And my very pragmatic suggestion would be just before [inaudible] taking time and discuss about a necessity of something what never happened, and what will never happen, in my opinion, in the future, my practical suggestion would be simply to drop the whole part E.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay Wolf, thank you. It's Olivier speaking. So E funds of the association financial matters. We haven't reached that point yet. I don't think we're looking at this yet, but let's put this on the side, and record this because I'm sure we will be touching on this at some point.

And my suggestion, when I was reading this, was actually we could keep this open, as an open door and say, funds of the association and we would say, you know, if there was a need for it, or if there was a, I haven't even thought about wording for that, but you know, put this as a conditional thing in saying, well, you know, there is the option of...

If the association had funds, there is the thing of being like this. But if there isn't, then this paragraph is to be ignored or something like that. I don't have the exact wording for it. Mikhail?

MIKHAIL MEDRISH:

Some very brief, about [funds]. I suppose it is necessary before we discuss this point, to look at the operational of our neighbors for other RALOs. [Inaudible] mentioned what they are thinking about it. I suppose it will be useful. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thanks for this Mikhail. It's Olivier speaking. Let's take this as an action item. So I'll take this, and I'll ask all four other RALOs about what their, you know, what they have in this kind of matter. So as far as financial matters are concerned, and as far as their structure is concerned. Mikhail?

MIKHAIL MEDRISH:

[Inaudible] I have, all operational principles of all RALOs. Just today [inaudible] distributed, it will be [faster?]. And after that, it can be possible to ask someone from other RALOs to give details.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. And I guess you'll be sending this to our mailing list immediately afterwards?

MIKHAIL MEDRISH: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent, thank you. We have run out of time on today's call, but we have made some progress. I'm quite pleased to hear and to see. And we've also noted Wolf's point on being able to perhaps get rid of, or shorten our bylaws by getting rid of the financial matters part. Next week, and I suggest we have a call next week, we will be looking at the bodies of the association.

We will be starting specifically at the officers, and I think that this is part number eight point... Which point is it now? I don't even have it there.

WOLF LUDWIG: It's part F starting with eight bodies of association.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's it, yes. Correct. So we'll work on that, and we'll be starting and seeing what we do with the different positions that are there. And going from line to line. In any case, we will have a Doodle sent out to schedule a call next week. I'm going to be at the WSIS Forum next week, so with limited availability, but I will try my best.

Certainly, in the evening, it would be possible for me to run the call, or even in some of the afternoons. I'll follow up with staff, and I hope that you all have the ability to be on the call at a suitable time. We're not a huge group, so hopefully it's not too difficult to find a good time.

Gisella will coordinate and find something. Okay, I think that's all. Thank you very much for all of this. I'll follow up with staff on any action items, and please continue the discussions on the mailing list if you wish to. I think this was a good call, and I thank you all for attending.

I know it's very late in some of the places that you are calling from, so have a very good night. Thank you and this call is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]