TERRI AGNEW:	Welcome to the EURALO monthly teleconference, taking place on Tuesday, the 26th of July 2016 at 18:00 UTC.
	On the call today, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Yrjö Länsipuro, Roberto Gaetano, Siranush Vardanyan, Wolf Ludwig, Nick Thorne, and Sébastien Bachollet.
	We have apologies from Christopher Wilkinson, Sandra Hoferichter, Mikhail Medrish, Oksana Prykhodko, Bastiaan Goslings, and Jean-Jacques Sahel.
	From staff we have Gabriella Shittek, Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, and myself, Terri Agnew.
	I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. With that, I'll turn it back over to Olivier. Please begin.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much Terri. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Have we missed anybody in the roll call?
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Olivier? This is Heidi.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND	Yes, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, I just wanted to note that Rinalia sent her apologies, and she's now going to be invited to all EURALO monthly calls, given that she is now based in Europe. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you very much Heidi. So one more set of apologies to add to the long list that we have today. My name is Olivier Crépin-Leblond. And so welcome everyone. We weren't expecting that many people, as you know, in July and August. Most people in Europe are somewhere warm, somewhere south, somewhere far away from a computer or some kind of communication device.

Let's go and see if we can get through our call today rather swiftly. As you know, this is the first call after our face to face General Assembly that took place in Helsinki. It was not a funded face to face General Assembly, but we had a good amount, number of people that joined up.

So we have a number of action items, both from the previous conference call that we had in June, and also from the General Assembly. First the previous call. And I can note here that all of the action items have been completed, and including the first one, which doesn't have a little box where I was to ask the ALAC Chair if there was a place in At-Large to discuss the protection of geographic name.

The response was that there is indeed, that would be in the new gTLD working group. But we know that there is a discussion going on at the moment in the GAC when it comes down to geographic names, and so

the ALAC is very attentive to seeing what discussion is taking place. And it looks as though there might be some public commenting period at some point on this topic, in which case the ALAC will be most probably drafting something about it, if there is a need for it.

But, as I said earlier, the home for discussion of protection to geographic names, would be the new gTLD working group. All of the other action items have been completed. There is a link in your agenda to these action items, I'm not going to read for each one of them. Are there any comments or questions on the action items from our last conference call?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so then we have the action items from the General Assembly, but those are actually hidden on the Wiki page, which is linked to our agenda. If you scroll down… This is the action item page for all of the ALAC and At-Large meetings that have taken place. Scroll down to Tuesday the 20th of… Actually, it says Tuesday, 20th, 2016.

Obviously there is an error here that could be fixed. The EURALO General Assembly. So that took place in two parts, from 8 to 9 AM, and from 8:15 to 10:30. We're going to go into more detail into the GA itself, just as a quick review. But as Heidi has just mentioned, Gisella was to invite Rinalia to all of the monthly calls. So she'll be doing that.

There are still two action items there which are not complete. The first one is for the EURALO At-Large structure outreach and engagement taskforce to discuss reporting requirements for EURALO At-Large structures to be compiled possibly in a document to be produced

annually. And that's something which we're going to talk about later in this call, with Yrjö Länsipuro. The newly selected, elected, I don't know how we can call it, maybe nominated, there we go, nominated Chair to, of the taskforce.

In fact, the last link that we have here, on this paragraph, mentions that Silvia is to send a message to EURALO engagement, ALS engagement taskforce mailing list, and several members have volunteered, or several people have volunteered. Eric [inaudible], [inaudible], Yrjö Länsipuro, also on the taskforce, and I think there is also Wolf Ludwig, a couple of other people there.

If anybody is not on this taskforce and is interested in this, please just drop a note to Wolf, or me, or staff, and you'll be added to it. We'll speak about it in a moment. And secondly, there was also a request for me, so from Olivier to request volunteers for EURALO ALS for At-Large structure spotlight, in their monthly teleconferences. And that's something which I wanted to briefly talk about.

The idea is to have, do a little bit like some of the other regional At-Large organizations do, which is to offer the chance for an At-Large structure to tell us about their work, as it relates to ICANN and as it relates to the At-Large community. It might not need to be directly related, but somehow related. It's going to be to do with internet governance and things that do.

Let's see. We can start that off and see how it flies with other At-Large structures. We haven't announced it yet by email, and that task on my desk, I think, for the week. Most people have taken a break after the

ICANN meeting, so things have been moving on, but we now are ready to get moving on this as well. Are there any comments or questions? These are the only action items that we have from the General Assembly, or these, the ones that are recorded here.

I don't see anyone putting their hand up. We're going to come back to the Helsinki meeting and the General Assembly anyway. The next item in our agenda is the current public comments. And I realize that last month, or during the last call, I spent about 20, or was it maybe 25 minutes, talking about this review of public comments. I personally think that policy is particularly important in the number of tasks that we need to do, but obviously talking about past policy might not be the best way to move forward.

There are a huge number of public comments, at the moment, requiring decisions, requiring drafting. So much for volunteer overload, and that's not my personal feeling, but certainly a little worried about this at the moment. There was one statement approved by the ALAC, that's the statement about the proposed amendments to the base new generic top level domain name registry agreement. If you're interested in this, it got 10 votes in favor.

I think that was partly drafted during the Helsinki meeting. A number of very interesting points which the ALAC has made, and since that time, there has been a revised new gTLD registry agreement. Unfortunately, I haven't had the chance to note whether comments were taken into account or not. So I would later on and see, and maybe report on it on the mailing list.

There is a statement currently being drafted, that's about creating a consumer agenda at ICANN, and that's not in response to a public comment, but that's a spontaneous statement to effectively tell the ICANN Board that there doesn't seem to be, at the moment, any kind of agenda, consumer agenda, at ICANN, draft view.

And I guess there are other people that have volunteered to help with that. They will present that there is a case for putting together a consumer agenda at ICANN. I note that Jean-Jacques Subrenat, you've put your hand up. Is this in relation to this statement specifically?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, hello Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques speaking. When on the Board and later on the ALAC, on several occasions, I questioned the choice of the word consumer group or consumer [inaudible], etc. because my point was that, in many cases, using the word consumer was reducing the user perspective of an user experience to only a commercial aspect of an user entity, or the user reality in ICANN and in the internet in general.

So although very belatedly, and I put the question again in the context of EURALO and ALAC, would it be worth considering this once again, reformulating this to, really in a broader way to user requirements rather than on the consumer? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you very much for this Jean-Jacques Subrenat. It's Olivier speaking. And on this occasion, and this follows the discussions, on this

occasion it looks as though this is more geared towards people who register domain names. So who purchase domain names, register domain names, and people who purchase goods on the internet, and therefore use the domain names in a matter of reaching a website in a very reliable way, etc.

So I do understand your point regarding the user agenda. What I would suggest is that perhaps you go on that Wiki page, and you know, comment about this, and get basically Garth to get some input from this, certainly mentioning the user agenda. I think that's important. What I do note, let me just check this, because I'm not sure if there are any comments so far.

Yeah, there is certainly a text at the moment, first draft submitted. Jean-Jacques, I would suggest that perhaps you could write your comment in there, and take it from there. The comments open on the 11th, so they've been open for a week already, but there is no closing date. So that would probably be helpful to launch a discussion on the Wiki page.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Jean-Jacques. Next we have Heidi Ullrich. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Thank you Olivier. This is Heidi. I'm just wondering whether this statement should be reviewed by the working group on the public interest, that Wolf chairs. You know, I think that that working group would be able to have interesting things to say on this. And also, it would lend legitimacy to the statement that the working group and publications could take a look at that, and added their thoughts on it. Thanks very much.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thanks very much Heidi. It's Olivier speaking. Wolf is, I guess you are online. What are your thoughts on this? Wolf Ludwig.
WOLF LUDWIG:	Sorry. Thanks Olivier. I had to unmute my line. Well, it's… It's coming a little bit, sort of say, by surprise. I have to have a closer look on it, but I guess, if Heidi suggests maybe a better link or connection with public interest issues. I can imagine it's a good idea. So let me say, I will have a closer look at it, and the given case, I will put it on the list of our potential subjects.

Is this enough for you for the moment? |
| OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: | Yes, thanks very much Wolf. It's Olivier speaking. That's perfect. So, maybe we can maybe just have this as an action item, so as to not let it fall through the cracks, and you can just follow-up. So you will follow-up with the request for creating, well, with creating a consumer agenda at ICANN part. And so will Jean-Jacques Subrenat as well. |

Excellent. Let's just move on then please. Let's go on to the statement that seems to be stalled at the moment. Alan Greenberg is proposing drafting a response on the request for inputs about rights protection mechanism on all generic top level domains. There is no first draft yet, as I see. So if any of you are interested in this topic, you'd like to move it forward, please volunteer to help Alan out on this, since we are only a few days away from the end of the month.

Next, the new public comments requirements decision. Our mention is requiring decision, so there is not even anybody currently stepping forward to draft a first draft, to read it, to provide feedback, etc. We can see there is a huge quantity. I'll try to go through them quickly. First, the ICANN Fellowship Program Application process review. There have been some amendments to the program, and so as with any amended program in ICANN, they are collecting public opinion on this.

We are somehow effected by this, due to the fact that the Fellowship has always been restricted to certain regions, and there have been some requests made by the ALAC on widening the scope of the geographic reach of this program, and several other things. So if you're interested in this specifically, please have a look. We've only got until the 29th of July to comment, so only a couple of days left.

But to me, it looks like they've followed most of the recommendations or comments that we've made over the years, we as in the At-Large community, I don't see anything that really warrants the pushback of some sort, unless I've not read closely enough.

Next, the draft post-transition IANA articles of incorporation. As you know, the IANA stewardship transition has asked for post-transition IANA, wholly owned subsidiary organization. So a wholly owned subsidiary of ICANN, but that still requires articles of incorporation, and these are the ones which have been drafted by the independent lawyer law that the cross community working group on IANA stewardship transition is using.

I'm part of that working group. I haven't noticed anything specific to point out in the very legal language. Next, the input requested. Supportive organization and advisory committee, stakeholder group and consistency outreach. The new generic top level domain subsequent procedures. That's, of course, to do with the next round of applications. There are two chars to this working group, it's a generic name supporting organization working group, GNSO, policy development process.

If there first request for input, they've got a large number of issues that they've identified. We might have a few more issues that we might wish to point out, but it looks pretty complete so far. Next, the reference label generation rule sets for the second level. Another of these fantastic titles for a request for public comment, that means absolutely nothing, but actually has to do with internationalized domain names.

I wish that they made these things a little bit easier for people to understand. But this is all to do with the second level. So the top level would be, let's say, if we used a Latin character set, top level could be dot COM. Second level would be ICANN, or top level or second level is

ICANN as in ICANN dot ORG. And they're looking at label generation rule sets. There is something that is required when you've got an internationalized domain name, so non-Latin character sets.

And there needs to be a rule, because some words can be written in many different ways, that needs to know when it's equivalent and when it's not equivalent. Next, the post-transition IANA governance document. These are further documents for the creation of post-transition IANA, and that also includes the different people that are supposed to work, so the different positions, etc. in IANA.

You know, if there is going to be a chair, a vice-chair, a Board, how many people on the Board, etc. Next, the draft post-transition IANA bylaws. Yes, another thing about post-transition IANA. We are creating a new organization. That closes on the 11th of August. You can see there are so many of these things going on in parallel, and these are the full bylaws that are working with the articles of incorporation.

Again, we have people directly involved with the drafting of these bylaws, and so far, I don't see anything that really stands out. Next, the proposed amendments to the dot COM registry agreements. As you know, VeriSign needs to, well, VeriSign is running dot COM, and so there are a few amendments that need to be made in there.

I haven't even had a chance to look at this, I must admit. So if anybody has, please follow-up, after I finished reviewing this and let us know. Next, the proposed measures to letter to letter, two character ASCII labels to avoid confusion with corresponding country codes. And that's an interesting one, of course.

It is when you've got two-letter ASCII labels. For example, IT and LT are very similar to each other, especially when one is the lower-case L and one is the upper-case I, I think that's [inaudible] together. There is also the one and the L looks very similar, etc. But they're proposing some measures to avoid this confusion, because we are seeing more and more requests for country codes to be available at the second-level.

So you'd have a generic top-level domain, dot, let's start with dot COM again, and then you'd have the second level would be UK dot COM, or IC dot COM, or LC dot COM, and so there is some potential confusion there. I must say, I haven't even had a chance to look at this in detail.

The next one is one which we've seen so many of, which is the release of country and territory names within the specific set of top level domains, in general, the ALAC has not responded to these. The next one is about guidelines, that the new string similarity review program. Now the string similarity review is all about again, characters which might look very similar, and might be different.

Again, it has got to do with the internationalized domain name, and perhaps we should really ask our working group that deals with this. [Inaudible] until the 31st of August, so both the label generation rules, and the string similarity review process should really be punted over to the new gTLD, sorry, the IDN working group, the internationalized domain name working group.

And the… We're reaching the end soon. The independent review of trademark clearinghouse services draft report is… As you know, a few years ago, the trademark clearinghouse was created to make sure any

issues to do with trademarks in the new generic top level domains, especially at sunrise, so when the domain is being launched, would be dealt with in a sort of even way.

This is the first review of the trademark clearinghouse. So that's a system where you can put your trademarks… Instead of having to register… Let's say you've got a domain like me, for… Let's say ICANN, and you say, well ICANN is used by ICANN, you register this in the trademark clearinghouse and anybody who is trying to register a domain name ICANN in any of the participating top level domains, would then be notified that ICANN has got a trademark over ICANN. This sort of thing.

So that's kind of… And it's a registered trademark. I don't know if ICANN has a registered trademark, but if it did, that's what it would do. So there is a review of it. Interesting reading. But I'm not sure that we have so many people qualified to be able to go deeply into this. And then finally, the generic top level domain marketplace health index. That's a new program.

It's something which was asked in the first round of the new generic top level domain, and it's basically to find out if all of the launch of the new generic top level domains has helped the market, has it brought prices up, brought prices down? Has it widened consumer choice? Has it brought consumer confusion? And how have these new domains, new top level domains been used?

What types of customers have they had? Etc. And so that's [inaudible], the very first one that they're working on. That would be pretty

EN

interesting, and I think that would certainly go into our registrant, registrant rights working group, and also in the generic top level domain working groups.

I have made it less long then last month, but it still has been pretty long due to the volume of things that we have to comment on. The floor is open, and I now see Sébastien Bachollet. Sébastien, you now have the floor.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you Olivier. Yes, a few things. The first one is that, I really think that if we want to involve more people, we need to find a way, I don't know where, and I don't know how, but to have a short summary, not just a written short summary in what is happening in all of those policy development processes, but something in speaking. Why? Because we can go to the Wiki page, but it's just in English.

And if we, if you don't go, you don't go. If you are here, I think, you're at ALAC meeting, or meeting you want, we want to have a short summary of somebody who knows a little bit. If nobody knows, that's another plan, we may find somebody from staff, or from another organization. But I really think that we need to stop this discussion of this topic, but not the substance.

And now to answer a little bit in this substance, just a little bit, and just to be sure about what you say. I guess what is on discussion, it's for new gTLD, and the example you took was with dot COM or dot ORG, and I am not sure that it's for them. And when I say I'm not sure, it's because I don't, I am not sure. But I guess you may have, be better to

take some example with new gTLDs, and with the very old TLDs from the domain name.

And the other point, I really think that it's just more and more crazy, the number of topics we have, the small number of people doing it, nothing against them, but if they are not able to find somebody else, then let's stop. We don't need to do everything if we can't have the people to do it. And I really think that this discussion about some of the topics need to be taken with more care for our members, for the ALS and the member of the ALSs. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sébastien. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I take your three points. First on the sort of drafting of explanations, or being able to provide explanations, and perhaps in-depth explanations on each one of these public comments. There is a program that is starting, and that's the document drafting, which we are going to be speaking about shortly, but that's not, I take it, of course, as you said, that it's not recorded as such.

So, and it would be in English, and so that may be at one point, but I note that Alan put his hand up, so I'll let him speak to this. Next on the, my examples where I took the legacy top level domains instead of the new generic top level domains, point taken. I guess, I just, at this moment, having been out of the ICANN thing for a week, I just can't think of a new generic top level domain perhaps, I don't know.

And finally, the volunteer overload, well understood. I don't know either how we're going to be able to deal with that. It's funny, on one

side, we are told, oh, we're doing our best to have as few public comments periods, and to, you know, stretch them in the distance and so that we even them out, and there is not too many.

And yet now, it's the summer and the craziness of the calendar have made it, but there is quite a few coming out of the accountability working group, and the IANA stewardship working group, and we say, oh volunteer overload, terrible. And on the other side, we dump the community with so much stuff on their shoulders.

I don't know. But my personal feeling is that ultimately, this is all going to collapse. I'm really sorry about this, but it doesn't like right to be doing so much there. But Alan Greenberg, please save us.

You might be saving us Alan, but I think you might be muted at the moment.

Or maybe I've dropped off, I don't know.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No Olivier, you are still online and I guess it's Alan we cannot hear.

TERRI AGNEW: Alan, this is Terri. I confirm, your line is now open.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. Thank you for this Terri. Whilst Alan dials in, or dials back in, are there any other comments or questions on the points that we've had discussed so far? And, by the way, this whole thing of volunteer

burnout is very real, and all of the, certainly the supporting organization advisory committees and everyone else has said, we need to do something about this and slow things down.

And yet, I will note that there are also, if it's six reviews that are coming up, or five reviews, including the At-Large review, but also a whole lot of other reviews, it's a bit strange. Who do we have now? Sébastien, Roberto, and then Alan Greenberg. Alan, please let me know when you are back on. Are you back now? Okay, so let's start with Alan Greenberg then. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Assuming you can hear me this time.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Good. I don't know what happened last time. A number of things. Clearly, we have to do a better job at getting information out. And that's one of the prime things that is coming out of the ALS criteria and expectations, that we can't expect anyone else, anyone outside of the people who are following things very closely, to get involved, unless we can give them simple, you know, easy to understand blurbs.

Now, what we're dealing with are often very complex subjects. So it's not clear that everything is going to be addressable in a one page, easy to understand document, but we need to do better and that's well

understood. And hopefully, you know, as we go into the… Later in the year, we will start doing that on a regular basis.

It's not going to fix everything, but it should help a little bit. In terms of we can't do everything, we are increasingly not responding to certain comments. We sometimes agonize over it, and then don't respond by default, but certainly, a significant number of them we are not responding to now, and I think we probably have to increase that, and we have to look carefully at, is there really user components in this, or something else that we feel very strongly about?

And again, those are decisions that we tend take either on the leadership calls, if the timing is such, or on the ALAC call. The ALAC call later today, we have 50 minutes allocated to go over all of these new comments, and try and determine, is it really something that we should be talking about or not? So hopefully everyone will participate in that process.

And overall, I think Olivier is right. The number of comments right now is just ridiculous. Some of them are related to PTI, others are not. Partly they're related to new gTLDs, partly they're related to just stuff that is coming up. And for a, what is the middle of the summer for those in the Northern Hemisphere, it's an absolutely ridiculous load. And this whole concept that we have to predict things, that we know about them ahead of time, in my mind, just is not working.

And so I do think the process needs to be looked at. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Sébastien Bachollet is next.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, I have one question, as I didn't look, the situation. But with PTI, it seems that we are in a creation of a new structure, and it seems that it will be different from the ICANN way of incorporation. If somebody have some information on that I will be, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Sébastien. Alan, did you wish to say a few words on this?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I'm not sure I know what Sébastien means by different from the ICANN method of incorporation. I'll be quite blunt. PTI was not something that I think we really needed or wanted. We've ended up with it. I do not think the details of what the bylaws say, or the articles of incorporation say, are going to make it or break it.

And from my point of view, I have not put a lot of energy into the details of it. Other people can take a different position, but I just don't think it's going to have a huge impact on users. It's either going to fall flat on its face for operational reasons. It's clearly going to cost a lot of money that we didn't, in my mind, we didn't need to spend. But it is what it is, and I don't think the details that people are agonizing over on the articles of incorporation or the bylaws, or the structure of the Board, is going to make one iota of change, a difference. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. It's Olivier speaking. And I agree with you. Sébastien, do you wish to respond to this?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you Alan. And definitely, I fully agree with you. I just that, you know, ICANN is see something, US, and PTI will be another one thing that it will be another way of doing the finals, and the non-for-profit, and I think this little part need at least, we need to be sure that it will not create any impact on what we think user needing this all [inaudible].

I have no doubt that people are doing their best, but I would like to be very sure. And I just got this impression, and I just knew, that's why I was asking the question, but maybe if somebody has the answer, it would be great. They think they have to go into the detail. But the rest of the composition of the Board, as you say, so be it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Sébastien. It's Olivier speaking. And [inaudible] raise this point, I guess it would be at the ALAC meeting. I have the feeling that some people might know the answer. Did I hear somebody trying to…

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan. Just one quick comment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. My understanding is the endpoint is the same as ICANN. It's incorporated at the not-for-profit, and then we have to go through the process of applying to the Internal Revenue Service, the tax people, to be tax exempt, and a charitable organization. So my understanding is the endpoint intent is to be the same class as corporation as ICANN, but it's a multistep process.

That's my understanding. If I'm wrong, so be it. But…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. Next is Roberto Gaetano.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes. This is Roberto for the transcript. I would like to go back to the general statement about the, how many comments we are involved in. On the one hand, I think it's important that we comment because one of the basic objectives that we have is to participate in the policy development. And if we are not involved in the process, then we have not a lot of influence.

On the other hand, I surely understand that when in a teleconference like this, we have a whole list of items that are presented to us, and then we try, in the teleconference, just to do something about it. There is something wrong here.

I believe that when the comment period starts, or when the working group starts, or whatever, we all know that because we all subscribe to the mailing list, and so we know that something starts that is of interest to us, either within ALAC we have somebody, or at least one person who is interested in holding the pen, and gathering the feedback in the name of ALAC and staff discussion.

And in that case, we can do something that is meaningful, or it's not even worth it to have the 15-minute discussion about knowing what is happening. On the long list, I am interested in a couple of items, I believe that there are several other items that are obviously of interest to ALAC, but that I don't have a particular intention to invest time in it, and there are a few items that I think are completely irrelevant.

And so we need to have a process where we can concentrate on the items where we have one, somebody who is willing to take hold of them and start something and gather a meaningful feedback. Second, we believe that the results are of interest to ALAC, and then concentrate on those rather than having just, you know, a long explanation of what these things are, which I believe we all know.

And if not, maybe staff can just write an email summary of what those items are, and we don't need to lose time in teleconferences. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Roberto. It's Olivier speaking. And I think that one of the reasons why we have such a long list is because the scheduling of this call was before the ALAC call, and so the ALAC has not actually

EN

made that selection of what it's going to be answering and what it might not answer, and so on. So it might be that we have a special, we're in a special [consideration?] this month because of this.

And so we haven't had this first triage, which I think you're asking for, in which I would totally agree with. And hopefully that triage will take place. Now if the triage could take place as early as possible, that would probably be good because by the time we then share this, then we certainly have more chance to just focus on the items that are of interest to this community.

But there is always a question as to who would have to do the triage, and what I heard from Alan is that it seems to be that the ALAC would be doing the triage. Alan, do you have any points on this specifically? And I would also like to move on, because we are 45 minutes into this call nearly. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just two quick points. In general, what Roberto is describing is what happens. The problem is actually carrying it out. A lot… Sending out email to the lists saying we have new public comments, does anyone want to do anything on it? Gets virtually no response from anyone. And that's one of the realities that we have to deal with, or fix that.

The other thing is that some of these are not trivial. You can't just look at them quickly. The example is the base register agreement, which several of us looked at, said no, there is not very much there, and then talking to other people in Helsinki, we realized there were four or five things which were important to At-Large and we have to comment on.

There are a number of the current ones that are in a similar category. You know, the string similarity, which is largely to do with ccTLDs and IDNs. It may well be something that's innocuous, or it's an issue which has been of great concern to At-Large, and until someone takes the time to go over the document in some detail, someone with a fair amount of history, it's really hard to tell what status it's in.

Simple solutions, I don't think, are going to address the problem. We're going to have to think about it in a different way than we are now. And going back to what Sébastien said, we need to get more people involved in the process on a regular basis, and that's with the triage too. How do we do that? I don't know. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Next is Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques speaking. I agree with all of the points made by Alan, Sébastien, and yourself Olivier. But I would like to step back a bit and go back to the first ALAC meeting I attended late in 2010, and my intention was at the time I was struck by the huge effort that the ALAC was already making in commenting on various things, which have been initiated by other parts of ICANN.

And it's in that context, that I have proposed through ALAC of a future challenges working group, which I realize has not been active now for more than a year, perhaps more. Now if I mention this, it's because I would like to bring to your attention two things. The first is that,

unexpectedly only the mailing list of the current informative actors of the ICANN Board, that has been going on the past few weeks, that is [inaudible] very interesting discussion about, which would, possible improvements of ICANN [inaudible] structurally, but also in terms of it's working [inaudible].

And the second feature I noticed is that in various parts of ICANN, people are putting the same question which is of his or her own constituency part of ICANN. Now, with the transition proposal, there is something new, which is the proposal to set up PTI, etc. but also the Consumer Council.

So I think that for once, I have something to propose which would be specific [inaudible], which would be to suggest that ALAC could look at the, not at the consumer, but the user, the internet user perspectives. What does all of this mean? What does the PTI, or what would it mean from the user perspective? And could we propose any adjustments or things which the [inaudible] community should be careful [inaudible].

That's the kind of thing which I think would be interesting. I see Roberto writing, this is a philosophical issue. But then, the situation is there is no harm [inaudible] that philosophical and the question [inaudible]. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this intervention, Jean-Jacques. It's Olivier speaking. I think that this could be the sort of discussion that the working group on the public interest would be interested in. Because I somehow feel that the user perspective and the end user perspective,

dies tie in with the public interest. And this is similar kind of a discussion, not only looking at the public interest, but effectively seeing does ICANN do this? How does it do that? Etc.

And Wolf, I mean, is that your feeling as well? Do you think it's vastly different topics? Wolf Ludwig.

WOLF LUDWIG: It's Wolf Ludwig for the record. It looks to me for asking succession, yes. I was just on the way to something in the chat below, because we are running short of time. I think one of the next or the first challenges, should be the public interest, in my opinion, is probably for many people, very abstract, especially from our community.

People from the GAC are most probably, due to their function, etc. [inaudible] much closer to it, and they may have a clearer understanding. I don't know. For us, I think there will be plenty of similarities, and there is another angle you can look at it, it's public or public audiences.

And I think there is public audiences and the public in general, and the public interest, they are linked together. And as users are meant to be the majority of those people using the internet, therefore, they correspond with these terms which like public and public interest. And I think we should really look at our next call into such issues. That's all for the moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Wolf. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And let's then see again to the next, go into the next agenda item. I'm aware that we're very late in our current agenda, and with apologies to Nick Thorne who is joining us. Nick is one of the problem from [inaudible] the organization, which is currently undertaken the At-Large review. It was thought that Nick could perhaps share a few of his thoughts with us, and provide us with an introduction to the EURALO input, which has been received so far.

And perhaps further input to be received. Welcome Nick, I guess you have the floor.

NICK THORNE: Thank you Olivier. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, very well indeed.

NICK THORNE: Good. Well look, it's very interesting to be here, and thank you for having me. This is the second RALO meeting that I have attended. Many of you already know me. For those who don't, very briefly, I'm a former British ambassador in Geneva, after which when I retired, I did three years of the international relations advisor to the CEO of ICANN. So I like to see the meetings from both sides.

I'd like to make just a few points. Number one, this review gives you an opportunity. It's not going to be antagonistic. The idea is that it should

be completely objective. That's why I told you where I came from, and I'm really not interested in being anything other than objective.

I have an idea of how ICANN works. But it's an opportunity for you to contribute to an exercise which will put a report before the Board of ICANN, which could give you an opportunity to change things. That's the first point.

Second one is, your EURALO, you Europeans, [inaudible], I live in southwest France, I'm a Brit, you should be offering best practices to the rest of the organizations. And if the rest of the organization doesn't work, then your leg of the ICANN multistakeholder stool, if you'll excuse that expression, will not support the weight of that stool.

I would argue that the multistakeholder input to ICANN has been, let's just say, upset by the advent of new gTLDs and the predominance of the GNSO, but that's still to come. But that leads me to the next point is that I have twice, on this call, and on my last call with the APRALO, asked for my personal email to be given out on this call.

It hasn't happened. I'm not going to ask staff to explain why, but would they please ensure that everybody on this call get my personal email address. If you want to make a contribution, you can. It didn't happen with APRALO, and it hasn't happened here, but I would like to make sure that it does in the future. And I will suggest, if I may, to Alan Greenberg, my good friend with whom I shared the last, in Helsinki, that I might be a fly on the wall, having done two, on the other regular RALO calls, just to see how they compare on these that you're on with you, Alan.

The things that have come out of our interviews so far, have been major headings, like they're just missing, about how the ALAC actually demonstrate to the organizations, the multistakeholder organization At-Large, it has legitimately. This I think is unique to the conversation you've been having about the consumer agenda, and Jean-Jacque's points, which I have a lot of sympathy with.

Again, I come back to this whole business of rebalancing the ICANN stool. [Inaudible] is something which I think Sandra and her Academy has a real contribution to make to that, but it's an issue which is coming up wherever we go. And I raise that with you, so if anybody has input, please, on the basis of the email address, which you will get from staff, contact me and we can have a chance on Skype.

My final point really is down to this feedback element. We've been tasked to look at the ALS and the RALO system. I am a European. I am, of course, aware of the fact that we have lots of things that others don't, but I do think this needs to be a global approach. And if you've got ideas, I'd really like to hear them because this is an opportunity for you to put someone before the Board of ICANN which could change things and make you more relevant.

Thank you, that sounds a bit sort of like a USA convention speak. But thank you very much for listening.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Nick. That's been very helpful, and I just had a first question, and I gather that maybe some of my colleagues would have questions here, but we have, many of us have been interviewed

during EuroDIG and we've been interviewed by Tom [inaudible], and I was going to ask whether you have already been going through the notes internally with Tom, some of the points that were made there, or when you mentioned the feedback that has been received so far, is it just the interviews that you've performed yourself.

NICK THORNE: No, sorry. I should have been clearer on this, Olivier. Tom and I work very closely together. He is sitting on a Greek island at the moment, lucky man, and so we share the European end, if you like, we otherwise spread out the EURALO between us. Tom and I have discussed inputs and questionnaire, and really quite interesting.

We will be producing, on the basis of that preliminary guidance, a more detailed survey questionnaire, which will go out to all of your ALSs, and frankly anybody else who is interested, but is your ALSs. So Tom and I are in synch. This is not a problem. We talked this afternoon.

There is an issue with the success rate of your ALSs. I have a detailed input to the survey we sent out from the Asia-Pacific region. Now, perhaps it's easier for them then it is for others, but really the… I was in Helsinki, and I was really conscious that people were running around. Any you must forgive me my cynicism, but I'm an old man, and I don't have to worry too much about people accusing me of that.

But to say that we've not got 200 ALSs, whoopsie doo, isn't this wonderful? If you look at the details of how many of them are actually… I mean, hi guys, I'm not terribly impressed. So there is the harder edge of the Nick Thorne review approach.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Nick. And you firmly have me smiling. It's Olivier speaking. You suddenly have me smiling and a number of people that have made the same point, even in At-Large in saying, 200 ALSs, great, but how many of them are really active? And there is a whole lot going on with the At-Large structure reviews.

And certainly to speak about EURALO in particular, we are undergoing a process now of looking at some of our At-Large structures that have not really been At-Large structure recently, have even told us that there are extinct. And so we are in the process of delisting a couple of them and cleaning up the rest.

And certainly there might be others that will be cleaned up in the future, but there is a process [CROSSTALK]…

NICK THORNE: Olivier, if I may interject there. The cleaning up the list is something which in any commercial, or [inaudible], or governmental, or whatever organization, will be done relatively regularly. And I very much welcome the fact that you're doing it, it would be extremely useful to me, if you could let me know how the process worked, because it will be…

I'm looking for best practice to share amongst the RALOs.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Nick. It's Olivier speaking. There is a process. Could I ask staff to follow-up with you and provide you with the details of the process? Because that's even, it's the same process across all of the RALOs to delist any ALS. And I'm actually quite a bit surprised that you haven't been told about this so far.

And maybe that's another practice of At-Large that you'll be provided information on, and make [CROSSTALK] follow-up with you on this. But, okay. I believe that we are running completely out of time. Thanks very much Nick for joining us on this. I really appreciate it. And you've also been able to see some of the problems that we are faced with here in having a one-hour call. You should have had a longer call then a one-hour call.

But this flow of public comments that has come in, it's certainly given a number of people on the call, is certainly not something that we can deal with. And so your comments are welcome as well. Let me just move on and try and go as quickly as we can through the rest of our call. [Adobe] has been advised of our delay, so we still have an extension, if you want, of the original time.

First there was a request for a candidate for the new financially assist the ICANN community document developing in drafting resource pilot program. We had someone come to us in Helsinki, letting us know about this program, and this is some program that will basically help us in having documents drafted on policy matters. Documents that will help our community.

I have put myself in the community of this working group as a placeholder, but also because of my total interest in policy. We need someone from the community as well to be a member of this working group, and act as a liaison and bridge between the staff members that will be doing this drafting, and our community.

So this is just to let you know of the calls for interest. We have… I might just contact a few people separately, I don't know if, I don't receive any spontaneous people coming forward… Let me rephrase this. If I don't receive any requests from people spontaneously putting this forward, then I'll be trying to ask a few people that I think might be able to be interested in this, or to have the time to do this.

It's important because that could be an answer to some of the problems that we have in not only responding to public comments, but certainly in getting our community to understand more about policy. I don't see anyone putting their hand up, which is pretty much the greenlight to move forward then to agenda item number six, and that's the review of the Helsinki meeting General Assembly.

Before that, I note Wolf Ludwig has put his hand up. You have the floor Wolf.

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes. It's Wolf Ludwig. Just shortly, I put a comment into the chat below, with [inaudible] saying, what about you and Sébastien to go into this community document development, blah, blah, blah. Because I think there should be people involved was two very good English

speaking people, and understand those policy issues, content wise and procedure wise. This is just a short suggestion from my side of things.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Wolf. It's Olivier speaking. And yes, that's a very good point. Bastiaan Goslings was funded by ICANN to come and help in Helsinki on sort of totally separate program that deals with, I don't know, it's not called Fellowship. I think it's some kind of mentoring program.

So he came there. He had Cheryl Langdon-Orr's as a mentor. I have yet to get feedback from Cheryl on what he has been up to, but certainly seeing his interest in Helsinki, he was definitely interested in policy. So that might be a good candidate indeed. And I note that he has provided his apologies on today's call, so I might just drop him a note as well, as I said, if there is no interest from anyone else, he might be the person to ask, and probably would be interested in this.

Okay. So let's then continue, and number six is all about our General Assembly that took place in Helsinki. There is a link to the General Assembly workspace. There is also a link, I probably have to reload the page, here we go. There is a link to the workplace, there is also a table underneath there, which has got the link to the two parts, part one, part two, the local hours in which they took place.

There is a record of the Adobe Connect chat. There is the recording in English, in Spanish, and in French. Although I believe that there was only a recording made in English for this. And correct me if I'm wrong, I think there is only a recording in English. And then there is the, also the

transcript. The last box is about the transcripts in Spanish and in French. Is it in three languages or is it in just one? Silvia?

TERRI AGNEW: Hi Olivier, this is Terri. Actually I'm looking right now. It looks like for the General Assembly, we have transcripts in English, Spanish, and French. And the recordings as well, English, Spanish, and French.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That's very strange indeed. It's Olivier speaking. Because when I look at the actual page itself, it says just transcript in English. So…

TERRI AGNEW: I'm just clicking on the links now. I was looking at the…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Anyway, just to point this out. So it's all in English for all the links. So just to let you know, we had this General Assembly that took place. The first part was actually very much procedural with the first welcoming of guests, confirmation of attending members, call [inaudible], etc. So I was very pleased with the number of people that have attended.

We had, I don't have the exact numbers, because we don't seem to have the exact, the minutes on who attended, that's, I think, maybe something that we need to add on this. But the… We had Rinalia Abdul

Rahim and Alan Greenberg that came over. And we adopted the meeting minutes from the previous face to face General Assembly.

The second point was perhaps more important, or there was a discussion on the first on the annual report, but then a big briefing about the EURALO bylaws taskforce, and also a decision made on the EURALO At-Large structure engagement taskforce. And we'll have Yrjö Länsipuro, the newly promoted chair, nominated chair of that working group, or that taskforce, speaking to us shortly.

But we also listed the EURALO CROPP concept for the past fiscal year, and there was a discussion on whether there should be a taskforce to review the previously experiences and to define a new concept. There are actually some changes, there are some changes currently being made in the CROPP, and perhaps we should as the chair of the CROPP review team, and our colleagues who are on the CROPP.

I think that our two colleagues are Yrjö Länsipuro and Wolf Ludwig, to speak to us about the changes of the concept, and also for our community to choose whether they wish to continue with the same type of CROPP requests that we have made in the past, which is to send people to the EuroDIG, or to do things differently.

And I note from emails that I have received during this call that there is a follow-up from our CROPP review team members to the people that were collected by CROPP to receive a report, final report that… But finally, we had a discussion on EURALO's outreach strategy. And a discussion with Jean-Jacques Sahel and with Michael [inaudible]. Jean-Jacques being the vice-president of stakeholder engagement for Europe.

And Michael being the vice-president for Eastern Europe, Russia, and Central Asia. So that's the whole point. And including, of course, Russia TIF. So that's the discussions that we had. The recordings are available, and as I said, the transcripts are available as well. I was going to turn to Wolf to ask if there is anything that you wanted to point out.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks Olivier. Wolf Ludwig for the record. Just shortly, about attendance at, I think the general AG we had, we had more than 50% including remote participants and proxies, which was a highlight for a non-face to face General Assembly so far. This was a promising thing.

The other thing was, there has been a lot of discussions about our CROPP concept over the last weeks, months, etc. including at the General Assembly. It's a complex issue. I think it's a complex issue, I think we do not have the time here type minutes to make up a briefing or decision on this.

I think this should be a main topic for our next monthly call, to discuss the advantages, disadvantages of the CROPP experience over the last couple of years, in detail, and then after a discussion of at least 30 minutes, etc. I think we can come up, I can come up with some recommendations. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Wolf. It's Olivier speaking. I was there for, as an action item, for the CROPP topic to be the main topic during our next call, and for a second action item to be that the leadership team, so the EURALO

Board, I think that's what it is called, the EURALO Board should be actively looking at the CROPP report from our, and the topic of CROPP. Maybe the… Wolf, could you just send a note to the Board, the EURALO Board, regarding this?

So at least we have an understanding about what has gone on with CROPP, and the feedback whether it be positive, negative, etc.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And of course, if anybody else is interested in this topic, there will be able to fully take part in the discussion during the next call. Let's then move to our At-Large structure taskforce on ALS engagement. Yrjö Länsipuro, thank you for being so kind in waiting, but you have been, in your absence, whilst you were in the GAC, since you are also now the GAC liaison to the ALAC.

So first, congratulations on this. But secondly, you've also been promoted to chair of the EURALO taskforce and At-Large structure engagement. Something that is so important in EURALO, since we have had difficulty in engaging our At-Large structures. I guess I can just hand the floor over to you.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Okay. Thank you Olivier. This is Yrjö Länsipuro for the transcript. Yeah, the [inaudible] the emotional nomination [inaudible]. I wish that

[inaudible] was created some time ago, but it has been dormant. And I think that for whatever reason this was the other taskforce on bylaw change has been active, and it has taken a lot of the oxygen from people who are also going to be on the taskforce on the ALS engagement.

Now this is… We have to… But now it's time, now is the time to get going, people get organized, because as we have seen, even during this call, so many issues are actually connected and tied [inaudible] question of the activity of the ALSs. So, I was not at this, in this section of the General Assembly where this was discussed, but of course, I watched the recording.

I think the discussion on this topic in the General Assembly was pretty good. And it gave me sort of food for thought. There was also, of course, there was a discussion about how much we can realistically expect when the ALSs, and they were, you know, like Wolf, a caution against a bureaucratic approach, which was, and remembering what happened in 2008 when the ALSs were pretty much against with sending any other reports, anything like that.

So, what I think is that whatever we do, to promote the engagement of the ALSs should be something that would help them, as it helps EURALO and ALAC and ICANN. That is to say, it should, this exchange of information, exchange of experience, and so on and forth, which we could facilitate by the engagement of the process, it should help ALSs to play their part in the multistakeholder theme in their countries.

I mean, like charity, multistakeholder is really starts at home. And I think that this is one of the points that we should discuss in the ultimate

activating the ALCs. How far the ALSs can play their part in the multistakeholder set up for the internet governance seems to, or the national, and every other thing.

And I think that that also [inaudible] what has been talked about during this call. Sébastien, for instance, is that the… How could we leverage the extra keys that may be hidden out there, and the ALSs and engaged both experts in the advice in the process whereby the advice is produced for the PDPs, which of course is a big, big problem as we have heard in this call.

So basically, I'll cut this short because we are out of time. I think that now that first of all, I would like to issue a call for new members to join. There are quite few in this working taskforce, and then I would really like to get started, even [inaudible] we are still in the holiday period in there, but still, I think I would [inaudible] get started before the actual autumn period starts.

Perhaps I'm going to propose a Doodle for the staff for the first using my taskforce. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Yrjö. It's very encouraging. I fully supporting the launching of the Doodle then please, for the EURALO mailing list for people to join in that first call. And obviously, if anybody else on the call wishes to join that taskforce, please can voice your interest now. Nick Thorne, you're next.

EN

NICK THORNE: Very quickly. Four points. One, I entirely agree with Yrjö. Two, you are EURALO. What I would suggest you should be thinking about is those countries on whether they develop, developing countries who need your help. Three, a key element of all of this is what is in it or us.

You really can't expect developing country volunteers to act like the good people you all are. And finally, Yrjö, if I can help, tell me. I would love to get this into the report review somewhere.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Nick. It's Olivier speaking. Just one thing. This taskforce is a EURALO taskforce, so we would be, well we are focus essentially on our European countries. I note that there is an outreach and engagement taskforce for a working group, that is ALAC wide. But this one is specifically to try and get our At-Large structures, whether in Eastern, Western, Southern, Northern Europe to be more engaged.

And certainly, I guess some of the findings that we would have to enhance EURALO would be good practices that other RALOs can make use of. Any comments on Nick's comments Yrjö?

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Thank you Nick. I'm very encouraged by your comments. I think that I'm going to ask for your help. Thank you.

NICK THORNE: You're welcome, my friend.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. Well, so that's another good thing moving forward. So thank you so much Yrjö, for launching this and for being able to drive it home, or at least drive it out there. We are outrageously behind time, and we have to move into any other business. I know that there might be something from Sébastien Bachollet. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much Olivier. Just very quickly. I just want to tell you, I guess, because very few people from Europe who are attending the webinar on the work stream two topics. And I think it could be useful to listen the recording. I gather the recording is also in English, Spanish, and French.

And you have a good overview of what will happen in this work stream two. And I hope that for European ALSs or member of our EURALO world participating, [inaudible] all the discussion and all [inaudible]. I will put the link to the chat, and if you have any questions, feel free to ask me or anybody else from the At-Large who are participating with questions. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Sébastien. It's Olivier speaking. And thanks for pointing this out. I certainly couldn't attend because this was a busy week. [Inaudible] and summer school on internet governance this week, but I'm glad to hear that not many people from Europe attended, also due to the holidays.

But also, I do think that the title of this webinar was terrible, because it doesn't inspire anything. What is work stream two topics? If you don't know about the IANA stewardship transition, the ICANN accountability, and all of these [inaudible]. We really have to provide more details about our webinars when we send out the requests and the announcement, and provide some explanation as to what this webinar is going to be about, because using a title.

Nick Thorne, your hand is up… Is that a…

NICK THORNE: No, I'm sorry it is my incompetent, it not meant to be up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's fine. We're very indulgent here. And we'll move to Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just a very quick thing. There should be a document ready in time for the ALAC meeting, which will list all of the participants in the various work stream two topics and identify the At-Large people to give you an idea to what extent are we active or are we not active in these topics. It is being worked on right now.

I hope that it will be ready by the ALAC meeting. So if you're not on the meeting, check the agenda later on. It's attached to the review of the IANA and the accountability CWGs. So thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Alan. I have just one more, well two small pieces of any other business. First, I just alluded to this, last was the Euro S SIG, European Summer School on Internet Governance that took place in [inaudible]. Both Wolf and I were there. There were several people who were from Europe, very interesting potential recruits. Very interesting ICANN topics.

And because they are not part of an At-Large structure, we have, we will be following up with them, and pointing them to our EURALO individual association. So, I hope that they will be able to take part in some of our discussion. And a couple of people are particularly interested in policy.

So perhaps we might get more help on the policy side. Secondly, quick question and that's to do with our next call. Do we want to have a call in August? So far, I have heard Wolf Ludwig mention an August date, and I've also heard Yrjö Länsipuro speaking about wanting to move forward with the taskforce on ALS engagement, and perhaps even returning to us in August.

So I'm edging towards saying yes, we would have a call in August. And I'm quite pleased to see the turn out we have today, since we are at the end of July. Does anybody here that we should scrap August and meet next time in September?

I see August fine with Jimmy. August fine with Wolf. Wolf Ludwig, you have the floor.

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes. Thanks Olivier. Just shortly. Wolf Ludwig for the record. Yes, so far over the last couple of years, July was a critical month, and most of the people are on holidays. And it's surprisingly worked very well today having a monthly call in July. Therefore, in August we usually always had a call. In August, to my experience, most of the members are back on duty, and I think there should be a call for August.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Wolf. So we'll do, as usual, it's the third week that we usually have this call. Perhaps could we look, because you said later in August might be good, so maybe we should be looking at the fourth week of August exceptionally. This month, in July, we exceptionally move to this fourth week because last week, both Wolf and I were unavailable.

We should look at that for next time, although I do understand that we arrive on the same day as the ALAC call. We'll follow-up, and we'll make a choice as to whether the third or fourth week will be good. And until then, I note any other business. Sébastien says, please don't change the week.

Okay. So maybe we'll stay the third week of August. I don't see anyone else holding their hand up, with thanks to [Adobe] for letting us have another 26 minutes. And thanks to our staff. I think I believe there is an ALAC call starting in an hour and a half. And if any of you are interested in ALAC matters, that some of the discussions we had today that will be undertaken on the ALAC call again.

And as you all know, I hope you know, all ALAC calls are open to everyone. We work transparency. So you're very welcome to take part in it. And until we have our next call, I would like to thank you all for having joined us today, with apologies for being a little too long, but I'm quite happy we discussed what we discussed today.

And I will and others will follow-up in the next call. Thank you and goodbye. This call is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]