
TERRI AGNEW:

An introduction now. One moment please.

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the EURALO Monthly Call taking place on Tuesday the 23rd of August, 2016 at 18:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Oksana Prykhodko, Yrjö Länsipuro, Nenad Marinkovic, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Wolf Ludwig, Ann Marie, Roberto Gaetano, Jordi Iparraguirre, Mirjana Tasic, Sebastien Bachollet, Annette Muhlberg, Bastiaan Goslings, and Julia Velkova.

We have listed apologies from Matthieu Camus, and Gabriella Schittek.

From staff we have 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 hand it back over to you, Olivier. Please begin.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Terri. Welcome everyone. Have we missed anybody in the roll call? I can see more people are coming in actually as I speak, so I'll let Terri do the tally on who's coming in as they are coming in and let's start with our call today.

It's a long agenda that we have. The agenda is going to be speaking about so many different things. I guess we have to adopt the agenda

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.

first. We've got the public comments, we've got discussion on the CROPP – Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program, we've got a discussion regarding the selection of a new member for the EURALO Board, the EURALO Task force on at-Large Structure Engagement – just a little update from Yrjö on this, EURALO Bylaws review – a little update from me, and then the call for candidates for the Board Member Selection Process Committee – the BMSPC – and the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee – the BCEC. And then we have something else – EURALO conf call scheduling – looking at the results of the Doodle that we had, we will have a review of one At-Large Structure application and then a discussion that Sebastien will share with us regarding the selection of the At-Large Leaders [inaudible] specifically the ALAC call for nominations for ALAC Chair.

Is there any addition to this agenda or any amendments to this agenda? I note that Oksana puts in the chat, "Please add the question regarding the GA 2017." Okay. I've noted that question, Oksana. The question is aimed at staff so let's put that in the Any Other Business part.

And I don't see anybody else put their hands up. So that's the only thing that we have to add to the agenda.

Let's move on then. The review of the action items from our last call. There are two action items that are yet to be completed. First is for Wolf to review the current draft of the Consumer Agenda Statement and confirm if the Working Group on the Public Interest should add that to the statement, and Jean-Jacques Subrenat is to assist.

Wolf Ludwig, have you had a chance to have a look at that? And you might be muted at the moment, Wolf. Wolf?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Wolf, yes. Wolf, we're looking at the EURALO action items and it says, "Wolf Ludwig to review current draft of Consumer Agenda statement to confirm if the Work group on the Public Interest should add to the statement. And Jean-Jacques Subrenat is to assist." Have you had a look at that?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, we have actually added this on our last call agenda of the Public Interest Working Group, and as Garth Bruen was not available. We postponed it to the next call. But it was added and there are questions to be reviewed for the Public Interest working Group.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That's great, Wolf. Thanks for this update and we'll look forward to hear from you during our next call on further developments of this.

Heidi, you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, thank you very much, Olivier. I wanted to also let you know that the ALAC will be having a special call on the Consumer Agenda some time either probably next week if not early September. And that's going to be an At-Large briefing call. I'm sorry, it's going to be just a call for people who wish to contribute to that draft statement.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That sounds great, Heidi. Thank you. If that will be publicized on the EURALO mailing list that would be great, because I know that there are a lot of people here who are interested in this as well. So that would be great. Thank you.

Next is the only other one that's still remaining to be done is for the CROPP to be the main topic of the next monthly call. And yes, that's correct as well. That's the main topic so we can mark this one as being done as well. And I think I have a feeling we won't be able to go through the whole CROPP discussion from A to Z, but let's go and let's move on then unless there are any comments on any of these action items that we've had.

On the completed action items, may I just add that on the DDDPP – the Document Drafting Pilot Project – we have managed to select... We've actually had four people that came forward and we had two of them that became members of the group and two of them will be observers of the group, and the names have been forwarded. I don't remember their names exactly. I know that I'm one of the observers. I think that Yrjö Länsipuro is one of the members and is it Julia Velkova who is the

other member? I'm just doing it just by memory. Silvia, would you know by any chance or is it someone else?

SILVIA VIVANCO: [Inaudible], Olivier. Let me check.

WOLF LUDWIG: It's both of them.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It's both of them. Okay, so it's Julia and Yrjö.

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, and Bastiaan and you, you are observers.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, perfect. Thank you very much, Wolf.

Alright, let's move on then and let's go to the next section which is the review of the current public consultations and public comments. There are three statements currently in process being drafted. There's one about the creating a Consumer Agenda at ICANN, and we've just talked about it just a moment ago. There's one about the proposed guidelines for the Second String Similarity Review Process. The comment is about to close and the ALAC is already voting on the statement so I'm not going to go any further into this because it's too late for us to be involved.

The Independent Review of Trademark Clearinghouse Services Draft Report is an interesting one. It's to do with the database of trademarks, and as you know in Europe we have a slightly different view of trademarks and some different rules according to trademarks than in the United States and elsewhere. So it's something that's interesting for any of you that's [in on] this topic. And [inaudible] and Alan Greenberg are both working together to draft a first draft of this statement.

I see Sebastien has put his hand up. Sebastien, you have the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Sorry. Thank you, Olivier. If I remember well what it was discussed this morning at the ALAC call, I guess that Alan can confirm or say that I am wrong, but it was decided not to have a comment on that and that Alan will be better than me to tell you the truth.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sebastien. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you. Yes, we decided not to do that. Olivier, as you remember when the Trademark Clearinghouse was created, we had a number of minor concerns. They were not large and the use of the Trademark Clearinghouse is so low anyway that it didn't seem worthwhile. Ariel's on vacation and the Table hasn't been updated yet, but we did decide not to do that one.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Alan. So let's then move on to the statement that seemed to be stalled. The input requested from the Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, Stakeholder Groups, and Communities Outreach – I hate it when they say SO, AC, SG, C. That's not helpful – the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures. And that's obviously the input requested for the next time there's going to be another round of generic top-level domains being created out there. It's a very big topic here. So there was a thing closing on the 1st of August. Holly Raiche and Alan Greenberg were supposed to be pushing this forward. Let's hear from Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We did draft a bunch of very short answers to the very large number of questions asked. I'm just finishing up reviewing it and should be finished tomorrow. As discussed on the ALAC call yesterday, this is a rather informal set of answers and I don't see there's any real need to go through a formal ratification process unless someone else feels strongly there is. They will be made public, of course.

As one can expect from the positions that many At-Large people have taken, we are not overly demanding that there be a new round immediately and that everything be opened up. As you may know, in Helsinki there was a fairly large presentation of demands to the Board and Board members that this has to be speeded up, that the estimated current date for a next round if there is a next round is something like 2020 and people are saying it is ridiculous to have eight years between rounds if indeed we're supposed to be doing this on a regular basis.

They have sent a letter to the GNSO. The GNSO will be considering it at its next meeting. And of course the PDP people are involved in this.

I think the Board had no choice but to ask the question because some stakeholders indicated they were quite unhappy with the date. I don't see any way that we're going to fast path things and suddenly have a new round in the next year or two, but the world will unfold as it will and we'll have to wait and see on that. And certainly we will be participating in that discussion and Olivier as our liaison to the GNSO, I presume will be very vocal.

So we are proceeding on this. It's a hugely complex area and I just don't see how we're going to move very quickly on it but we'll see. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you very much, Alan. Indeed it's a tough topic here because there are so many problems that have been raised and so little time, and now the commercial pressures are now mounting up again to have a round sooner rather than later. You might have seen on some of the discussion on the list that there are some in our community that think that it should be later rather than earlier. So it's going to be an interesting one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly and I both tend to be on that side.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I think some would even say it should be never rather than earlier, I've heard from [inaudible].

Anyway, let's continue on this. The next one is the public comments and I don't see... Oh, I do see some hands up. Sorry. I apologize for that. Yrjö Länsipuro, you have the floor.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yes. Thank you. On this issue, the new gTLD round, of course the GAC has pretty similar ideas and similar thinking as ALAC. In Helsinki this was a big topic in the GAC meeting and also at a call that the GAC had later with the Board where they discussed – this was actually a new thing – I mean, a GAC Board call to explain what GAC means in the communiqué its advice. And basically GAC is saying that they are not against a new round in principle, but several things have to happen before that, including of course analyzing and learning from the lessons of the first round. And of course this is one item where I see a good synergy between the GAC and ALAC.

Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN LEBLOND: Thank you, Yrjö. Next is Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Olivier. There are a lot of discussion around this next round of gTLD and I think we may wish to have, as we say, a shopping list of what is absolutely mandatory for us as a user of [inaudible] to be done

before any round starts. I have in mind at least two points. The one is that a real program to help [inaudible] program must be in the...

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: The Applicant Support Program.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Application Support Program, yes, must be in place and the communicate well in advance and the help must be done provide to those people who would like to participate to the program.

And the second is that we find a way to have a real balance to regional balance to have real [participants] of real application from Africa and from Latin America. There were very few this time. Some will [be of] really good ones, but we can't have just .africa in one hand and .lat in the other and no other operating gTLD in those regions.

I really think we need to state that very firmly and if not, there is no reason to reopen to give money to the same type of people, and I am really concerned with what is happening with .web for example, or with big applicants. And we need to show what we would like to do and what we want the [prime] done for the world. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sebastien. And for those people who are not aware of the .web story, I believe that .web was purchased by Verisign who already owned .com, so that's what you were meaning, Sebastien, correct?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, Olivier. Definitely. And I would say I would have loved that [inaudible] would get the .web and not the one who have so much money in the pocket. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. Alan Greenberg next.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. To be clear on .web, it was not Verisign that bought it. It has now come to light that perhaps in violation of specific ICANN rules Verisign may have funded it. So the situation is murky and will likely go to the courts, so we'll see what happens on that one.

I'm not sure I completely agree with Sebastien. There are those of us in At-Large who have said that much of this whole gTLD program is really a sham and a way for people to make piles of money or hope they're going to make piles of money, and it's not at all clear there's a lot of real reason for having gone through this process. That doesn't alter the fact that we did and we're stuck with where we are, but for those same reasons it's not clear that there is a lot of real need in developing parts of the world to have gTLDs. There are some exceptions I'll go into in a second.

To say that Africa or even Latin America needs its share – and at the moment Latin America has a real problem that there are no registrars who want to sell these TLDs even if they're in demand in those areas – so there are some real structural problems associated with it. But if

indeed this whole thing was a make money fast game, to use the subject line from old spam e-mails, then it's not clear that if it's failing for the big players in the west and the north, that it really is going to help those in developing countries.

That being said, there is going to be a real need for IDNs, and there may well be a real need, if we're moving into a world where .brands are essential for a good presence on the web for large corporate players, there are certainly large corporate players from other parts of the world that should be able to participate in the same game.

But other than those targeted areas, it's not clear exactly what the demand is going to be other than more attempts to make money. So I'm not all that much of a believer that we have to have success in selling these in the developing world. We may just be selling things which are useless pieces of whatever and extracting money from them for no real reason. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Next is Sebastien Bachollet, and then I'll close the queue because we do have a very long agenda today. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, I will be short. If the industry needs to be enhanced in those regions – in Africa and Latin America – yes, then so be it and we need to do something. For example, I struggled when I was in the Board to not have increase the cost to become a registrar in Africa, for example, and I was not followed by the Board because they are there [too]. We at ICANN

we are doing things against the fact that industry can be developed in Africa and Latin America, and we have also to take into account that all the new gTLD we need to allow them to do something. If everything is taken by U.S. [inaudible] industry people, then we will have lost in the long run. It's something I really think we need to take care of. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Sebastien. This discussion is, I find this pretty interesting. I would invite you all to continue the discussion in the New gTLD Working Group which is the group that deals with this. So if you or anybody listening is interested in this discussion and you want to be part of that New gTLD Working Group that is going to have to deal with producing responses and bring direct input into those ICANN-wide discussions and maybe even make a difference to how soon a next round takes place and who gets what in the next round, then if you put your name forward then we'll add you to the list.

Let's move on. The next one is a public comment request to which the ALAC has decided not to submit a statement. It has to do with country and territory names in some top-level domains. We've never responded to these. There are a number of public comment requests requiring decision right now. I am not sure whether this is the list, whether it's changed or not. I could perhaps ask Alan Greenberg if you could please just go through that list and let us know whether they are on or not, or a decision has been made on the ALAC call.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't have that list in front of me. If someone can tell me what they are, I will certainly answer.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: The gTLD Marketplace Health Index.

ALAN GREENBERG: We are looking for someone who's interested in reviewing the document and producing a comment.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks, Alan. That document is about exactly what it says. It's the marketplace of generic top-level domains. It's a set of graphics and so on that's been put there. I've actually read through it. I might put a comment. Did I write a comment on this? I thought I had. I'm really sorry. I might just put a comment on this.

IANA Naming Function Agreement.

ALAN GREENBERG: On that one and the Intellectual Property, it was suggested by Cheryl that we write a very short statement saying we appreciate all of the work that went into creating these in a timely manner. Other than that, I don't think we intend to say anything substantive on them. And I think between Cheryl and I, we'll probably put a very short statement together very soon on those two.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. And it's worth noting also that many At-Large and ALAC members are part of those working groups in the IANA Stewardship Transition, Cross Community Working Group, and also the Accountability Working Group, and they all have fed into this process. So there's already been some input from our community into this.

The proposed renewal of .TEL Registry Agreement.

ALAN GREENBERG: If anyone cares about it, they should speak up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, that's an open question for anyone on the call today.

EURALO Hot Topics is a paper that Ariel Liang and I put together in a short amount of time for the Board who is going to be visiting Europe in a couple of weeks' time and they needed to have a briefing of what the policy issues were in our region. We put this together quickly. We've already passed it on to Rinalia Abdul Rahim who's our At-Large selected Board member, but you're very much welcome to add to whatever we've written in there. It had to be short. I think that we've touched on most of the points if not all the points that people are interested in in Europe. If you see anything that's blatantly wrong or that we've forgotten, please let us know as soon as possible and we can always add to this.

Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Olivier. I'm sorry but for that we need to have access to this document and we don't. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: You don't have access to the document. Okay. That's interesting. Why do you not have access to the document? What does it say?

WOLF LUDWIG: Because it's locked.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Oh it says log-in required. [Inaudible].

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [Speaking in French]. I have done that. I have request the access and I didn't receive anything, and I am still trying to get and I am logged on. I have my picture and so on and it's really because it's a document private.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Very interesting. Okay. So Silvia or Terri or whoever's in charge of this, please make it opened up.

And then the At-Large Community Policy Issues is also something that was also in there. I don't know if that's open or not. Is that locked as well? And that's again another paper that Ariel has worked on with

Heidi and has put together, and these documents have now all been passed on to Rinalia.

Anyway, let's move on. I see Sebastien. Another question or comment?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, sorry. It's an old hand.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. Sorry about these two last points, but if staff will please inform us on the EURALO mailing list when this is unlocked.

Let's now move to the CROPP EURALO discussion – the Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program. We have 10 minutes assigned to this. I don't think we'll reach a decision in those 10 minutes. This is just to remind you of this process. I've sent an e-mail a few weeks ago to the mailing list asking for feedback on how we should be selecting people for next year and whether we should be doing the same thing as what we have done in the past three years since the program has started.

The way that we did it was to select people to go to the European Dialogue on Internet Governance – the EuroDIG – every year. Some people were members of already established At-Large structures. Some people were not members of any At-Large Structures but were members of organizations that could be potential At-Large Structures. The responses that we've had so far, well some of them have actually applied as At-Large Structures afterwards. Some have not. Some have produced reports. Some have not produced reports.

Our 2016 crew this year who were Walter Hötendorfer from one of our Austrian ALSes, Yrjö Länsipuro from Finland, Nenad Marinkovic from Republic of Serbia, and Ovidiu Popeti from Romania, and Eric Schweighofer from Austria. Of all of these people, they've all actually written a report. I don't know, the prospective member Ovidiu, I'm not sure whether they have applied yet or not. This is something that we can follow up with. But in general, everyone's played the game really well and it's been very helpful I think for everybody.

One comment that we have received – and that's the comment we had received from Sandra Hoferichter who is running the Secretariat for EuroDIG – is that from this year onwards, EuroDIG is now proposing some Fellowships to people, a much larger number of Fellowships. And so she has recommended that perhaps we start using CROPP for other things than EuroDIG or for sending people elsewhere. And what the other regions have done is to take some of their regional Leaders or anybody who is active in the region to go and act as a publicist to search for other At-Large Structures, if you want – an evangelist as one could call it like this – at other conferences to try and find new At-Large Structures and get more interested people in the community.

So that's where we are today. And obviously the other thing, there were questions about how the people were selected, and so far it was always just a small group of people by word of mouth I guess, saying, "Well, this could be a good idea. This could be a good idea." We need to formalize this process a little bit perhaps at an open call for volunteers to go out there and use an inside process, open process, transparent process, so we know who was selected, how and what we are asking of them.

Wolf Ludwig is one of our CROPP Review Team delegates. I don't know whether – did you want to add anything else to this, Wolf?

WOLF LUDWIG: No, nothing for the moment. Thanks, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. So the floor is open now, and I see Oksana Prykhodko.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Thank you, Olivier. I propose to use the CROPP resources to finance participation in face-to-face General Assembly meetings in 2017. First of all, for Eastern participants.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Oksana. So the General Assembly, I don't know where we have decided to have that yet, which would be the first question. And then the second question is – and I think that you alluded to Denmark – so I believe that would be an ICANN meeting. I'm not sure that CROPP would apply in that way, but we might have others who might know about this.

Let's go through the queue. Wolf Ludwig? And if I could ask staff whether they are aware of whether this could apply or not. Wolf.

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes. Thanks, Olivier. Just a very short reply on this one. I remember a case it was one or two years back of an ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires where LACRALO had similar application. I think it was approved at the time but it was broadly criticized to send LACRALO members to ICANN meeting to do some sort of outreach. There was a contradiction seen in this combination, etc. and there was a lot of criticism after that. I was, by the way, one of them and I do not see any much sense in this regard. It's not really complying to the goals and principles of the CROPP program, and I think we will meanwhile not get through any more after that LACRALO case some years ago. Therefore I think this is not a real option any longer.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Wolf. What we can do perhaps is take it as an action item that we could ask the CROPP Review Team itself whether such a request would be eligible or not eligible. Because I know that the rules change every year and the rules have been tightened this year. So I'm not sure what the feedback was on that experiment that took place with LACRALO back in Buenos Aires, and it would be worth checking.

I must say personally I'm not really for something like this either, but then if there is a possibility of having people go to Denmark and find more At-Large Structures there, the concern is that it's an outreach pilot program and it's not an inreach pilot program. So the outreach part is always a little difficult when you go to an ICANN meeting. It's an oxymoron effectively.

Sorry, I've lost my track here. I can't see... Wolf, you still have your hand up.

WOLF LUDWIG: No, it's an old hand. Sorry. I'll put it down.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. And Silvia has noted the action item, so let's then move on. Thanks for this comment.

Anybody else on this CROPP? I think that what we should do – and I really want you to think about this – is do we continue with sending people to one location or do we start sending people to various locations? Like sending one person at a meeting that takes place in Poland, let's say, and one person at a meeting that takes place in Ukraine, and one person that goes to a meeting that takes place in Romania. Perhaps even in countries where we do not have current At-Large Structures. So where there is a big Internet related meeting somewhere or domain name related meeting somewhere, and then we could send somebody over there from our Leadership. And for the Eastern European countries it might be somebody who might be able to speak the local language and be able to try and find an At-Large Structure or even more than one At-Large Structure but actually be able to recruit people over there on the ground.

Wolf Ludwig.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thanks, Olivier. Sorry, Olivier, but this is a motion we are falling back to a discussion level I think we clarified already before. When we said it's a little bit far more complicated in Europe due to so many different countries with a variety of completely different national languages. So it makes no sense to send somebody from the country to an event in his country or to send somebody from another country to an event where the event is only international language and another person who is not familiar with the language doesn't understand anything.

This is a real problem and a real limitation. Therefore, I think we should reflect other options and alternatives, but I think one of the basic criterias to send people to the European meeting is a conference language. And it should be a language what at least several people – as English would be ideal but even French could be an option – because there are several people in EURALO who speak or understand French, etc.

So there's a language issue is a key factor to be considered and then we really should suggest meeting options like this and then short lists. And over the next couple of weeks there is no pressure at the moment to make a decision tonight so we can keep it open and come back to it let's say in October again when we have made such a listing and to do the short list and to reflect how to proceed further[more]. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much for this, Wolf. May I perhaps ask you to draft just like five lines on summarizing what you just said here over to the mailing list as [inaudible].

WOLF LUDWIG: I have done this, Olivier, already weeks ago.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, they're on there? [Inaudible].

WOLF LUDWIG: I've done this weeks ago via the mailing list and there was no response.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I'll highlight it and check it out. So scrap that action item please. But you're correct. We don't need to act on this right now, and let the discussion continue and let's continue having CROPP as a major discussion item in our next call. And hopefully we'll have less other things to discuss in addition to this.

Next. Agenda item five – the EURALO Board. There is Mikhail Medrish has stood down from the EURALO Board because he has been hired by a company in Russia so he's not able to assume his responsibilities as part of the organization that he was representing. So there's been a change of people. We've had some new people that the organizations have decided to register as the representatives for that organization. But that means that we have a space at the moment on the EURALO Board and we need to fill it up.

What I was just going to suggest is that we proceed according to the rules that we had already set up for ourselves for the current Board.

And the rules are pretty straightforward. They're all linked by the way. So the first thought that I had was that we always take the people that did not make it to the Board and take the next person in the list. But unfortunately, that was not possible because one of the rules that we had chosen was that the Board should be made up of people from different countries. And the people that remained were from countries that were already represented on the Board. So we need a new election and we need to start it as soon as we can really.

I just wanted to obtain your green light or whether there were any comments regarding the selection of that person. Otherwise, we would just start with a call for a candidate – a quick call for a candidate, maybe a week – then we would have a quick one week election going on with a poll, and then we have our next Board member on there.

Any comments on this? Okay. Was that Annette?

ANNETTE MUHLBERG: That was me, Annette.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I recognize your voice. Okay, I also see a green tick from Wolf Ludwig. So we have agreement from two people, silence from everyone else, so it looks like we've got agreement to proceed forward. Let's have it as an action item to launch the election process. Oh, I note that Lutz Donnerhacke has put his hand up. Lutz, you have the floor.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: No, sorry. Please proceed.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Lutz. Okay, let's move on then and let's go to the next one and that's the EURALO Task Force on At-Large Structure Engagement. It's a quick update, and Yrjö Länsipuro is going to be speaking to us about this.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. The Task Force had a call, a meeting, on the 3rd of August, and based on that meeting I drafted the first draft of a letter that could be sent to all ALSes under Olivier's name – it's signed by Olivier – e-mail letter which would be personalized to a degree so that each ALS would feel that they are really taken one by one and not like one size fit all. I think that this was one of the conclusions of our call.

The letter is also on the wiki page and not really spending time to go through it but basically there are two points here. One is that we asked each ALS to identify subject matter experts in their organization who would be willing to participate in the drafting of EURALO input to the ALAC – advice that would reflect the specific circumstances in that country and the topics that that ALSes knows best.

The other thing we asked for was ideas on how EURALO could help ALSs to play a more active part in the multistakeholder set up on a national level when it comes to Internet in their countries. And last, since we really wanted to treat the ALSs individually, and even though there are 37 of them, we proposed that if an ALS want we could have a call with

the Chair and a few others actually discussing with them the ways how they could participate in the drafting of the advice, which is of course the key function of why we exist. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Yrjö, and I note that the letter that you're referring to is on the screen and I think that everyone has the ability to scroll through it. It's difficult for everyone to read through this now, but if I could ask that – the letter is linked over to the wiki page, isn't it, that we have on the agenda – so if people want to – I think the letter is in there somewhere. Maybe that letter should be in the... Oh, no. The letter is linked there on that wiki page. So if anybody is interested to read through it and please provide some feedback to Yrjö. He unfortunately hasn't had very much feedback and I understand it is the summer so many people are just slowly coming back to the world of work. But have a look through this and provide some feedback on whether if it's too long, too short, is it understandable, or how that all works.

Let's move on with the next... I notice that there's full support for the letter from Oksana. And yes, it's all linked.

So now let's move on and the next one is the EURALO Bylaws Review Task Force. At the Helsinki meeting there was a meeting of the Vice President for Russia and CIS. Michael Yakushev and the Vice President for Europe Jean-Jacques Sahel and several of us in EURALO – Oksana Prykhodko, Mikhail Medrish, Wolf Ludwig and I – and we basically were discussing a number of things including that EURALO Bylaws Review which has moved forward but has gone very, very, slowly. We have

asked for some help, or rather some help was proposed by Michael Yakushev. We haven't had any follow-up on this yet.

But that's where we are at the moment. We're holding off with the Bylaws Review until we have a follow-up from Michael on this. And of course, Mikhail Medrish having been one of the real drivers of this has now left, so if there's anybody else who is interested in joining and who hasn't joined in this and is interested in the Bylaws Review, then please move forward. We need to have more people to help on this.

Next. I don't see anybody having their hand up on this so let's move on. Next is the call for candidates for the Board Member Selection Process Committee and the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee. These are two committees that are set up when we have to start our process to select a board member. The first of the two committees is one that looks at the processes and any amendments to the process and makes sure that the process is followed. The second one, the BCEC – Board Candidate Evaluation Committee – is a committee that evaluates the people that are going to put their names forward for the position of the Board. So it's a bit like a Nominating Committee because what it does is to select a number of people between, I think it's three to five people, that it then sends over to the ALAC and the ALAC then decides to have the vote on these three to five people – like a pre-selection process.

So that's how it works. We have to fill each one of these committees with I think at least – is it two people that we have to put in there? I notice that some have actually put three volunteers forward. How many people do we need to supply? I don't remember that by hand.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Olivier. This is Heidi.

ALAN GREENBERG: This is Alan speaking. Go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, go ahead. You're on your computer, I'm not. But I know that we need an alternate as well so I think it's three. But go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, it's two people per committee plus an alternate. Overlap is allowed, although it wasn't envisioned it was certainly allowed. So you probably should try to find at least five with a common alternate, but the exact number is up to you. Obviously we want people for the BCEC in particular we are looking for people with experience and understanding of what is needed from a Director. The other one is a process committee, and people who are good at process should be selected.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Alan. That's helpful. I note that Oksana has volunteered for the BMSPC, I believe. She had participated in the previous one so she would be happy here again. Let's put her on the list. And if anybody else is interested, please e-mail staff and then we'll have a short list of people who are interested in this.

We need to select people very quickly because I think the deadline for this was yesterday. No, it's today. So we need to be quick at this one.

Wolf Ludwig.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Yes, okay. Thanks, Olivier. I've posted a general question on this in the chat, and the question was whether people who are representing us at the NomCom could be considered for a task like this as well or for a working group. It's a general question. And the second is a remark. It's Jordi who pointed in the chat that he's volunteering again and he has already been there the last time. So I would like to suggest Jordi again.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Wolf. So Jordi Iparraguirre has volunteered to serve on the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee. And I think Alan Greenberg would have announced I believe that Wolf would be mentioning specifically for example Sandra Hoferichter who would be on the NomCom next year, would she be able to serve also in the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee for example?

Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

To be clear on the timing, today is the deadline for submitting names – either nominations or Expressions of Interest. The RALO then has a week to do the selection. I think it was a week.

In terms of overlap between the BCEC and the NomCom, there is nothing to prohibit it. It is not against the rules. It does put a person in that role in an interesting situation in that they would be privy to knowing – and this will depend on when the BCEC process finishes and when the NomCom process starts – but probably they will be in a position to know that someone might be applying for both. That could prejudice how they look at it. In other words, that could prejudice someone against a person on the NomCom because they knew they were also trying to get in via the ALAC position or something like that. But there is nothing to forbid against it. There are strict confidentiality rules in both directions, and the person would have to honor those. So it's purely a judgement call on your part and the individual's part whether they choose to do this or not.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. So I note that Wolf would like to suggest Sandra as well then for the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee.

Oksana mentioned Rodrigo did a great job at BCEC. Who was Rodrigo? I don't see any Rodrigo here. Rodrigo?

ALAN GREENBERG: [Inaudible] but staff could look up who was on last year for [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Roberto. Okay, Roberto. I think Oksana was nominating Roberto. Okay. And I note that Yrjö Länsipuro also admitted the interest of being on the BCEC [inaudible].

Okay, let's move on. I'm happy to see that there is interest to fill those committees now. I would be quite open, I'll think I'll have an interest in being in the process committee as I have served on it in the past as well. So it's been an interesting case, so just making sure the process works. And I think there needs to be some knowledge of it, although I don't think it's going to be that much work because it's not a... The second time... No, the third time that we're going to be running this .

Next we have the EURALO conference call scheduling. There is a Doodle that we sent during our last call, and the Doodle showed – the question was about when should we have our EURALO call? Should we keep it on the third Tuesday of the month, or should we move it to the fourth Tuesday of the month, or maybe another day in the third week of the month, or another day in the fourth week of the month?

And then there was a question about the timing – should we keep it at 18:00 UTC in the summer or 19:00 UTC in the winter, which makes it 8 p.m. in general for Central Europe and 9 p.m. for Eastern parts of Europe. Or should we have a timing that's earlier or later, or should we have a rotating time? And the Table shows quite conclusively that the current timing we're using seems to be the one that the most people like. So I would conclude that perhaps we're not going to change the timing on this occasion.

Are there any comments now that you're all able to see this?

I must say I was quite surprised, by the way, by those results because I had heard a lot of people complaining that it was too early, too late,

etc., so it was surprising to find that most people are happy with the current timing.

Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. It seems that there are people who didn't answer, but so be it. My only trouble is that we have sometimes the same day the same hour as the CCWG meeting on Accountability. I know that there were less of those meetings but still when it happens the same day it's difficult to split my participation. I know that there are people who are able to do that, but I am not. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Sebastien. So yes, I mean this is a problem we're all faced with, sometimes the occasional clash. [Fine], I don't see any other notes on this. The only thing I can add, though, is that next month I would have a problem with attending on the 20th of September because on that day I will be travelling and I don't think that I will be on the ground. I'll probably be in an aircraft at the time of the EURALO monthly call, so I would ask whether we could move the EURALO monthly call perhaps one week forward or one week later, whichever. Either to the 13th of September or the 27th of September.

Let's have this as a follow-up Doodle please. Sorry to be [splitting] you on this, but a follow-up Doodle for next month – one week earlier or one week later. And I would have taken the details of what was being said on the Doodle here, but unfortunately the results were exactly the

same I think, or nearly the same, of having it the fourth Tuesday or the day earlier. Actually, I didn't even ask that question.

Okay, let's move on. I realize we have four minutes left into this call and we still have some significant discussion to have. Where is the agenda now?

Let's move on. The next one is the current EURALO ALS applications. Article 19 has applied. It's an organization that is based in London, but has actually got people that work from the Netherlands as well. They are dealing primarily, in fact all, about Human Rights. The representative for that organization has been very involved in ICANN in all matters of human rights including leading the Working Party on Human Rights.

There is only one concern with this organization. It doesn't actually have members per se. It's active with a lot of communities, but it doesn't have members. And we usually are having organizations that have members. But on everything else – it certainly interacts with end users but it doesn't have an open membership. So there's a question on that and I was going to launch a little discussion on this and any follow-up comments would have to be done by e-mail.

Wolf Ludwig, you have the floor.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thanks, Olivier. Meanwhile because the DD form was sent by At-Large staff I think 10 days ago already, and I have had a closer look on it – and by the way I know Article 19 for more than 10 years and I'm as a former

journalist I was also not an official member. It's not an ALS. It's not a membership based organization like most of our ALSs. It's a network. And it's a very good and it's a very relevant network. It played a major role during the WSIS process in 2003 and 2005. And it is lobbying since many years for freedom of speech in all parts of the world.

Therefore, the only problem I see is a formal problem that it's not an association of the regular type we are familiar with. It's a network, but it's an open network and anybody who is interested can join. Therefore, it's sort of a membership-based organization.

So besides such a tiny formal aspect, I would be very much in favor to encourage them and to approve them because from the content side and point of use, they fit well into our goals. And since recent years they also got involved in ICANN and I would really like to encourage them first. Another side aspect is that it would be our first member organization from the U.K. We are waiting for years to encourage potential candidates from the U.K. and after Brexit in my opinion it's even more important to encourage anybody to be part of European activities.

So my vote, I didn't post it and I didn't declare it openly on the list so far, but it was my consideration and I would like to argue in this respect in a circular mail to the EURALO list by the [inaudible] okay. If there is no strict reason from ICANN staff or at-Large staff for such a new type of a member organization, I would be very much in favor of it and I would like to suggest to approve them. Thanks and okay so far.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Wolf. I note in the chat support from Oksana, support from Roberto as well, and support from Jordi Iparraguirre, support from Eric Schweighofer, and support also from Yrjö. So there's nobody going against this application. I'm not sure how much time we have for [inaudible].

ANNETTE MUHLBERG: I'd like to raise my hand [it's just] dropped off for a minute. Annette speaking. I would support [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Annette. First we have Cristoph Bruch who is on the call who has put his hand up and has now got a red cross so Christoph, go ahead.

CHRISTOPH BRUCH: Sorry about that. I'll lower my hand. I want to make sure that I'm not against Article 19 joining. What I would like to advise because of the kind of [inaudible] that has been going on in respect to the Bylaws, that if an organization wants to join that we should look at our Bylaws and act according to them. Of course, they can be interpreted but there are limits to the interpretation and if we need to change our Bylaws, then we have to consider it but we should not because we think it's a nice organization bend our rules. And I'm not suggesting that is happening, I just advise to take a look at that because we cannot expect people to abide by the Bylaws if we find special interpretations in case of need. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Christoph. That's a very good point and what I would suggest actually is perhaps because the Bylaws, as you said, could be interpreted but what we can do is to ask ICANN Legal to check the – I'm not sure whether this was done in the due diligence part – but ICANN legal could check if that works with us or with our Bylaws or not.

Perhaps, Heidi, would you know how that would work? Sorry to be putting you on the spot, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Basically, yes. I would need to look at the due diligence and I would certainly wish to contact ICANN Legal about that. There were questions before about organizations that a network type of set up. So let me go ahead and double check if that's been done and if not, I would recommend to do that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Next it's Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. I support Christoph's question and I want to raise another issue. I accepted the Bylaw change. I remember at the beginning we didn't accept the organization who were broader than at the national level – European coordination or other type of organization like that – and we have to be careful.

And my other advice is that we just need to be careful on what we want on this specific topic because we can have more member and good members but there are going in one direction about the ICANN Bylaws with the change of the Bylaws and if it's what we want that to happen then let's go. But if it's not really what we want, we will get into trouble. And we have to speak about all that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Sebastien. Next is Wolf Ludwig.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks, Olivier. Thanks Sebastien pointing to this one aspect I forgot in my previous remarks. As far as the exceptional circumstances, as this candidate is not based in one European country only as the rule usually is for our members, etc. I just want to point to the fact that we did such an exception already when we [had took the aid to] EURALO individuals and when we clearly said from the beginning this will be an exception, a sort of exception and an ALS which is not based in a particular country but which is across regional ALS and member or structure and therefore in the case of Article 19 I wouldn't see this aspect as a handicap or as a no-go. So it would somehow comply with the exception we once made already. This shouldn't become a rule but it could be considered in the same direction and I agree that we should check this with ICANN Legal. If they see any formal reasons and points of problems and if not, I would go ahead. As far as I know our Articles of Association, our Bylaws, and I think I'm one of the people who knows the current Bylaws at best. According to our current Bylaws, it wouldn't be a real obstacle as fact of

creating the EURALO individuals did not contradict our current Bylaws.
Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Wolf. And I note that Annette had asked for the floor earlier and I didn't give it to her. Annette, I'm really sorry. You have the floor.

ANNETTE MUHLBERG: No problem. Actually I asked for the floor for a long time ago so...

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible].

ANNETTE MUHLBERG: No, it was actually it was a totally different question. It was still that I'm on the list on the Bylaws and I was not explicitly asking to be on the working group on the Bylaws but actually I said I was available if there were any questions because I was not driving those Bylaws change. So that was in the past that I put the hand up. And here I just in this case now here I just asked Sebastien to explain again because I did not understand what he described as the problem. I just didn't understand it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks, Annette. If I could paraphrase I think Sebastien was alluding to the fact that this organization is actually present in more

than one country, and I think one of the rules might be that it needs to be present in one country and only one country as a chapter or something. Not a pan European or pan regional organization. But Wolf has said that there have been some exceptions that we have made and I note in the chat also that Oksana Prykhodko mentions the European Media Platform is also an international organization with chapters elsewhere, not only based in Ukraine.

I'm a little concerned about the time. We are 10 minutes over the official end of this call and people are starting to drop off. We need to provide our advice to the ALAC. I think it was supposed to be given yesterday or today. What I will do is to ask for more time from the ALAC so that we have another couple of weeks and we can follow up on the mailing list. If anybody is interested in the Due Diligence form, we're not distributing this openly on the mailing list since the mailing list is archived and this has sensitive information on it. But as members of EURALO, you all have the ability to consult that form. So if you want it, drop me an e-mail or ask staff and we will send you a copy of the Due Diligence form so you can have a look at it if you're interested in this.

Wolf Ludwig, your hand is still up.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Now I put it down.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alright. Thank you. Now next we have the selection of the ALAC Leaders from ALAC or At-Large Leaders from Europe with Sebastien Bachollet who is going to take us through this. Sebastien, you have the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Olivier. I just asked to have this put on the discussion today because we are supposed to decide about the Chair of ALAC before the end of this month and before we know we will be the third one represented within our region to the ALAC. And therefore I feel very [uncomfortable] with this way of doing things. And the second point is that anyhow we will have to have one of those three people, those three ALAC member, at the end of the year to be participate to the ALT Leadership Team and we need to have this discussion one way or another. It could be amongst the three people when we know who will be the three, but it could be also a little bit larger.

And then there are also who will be liaison with other groups and for the moment, for example, Olivier is the liaison to the GNSO and do we support him to stay as the liaison to the GNSO or do we want to make a new proposal. That's all those items were in the discussion right now. The first one is the Chair. There is one nomination – Alan Greenberg to be back – and it was put by Leon Sanchez and supported by Sandra.

And just to let you know my feeling today I wanted to send a mail [inaudible] that I want to propose [a] one who will be selected by the NomCom. We don't know who will be to be the Chair of ALAC just to show the difficulty with this process without knowing the 15 members

of the organization for selecting any leaders in this organization. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Sebastien. Are there any comments to this? I must say Sebastien has sent me the note. I hadn't even caught the fact that the process for the selection of the ALAC Chair had even started, but there was so much e-mail in the mailbox in the past few weeks and when you don't check it all the time then it tends to accumulate.

The call for candidates is open. Sebastien has raised a number of points here. I don't know whether does anybody have any thoughts on this on the spot here? Obviously if we have the topic in the next call then the process will be finished by then and the Candidate Evaluation Committee I think will already be in full swing to start its work. So perhaps may I suggest that we follow this up on e-mail? And Sebastien, if you want to voice your concerns on the EURALO mailing list and if anybody else has any comments on that, then we can proceed forward.

I must say I'm not quite sure what a RALO can do in this instance. I'm open to suggestions. Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I don't know if RALO have something to do but I think we can't have a leaders in this organization. It's a bottom-up organization so leaders is just because you are selected and and then you select somebody among those [ones] selected to be the leaders, it's okay but if we can have some exchange on that. My point today it's not too much who will be

the next Chair but the fact that we don't know what is the full pool of candidates and then the process it's organized to start at the end of this month and at the end of this month we will not have the name of the NomCom because it will be just beginning of September.

Then it's for my point of view first a process issue but also you may have a position [on] who will be a good Chair for the ALAC and who will be a good member of the Leadership Team of the ALAC Leadership Team or who will be liaison to the other group it's if we are not talking about that then it's just among the few people that it's decided. It's why I wanted to bring that to your attention. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sebastien. I think that's a very fair point. Yes, a sort of call for nominations do take a good look at this if you want and don't feel shy about nominating people on this. It is important that we get [contests] and that we don't just end up in a way where we say, "Well, you know we've just got one candidate so we'll just take that one candidate." Obviously there needs to be some discussions on this.

Wolf Ludwig.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks again, Olivier. I would just like to point to some previous experience we had in such cases. We have regional candidates in the Selection Committees, etc. and for the nomination process it's not so much a EURALO issue because we are represented in the committee so we can have an opinion on potential candidates. We can also make

suggestions candidates to be considered, but at the end of the day at this stage it's the Selection Committee itself who is doing a short list of the candidates submitted. And then it comes to the next step. And at the next level it's getting more important for EURALO again.

As in previous cases, once candidates were suggested and selected, finally the electorate for the ALAC Chair is comprising the ALAC members plus the five regional members, the RALO Chairs who have also a vote in this question. And from the very first case when then [15] was created and in Sebastien's case and the last time when Rinalia was selected, we have a sort of an exceptional rule at EURALO saying the vote of the EURALO Chair is a directed vote. So we have done in the past years always a consultation among our members, and according to the preference and the majority the Chair had to vote in his capacity as a regional representative according to his guided vote from our membership.

And I think this was a good habit in the past, and this good habit, what gives our members a choice to express an opinion or to make up their mind on this issue. So it's a fair chance of a quarter participation. So I suggest continue this time again according to our tradition, and at a later steps our members after the Selection Committee has made [his] short list, we can ask again our members what would be their preference.

ALAC members in the final voting rounds are free to vote according to their personal preferences. They have no guided vote, but in the EURALO cases, we always practice the good rules that the Chair is following the guided vote by [his] community. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Wolf Ludwig. Next is Sebastien Bachollet and I'll close the queue because we are 21 minutes past the hour.

Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Wolf, if you and me are not able to talk the same thing I don't know how the other people will understand something. I never talk about the Board member selection. I was specifically talking about the Chair of ALAC and the IRT members. And the Chair of ALAC, the nomination, will be ending the 31 of August. And at that day at least two of the ALAC member are unknown. And it's why I am putting this to you and the other point is that if you have any advice on who could be a good Chair for ALAC in the future in this election, it's time to say it and it's time to propose it. We have one name. It's Alan Greenberg coming back.

And I am not saying that to ask your support for any position but I wanted to have this discussion at this level, once again, because we are a bottom-up organization and I don't like to take those decision just by myself. Once again, I tell you that I will after this exchange I will send a proposal to have the nominated by the European member of the ALAC nominated by the NomCom to be the next Chair. We don't know his name. It's just to show the difficulty of the process.

But thank you very much, Olivier with that discussion. And if you have any question if the participant have any difficulty to understand the

situation, please feel free to exchange with either Wolf, Olivier, or myself, or anyone else and we will try to help you to understand. Thank you again.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Sebastien.

WOLF LUDWIG: Sorry for the confusion.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: No worries, Wolf. That's fine. It is late for all of us and I think many of us have not had food before this call, so we're all getting rather hungry. I would like to ask if there is any other business.

I don't see anyone putting their hand up. No, I see Wolf Ludwig put his hand up. Wolf, you have the floor.

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, there was one point among Any Other Business. It was a suggestion made by Oksana today referring to the next General Assembly in 2017. I think at this stage it is simply too early because we do not know any financial plannings. We have no idea whether there might be a slight chance to have a funded General Assembly in 2017 again. There are too much uncertainties at the moment. Therefore, I believe it makes no sense at this early stage to start a discussion. I think we should try to look into the direction if there is a small chance that we may have a

funded General Assembly in 2017 in Copenhagen. Therefore, we should follow up in this direction. I think it's also in the sense of Oksana but it's too early at this stage to have a comprehensive debate because there are too many unknown factors at the moment. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Wolf. And I note that Copenhagen is in March, 2017. The budget for the extra RALO requests has already been voted because it's a budget that was passed last June and it did not provide us with any funding for face-to-face General Assemblies.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, just very briefly. I wanted to just point out to everyone that as Olivier was the main author of the document for the multi-year budget for the Summits and their General Assemblies is that it did – and as was agreed there was only one face-to-face General Assembly per RALO per cycle. So EURALO had its face-to-face in Dublin in 2015. So that will be the only face-to-face General assembly that ICANN will pay for during this cycle.

Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Heidi. And on this lovely note, I think we've done a lot of discussion today. Thanks to everyone for having stuck to this. Please follow up and especially Sebastien, please follow up with your points on the mailing list about the ALAC Leaders from Europe. And for everyone else, we have a number of action items to follow up with.

As I said, if you want to have a copy of the Due Diligence from Article 19, please drop a note to staff or to me or to Wolf, and we'll send you a copy.

And apart from that, I'd like to thank you all for taking part in this. I hope that we will see you in other calls such as any policy calls or even the ALAC calls and the working group calls. But with this, thank you very much. Thanks to Adigo for extending our time, and thanks to staff for also being able to extend the time.

Have a very good evening everyone and see you or speak to you next month again. Take care. This call is adjourned now. Bye-bye.

TERRI AGNEW:

Once again the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]