
TERRI AGNEW: Certainly. We'll go ahead and begin at this time. One moment, please. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the EURALO monthly call, taking place on Tuesday, the 13th of September, 2016 at 1800 UTC. On the call today we have Oksana Prykhodko, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Wolf Ludwig, Yrjö Länsipuro, Erich Schweighofer, Matthieu Camus, Sebastien Bachollet, Lianna Galstyan, Wale Bakare, Ovidiu Popeti, and Sandra Hoferichter. We have listed apologies from Bastiaan Goslings, Robert Gaetano, and Heidi Ullrich. Also joining us on the call is Jordi Iparraguirre. Joining us a little later in the call, Alan Greenberg is hoping to do so. From staff, we have Gabriella Schitteck, Silvia Vivanco, and myself, Terri Agnew. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and also on the call is Mirjana Tasic. I'm now turning it back over to you, Olivier. Please begin.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Terri. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Have we missed anybody in the roll call? Has anybody's name not been mentioned?

[inaudible], okay. Oh, I see Jordi has put his hand up. Jordi Iparraguirre?

I think he was just mentioning that maybe he wasn't mentioned. I also note in the chat that Mirjana Tasic has not been mentioned, either, but I believe that a number of people are still arriving, so Terry will be adding those names of the people arriving to the overall roll call.

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.

Let's start immediately. We've got a meeting where we're going to be discussing CROPP, I think, mostly. I wanted to add one more item, and that was in "any other business," a quick discussion on the latest At-Large Structure Application Article 19. There was quite an extensive discussion on the mailing list, so I just wanted to try and square this one up. And no other changes to the agenda than what is currently on your page. Are we okay with the current agenda? Any amendments?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so the agenda is approved as it is on your screen. Next, the review of the action items. They have all been completed, apart from one, which is to do with the ALS Engagement Task Force members, to read the letter drafted by Yrjö and provide comments. Might I ask that we discuss this maybe later on, when we have our reviews of our different – well, in agenda item 5, we've got Yrjö Länsipuro, who will be able to speak to us about the Task Force on At-Large Structure Engagement. So in the interest of time, the action items are completed. We can certainly go into the next agenda item. And that's the EURALO Board Election of the vacancies.

Erich Schweighofer ended up as our only candidate, when Julia [inaudible] stood back, and we basically have two options. Option one is to have a vote, because we had already started up a vote when we had two candidates. So far, and historically, when there is just one candidate, it's a bit of a waste of time for staff and a waste of time pretty much for everyone to have a vote. And in fact, when it comes down to At-Large, we try and operate by consensus. It's actually in the ALAC bylaws, and it's something that we strive to do. Having had that discussion on the mailing list about Erich with the various parties and so on, I just wanted to open the floor. I know that Erich Schweighofer is

here, actually, on the call. But the idea would just be to have a consensus call – in other words, if there are any objections to Erich, then they could email me or email staff. But otherwise, Erich would be drafted into the EURALO Board by acclamation. Are there any comments?

So having seen no objection, and we did ask on the mailing list – having seen no objection to Erich Schweighofer having taken on the position, I think that we can say that Erich has been drafted into the EURALO board by acclamation. So, well done, Erich. I know it's gone a little bit fast. So, we have to confirm, who are the voters? This is not a vote; this is a consensus call. And we did have a consensus call on the mailing list; we did ask whether there were any objections, and I'm well aware that if we had an actual vote with members, we would probably not be reaching a quorum of people. That's what the whole thing of a consensus call is about. Wolf Ludwig, [inaudible] from you, Wolf, as the previous EURALO chair, and I'm into uncharted territory, here. Is there anything else? And as the current Secretariat of EURALO, is there anything that we need to do next, after this?

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thanks, Olivier. It's Wolf Ludwig, for the record. Actually, in comparable situations in the past, when we had one candidate only, and there was a lot of back-and-forth, and [inaudible] voting for [inaudible] even prepared and sent, and then we realized that Julia, the second candidate, won't be available anymore, so we came back to one candidate again. So the only thing in such a situation, what is needed now, when somebody is elected by consensus – that means without an

objection – we only have to announce after this call tonight that we are dealing with the issue again during our monthly call, etcetera, and we made this formal approval, etcetera, and if there was no objection raised again, etcetera, it was confirmed. That’s the only formal thing we have to consider.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Wolf. It’s Olivier speaking. And what was the time that we need to give our members? Is it 24 hours, is it 3 days? If after 3 days, there is no objection, then Erich is automatically in the Board?

WOLF LUDWIG: Well, I would say people who wouldn’t have liked it could have objected over the last week already. There was enough time in between, and it was clear that he would be a single candidate. So, it was more or less obvious that he will be approved, as we did previously. So there was enough time and opportunity for anybody who would like to raise an objection. So, I do not think that we have to reenter into the status of before. So we can confirm.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Wolf. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I note from Silvia that she will note on the Wiki page that Erich has been accepted as our new Board member, and as an action item, then, we need to – I don’t know whether – is it the Secretariat or the Chair that needs to make the announcement on the mailing list? Or is it staff that makes the announcement on the mailing list, Wolf?

WOLF LUDWIG: Well, in my opinion, I think it's always more neutral if staff does this announcement.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for the –

WOLF LUDWIG: For reasons of neutrality.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And it's procedural; that's correct, yes.

WOLF LUDWIG: It's procedural, and therefore I think it would be better if staff would just [inaudible] conservative announcement, while we can congratulate on the list afterwards.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Wolf. And congratulations, or suspended congratulations to Erich Schweighofer on this new appointment. Let's move on. We can go over to the current public comments.

Now, this is the policy discussion that we have in At-Large, and I've noticed that recently, there has been more interest in EURALO for policy, and I think it's very, very important indeed. It's a vital part of the

mission of At-Large to comment on all of the public comments out there – or at least, the ones that pertain to end-users.

There are three statements currently – well, first, you can see – lengthen your agenda. You’ve got the policy advice page on the new At-Large website, which looks really cool, because you can search on past policy items and statements, and you’ll be able to see what the At-Large community has said about topics and things. You’ve also got a link to our policy advice development page. That’s where the work happens, where public commenting takes place. And I encourage you, by the way – everyone is invited to have a look at what’s going on and to comment. The way that you go into commenting is that you log into the Wiki – if you don’t have a login, you can ask staff to create a login for you – log into the Wiki, and then use the comment feature on each one of those pages, and your input will be taken into account. Beware, though, if a process has already gone – if the train has already left the station – if a public comment period is closed, it’s no use commenting on it anymore. It’s only the current ones.

So, three statements currently that have been approved by the ALAC recently. One is the proposed guidelines for the Second String Similarity Review Process. This was to do with string similarity. It’s a weird old game, this one – when you have two strings that mean different things, but they look the same. For example, if I were to use country codes, you would look at .it and .It, so if you do .It with a capital I and a lower t, the capital I looks very much like a lower-case I on many screens. It depends on what typeface you use, but in some typefaces, it does that. So that’s kind of a string similarity, and there is a visual similarity, and there are others to do specifically with the internationalized domain

names. When you use IDNs that look Latin in some characters, then you might have the ability to have this string similarity. That causes problems. Why do they cause problems? Because a spammer would register a domain name, or a malware would register a domain name that would use this other character set, but would actually be empty and therefore free to register, and try to mimic the real organization, and then try, perhaps, to grab your credit card number and also some other things. So [inaudible] process. Anyway, that was a long way going around, but I think that sometimes it's important to explain it. So we've had a statement that was approved. If you're interested in this, have a look at it. It's on the Wiki page.

The next one is the At-Large Community Policy Issues: why end-users should care – that was a document that was drafted really to help Rinalia Abdul Rahim work with the ICANN Board. The ICANN Board is going to meet shortly – I think this week – in Brussels, and they will be looking at this document, specifically. It was drafted by Ariel, Heidi, and the ALAC Leadership Team. It's too late to comment now, but I think this is a document that we'll probably continue to want to update, because it's quite important for people who are out there, who are not so versed with what's going on at ICANN to relate to what's going on at ICANN. And when I start telling you about PDP on SO/AC and SG & C Outreach, part 3 discussion, that doesn't mean anything to you, and in fact, even less to people out there. But if you start saying, "Well, look, we're looking at expiry of domain names, and once you have forgotten to renew your domain name, how much is a registry or a registrar allowed to make you pay as a registrant to renew it and save it from the

abyss,” then that makes it a bit more interesting and certainly relevant to an end-user.

Thirdly, we have the EURALO hot topics, also delivered to Rinalia Abdul Rahim. I realized – I mean, these were drafted quite quickly because the Board needed those early enough before they met – these are both living documents, and I expect that both documents will evolve from here. And I hope that we might be able to get some input from you and others, have a special Wiki page to continue with the EURALO hot topics and update them as we know. Because that’s also something that’s helpful for our community. When somebody – a new At-Large structure – signs up, it’s important that they certainly find out and think, “Aha, so these are the current hot topics? Well, I’ve got more hot topics for you.” Sebastien, you put your hand up. Sebastien Bachollet.

And you might be muted. You probably are muted, actually.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, sorry, Olivier. Yes, thank you very much. I guess I am not muted anymore.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, we can hear you now.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: – my voice [inaudible] call, sorry about that. Yeah, we had to make changes on this document on the Wiki, but I just want to add the point that we finally got the possibility to read and to comment on this

document the 13th of August, and it ended the 1st of September. I really think that when such a document is produced, it must be done by more people than just you, and we need to have a discussion on that. We had to make changes after the case, because it was already sent. But I really feel more and more that we – not just EURALO, but At-Large in general – we don't take enough time and we don't do enough to have real [inaudible] to our members or to the end-user. We are in it to go out of just the shoes of us, to follow the things, and to discover things; because if not, we will end up not being the voice of the end-user, but just our voice. I take these documents as an example, but it's larger than that, and I really think that we need to find a way, because we are entering into a new world with this transition of the stewardship, and we will be accountable, not just to us, but to our members, but also to the rest of our community and to the rest of the RALO – sorry, to the rest of the RALO, yes – and to the rest of the SO/ACs. And we have to find out how we will be able to have a better [inaudible]. This document was just written by a few people. It's not a bad document at all; I am not talking about that. But we need more input from more people, and we need to find a way for that, and that's an important point. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Sebastien. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. What I would suggest is that we take a copy of this EURALO hot topics as a starting point, put it on the Wiki page linked to our EURALO pages, and perhaps keep the commenting open for this, and continue building it up. And maybe, from month to month – since this is an important thing – from month to month, we can review this and see what additional

input we've had in there. As maybe we review the current public comments, we could say, "Review of EURALO Hot Topics." Just a five-minute standing item every month. Any comments? It's a proposal, by the way. So I'm not just saying, "Let's do it!" I'm saying, "This is a proposal." It doesn't cost much. I can see a [inaudible] from both – it's just a cut-and-paste and we can create this, and then we can revisit it next month and publicize this on the EURALO mailing lists, so at least we can move on that. When it comes up to the ALAC topics, it's a lot more involved, so I'll leave that aside for the time being. Let's see how we can do on the EURALO hot topics.

Let's continue. Statements and process. That's your time for you to comment on first "Creating a Consumer Agenda at ICANN." It's not a public comment, but it's an At-Large community paper that's being put together. Have a look at that. "Consumer Agenda at ICANN" – there's some concern about who's a consumer and who's not, but it's an interesting paper in there, and it needs some input from EURALO. It's been primarily at the moment receiving a lot of input from other parts of the world, but not from Europe. So, that's one.

The next one is the gTLD – so, Generic Top-Level Domain Marketplace – Health Index. The ALAC is currently voting on the statement, so it's too late to comment on, but there is a request in there for volunteers who want to continue building the gTLD Marketplace Health Index. You'll notice it's a beta thing. So they're asking for volunteers to help out with building this thing. I've volunteered for it; I think a couple of other people have volunteered for it as well. Let's hope we can get a few more people from Europe to look at this and to volunteer. I don't think

it's a huge amount of work, because they've already started with a good set of data, but there certainly needs to be more done.

Then the IANA Naming Function Agreement. The ALAC is conducting a consensus call on a brief statement drafted by the ALAC Chair, Alan Greenberg. That, as you know, we've had members of our community taking part in the IANA Stewardship Transition Cross-Committee Working Group. We've also had some members in the ICANN Accountability Cross-Community Working Group, and these Naming Function Agreements have had some extensive input from our community. They've already been agreed by our members in the Cross-Community Working Groups, so Alan Greenberg is just drafting something that says, "Thank you, we support this, and good job, thank you for all."

Same thing for the IANA Intellectual Property, IPR – it's not "Regulation," it's whatever – Agreement. "Rights," there we go. Intellectual Property Rights Agreement. So these are two quick statements – statements that seem to be stalled; in other words, things that don't move forward at the moment. The input requested from the Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, Stakeholder Groups, and Constituency Outreach – basically, outreach from everyone – about the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures. There is basically a group currently working in the GNSO, the Generic Names Supporting Organization, to look at the ability, or the possibility, to launch a new round of applications for another round of new Generic Top-Level Domains, and they need some input from all of the community. So your input, as well, is really needed. We've had a range of input in At-Large. Some people have said, "We don't need any more Generic Top-Level

Domains, it's an absolute mess." Others have said, "Well, actually, we need some for communities. We actually need to have another round which will prioritize communities." And others have said, "We need another round that will prioritize geographical balance." In other words, places like Latin America, Caribbean, and Africa, that have had so few applicants, should be privileged to be able to apply for these. So a variety of views – please have a look at that.

Currently, no public comments to which ALAC has decided to not submit any statements. And then there's a new one that's just come up, and that's the proposed renewal of .TEL Registry Agreement. We of the ALAC, in general – well, the ALAC doesn't comment on individual renewals for registry agreements, not in general. But it might be that there is something here that raises the interest of the ALAC that might be so outrageous, or that might affect end-users in a negative way, that the ALAC needs to talk about. Are there any questions or comments on any of these current requests for comments?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up. So, that's the work we have. As I said, there's more every day, so check on these pages regularly, please.

Let's move to agenda item number 5, and that's the Task Force on At-Large Structure Engagement, with Yrjö Länsipuro, who will be able to speak to us about this. Yrjö is the Chair of this Task Force, and Yrjö will be able to also let us know whether the Task Force members have been able to read his letter and provide comments. So, Yrjö Länsipuro, you have the floor.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yeah, thank you. This is Yrjö Länsipuro speaking. Well, I hope that the Task Force members have that letter that was sent to the mailing list. But unfortunately, I have not received any comments. And of course, this can be interpreted in two ways. One is that everybody is so happy that they don't need to say anything; or, that this draft letter is so that nobody wants to comment on it.

Basically, what I propose here is that we send a letter individually to each ALS, asking for two things. That is to say, we ask them to tell EURALO who would be their expert on various areas, various substance areas, which At-Large is commenting on – experts who would be willing to give their input to EURALO and to ALAC on these matters. We would need names and email addresses. And the other thing we would be asking is about the participation of the ALSes in the multi-stakeholder processes in their countries or in their areas, and whether from EURALO and At-Large we could help them in any way, so that they would become active in that context.

So I guess I would still ask for comments, and then we would be, I guess, sending this letter to all ALSes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yrjö. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Thanks for summarizing the contents of the letter to be sent out to each European At-Large Structure. And I open the floor for comments and questions on this. And whilst I don't see anyone putting their hands up, I'll give you my comments.

I think that the idea, obviously, is to try and engage our At-Large Structures more, and to find out what they do, and be able to actually have a two-way, I-help-you-you-help-us type of thing, or we-help-you-you-help-us type of way, because obviously, having the push from EURALO behind you sometimes also helps with things that happen locally, whilst at the same time, if we manage to identify experts in various topics – and it’s great that you’ve given a list of topics, Yrjö, on the letter – if we manage to identify experts on these topics from each one of our At-Large Structures, then we don’t need to bother all of you every month and tell everyone, “Oh, you have to comment about this stuff and that stuff,” because we’ll know who to ask, and we can certainly then target things directly. So if there’s something about WHOIS, then anybody who is well-versed in that will be able to be contacted directly. And if there’s something about security and stability, I know that it’s a very focused topic, and we do have experts in our community; so only those experts in our community that are into security and stability would be asked if they could help with drafting something. I guess that’s the idea.

I just have one concern, Yrjö, on this letter – it’s the length of the letter. It’s a little bit – it’s two pages. I don’t know whether this can be shrunk a little bit, so that some people get maybe a page and a half. If we can do this, that would be helpful.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO:

Yeah, this is Yrjö. Yeah, I feel the same, actually. I think I did it too long. So what I propose is that I try to boil it down to one page, one and a half. If you feel – you, Olivier, and the people on the call feel that these

are the issues that we could talk about, then I will draft it again and make it shorter.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Yrjö. It's Olivier speaking. I've just put the link to the letter in the chat. It's a .DOC document at the moment. It's usually better to have this as a PDF; I don't know why staff has put it as a .DOC and not a PDF. If I could ask that a PDF copy could be linked to the Wiki page, that would be helpful. I don't know how you want to work on this, Yrjö, whether you want – you could do a Google Doc or something, and then get people to work on it to shrink it a little bit, or – I'll leave it to you to choose however you wish to do it, but if you could certainly shrink it, anybody who wishes to help you out on this would be helpful. But the intent itself, I think, is great.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Okay. Thank you, Olivier. I welcome all the help I can get. Please send me comments. And then in the next few days, I'll write a shorter version of it – one page, one and a half.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Yrjö. Any last comments on this letter? Is there any – I mean, I've spoken in favor of this; does anyone think that this is not the right way to go about it, or has any idea that we should ask another question, or ask the question differently?

Silence. Okay, so it looks like you're on the right track, Yrjö. At least, there is silence here; nobody is saying, "Hang on, you don't want to do it

like this! You want to do it like that.” Okay. Let’s then move on – thanks for this, Yrjö, and good luck on that, and hopefully by the next – well, in the next couple of weeks, let’s hope that then we can get this letter out to all of our At-Large Structures. And then Wolf and I will do the honors of chasing up after ALSes to try and build this knowledge, basically.

Next is the EURALO bylaws review, and just a quick update on the Task Force. Now, last month, I provided you with details of a meeting that Wolf and I had with Michael Yakushev and Jean-Jacques Sahel, who are the regional representatives – Vice Presidents, actually, for Europe in the Global Stakeholder Engagement part of ICANN. And we also had at that meeting Michael Mettrich and Oksana Prykhodka, who were also members of this At-Large Structure – sorry, of this EURALO Bylaws Review Task Force. We hit a snag, in that Michael was the main drafter of all these new texts, and unfortunately – well, good for him – he was hired by a company. So good, he was hired by a company, left his At-Large Structure, and therefore, we don’t have someone now to draft this new text. But we had worked out a way forward in Helsinki, about having some help from Global Stakeholder Engagement legal staff. I saw last week, I met with Michael Yakushev on a trip, and we had a discussion on this, and he has said that he would come back to me within two weeks with a proposal, and hopefully, that will include some legal supports as to be able to get that ball rolling again on this. So we’re waiting for his proposal, and then as soon as that comes forward, the Working Group will be able to make a choice, and hopefully have the help to move forward, and then we can continue.

That's the only news at the moment on this. And yes, I guess it is frustrating for some of us that during the summer, things have slowed down, anyway. So now is the time when things are starting to move again. If any of you, by the way, have knowledge of bylaws, and legal knowledge on drafting these kind of things, then you're absolutely welcome to join the Task Force. We usually end up with five or six people, and even less sometimes, on the call, so we would appreciate more help on that.

Next is the CROPP. That's the big discussion of the day today. And it's internal again, but it's important, because that's the Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program. This is a program that has been used for several years now to help our community reach new parts of the world – in other words, getting more people from underrepresented parts of Europe – underrepresented, of course, in EURALO. And in past years, we have been able to use this program to send prospective At-Large Structure representatives and also recent At-Large Structure representatives to EURODIG, the European Dialogue on Internet Governance. We've had reports that have been now filed by the more recent travelers. We've also had several discussions already on previous calls, and also on email, about which way EURALO should go this year. I note that other RALOs have already started filing requests for travels and trips. We haven't yet, so far – and it takes six to nine weeks, I think, for the process to move forward, so we pretty much are grilled until December, I guess, or late November. If there is anything that happens before that, it's going to be very, very tight to file something for it.

There has been – and I’m going to summarize this quickly – there has been some discussion about making use of this fund for five ICANN-funded people, two days and two nights. And it’s a trip that has to take place in the region. And there has been a call, the last call – and also in the email – to use some of these slots to send people to the forthcoming ICANN meeting in Copenhagen, which, I believe, is in March or April next year; I haven’t checked the exact date. And we could have a General Assembly over there, and have people sent to that General Assembly using the CROPP funds. I’ve seen some opposition to this. Certainly, Roberto Gaetano, who couldn’t make it to the call today, has voiced his opposition to it. There is actually no rule against this. I’ve checked with the CROPP Review Team if one was allowed to apply for such funding, and yes; LACRALO has already done this last year. They sent some people from the region to the ICANN meeting, and there was a LACRALO meeting that took place at the ICANN meeting. So we could – the rules are there – we are allowed to do it. But there is certainly some opposition, and I am also not at ease with sending people to the meeting that are already from At-Large Structures that we have, except if they’re brand-new At-Large Structures, and we need to introduce them to our community and to an ICANN meeting, and they’ve never been to an ICANN meeting. But when it down to seasoned At-Large Structures, sending them to an ICANN meeting when they already know what an ICANN meeting is like because they’ve already taken part in the At-Large Summit, etcetera, is something. And it’s only for two days, as well, when an ICANN meeting is usually four, five, or six days, so they’d only get a subset of this. It’s not really outreach; at this point, it really becomes more like “in-reach.”

I'll stop my rambling. I see a – there's no queue; there's just one person in queue. There's Wolf Ludwig. So, Wolf, please. You have the floor.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thanks, Olivier. It's Wolf Ludwig, for the record. I just want to comment that I completely share the reservations expressed by Roberto Gaetano on this point, that it makes no sense to send any established or old-hand ALSes to an ICANN meeting. Such a thing which has been done by LACRALO in the past, in my opinion, only serves the purpose of a particular ALS or person who can benefit from such CROPP [inaudible]. So I would definitely express my general reservation about using it for ICANN meetings in the region, with the only exception what you, Olivier, just said. It's a different issue if it's an incoming, new member and representatives who had never so far had the privilege or the possibility to attend an ICANN meeting. So this would be a validated exception, in my opinion, that would make sense. But under general consideration, I would say as – or better argued, it's not really a proper case or a proper context for outreach activities. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Wolf. It's Olivier speaking. I note in the chat – first, a note from Lutz Donnerhacke, who says Copenhagen is a good choice, easy to reach and therefore, cheap. Accommodation is a bigger problem. Indeed, the CROPP offers travel and accommodation, but only for two nights; so the accommodation for three nights would have to be taken up by others. But we can always work something out. We could try and work something out for a new At-Large Structure. I know it's

also that Sandra Hoferichter said under the outreach aspect, we might consider RIPE meetings of European, or European Internet Governance Meetings, as a better choice. Now, of course, we've sent people to EuroDIG, the European Dialogue on Internet Governance. But I have also read – I think it was Sandra who mentioned that EuroDIG now has some kind of a fellowship fund. Is that correct?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So, then, the question is – thank you, Wolf, for this, by the way, this “yes” – so if that's the case, I don't know whether we're doing double duty with sending more people to EuroDIG. I note now in the chat – I wish people would put their hands up and speak; maybe that might help – I see “RIPE is very special.” Lutz Donnerhacke says, “RIPE is very special. These people do not know enough about ICANN – I'm sorry, *do* know enough about ICANN and are already involved in the process. Outreach would mean to go to groups which are not connected, such as – but that are as valuable.” Of course there is – the only things that I can think of at the moment are RIPE and it seems that it probably isn't going to yield much interest to go and speak to people at RIPE or at a RIPE meeting. I'm not quite sure; I've never been to a RIPE meeting, so please, if you could let us know if there any potential At-Large Structures in there. Then there's EuroDIG, where we can continue with EuroDIG; and then there are other meetings, and I don't know of pan-European – I certainly know of SEEDIG in Hanover is a huge, huge

commercial fair, but I just have an idea it doesn't really deal much with end-users. It's really more of a commercial fair of some sort. I don't think that there are any At-Large or potential At-Large Structures there. I can't think of any other big European meetings. There might be some TED meetings taking place in Europe, or TEDx meetings; I don't know. I certainly have been to one in Geneva, and that was quite exciting to see all the young people there. That might be a place that we might wish to send someone to to do a better evangelism about what we do, and spread the word. But I see now, a queue is forming up, so let's start the queue. Lutz Donnerhacke, you have the floor.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE:

Lutz Donnerhacke, for the record. Thank you. I think that the most important point on outreach is to define what we want to achieve with this outreach. If we only want to achieve that ICANN, the name, is propagated through the community, well, we have first to define what the community is, or what the community we are aimed to is. The more interesting point is, which community is valuable for us? Where can we take benefits from? It might be a community of loyalists, it might be a community of [inaudible], it might be a community of people who are teaching in schools – I don't know. But first, we have to define which group we want to reach, and there we can try to find out where they are organized, and how to reach them, and how we can put a little bit of money into communication, and to prepare the communication for such [inaudible]. That would be helpful.

The main problem for me, and for most of the people here is that we are coming all from developed countries, where most of the people

know about Internet and know how to use it. I certainly have no idea how the world is outside my little space, and I think there are some areas where the funding is much more appropriate in Central Europe. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Lutz. That's very helpful. Let's go down the list, and then we'll continue the discussion. Sandra Hoferichter, you're next.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Yes, it's Sandra speaking. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, very well.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Wonderful. As I the one who proposed to skip some of the EuroDIG travels, Lutz, I would like to explain myself a little bit more. We have five travel slots from the CROPP outreach program, and I did not mean to skip all of them. But as I mentioned already, as we do have now a Travel Support Program, which I really hope will be stable for the future, not only as a course for Brussels, I think we can bring in a lot of our community people who are interested in participating in IG and ICANN meetings. We can also bring them in via the EuroDIG Travel Support Program. And I think it's time to really search for other meetings taking place in Europe and in particular, I have in mind those many meetings that are currently rising in the Southeastern European part of Europe,

the Internet Governance Forums. And I think those meetings would be a great opportunity for people to go there to reach out and introduce them to ICANN, get them into EURALO, because I've realized that at Germany just last week, that those communities are not aware of the possibilities of end-users being able to participate in ICANN matters. And I think those meetings – those small, especially the Southeastern European meetings – could be a good opportunity, and we should at least offer two or three travel slots for our community members, for our experienced members to participate in those meetings and represent the end-user and EURALO there. And we discussed already the matter of the language issue. I must say, most of these meetings have at least partly an English panel, and all of these, or many of these people are able to speak in English. Outreach takes place in the side meetings in the corridors. And I'm pretty sure that in personal discussions in English – or some people may even be able to communicate in Russian or in any local language – it might be feasible for them to go there and really to reach out to those who just found out about Internet governance matters, and learn about ICANN and EURALO for the first time. Then it would be really wise to have EURALO and end-user participation to have representatives in place to reach out to them, because many of the participants in those national Internet governance meetings are society. And usually, they are not really aware of the participation possibilities at ICANN and even at EuroDIG and other forums. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks so much for this, Sandra. That's helpful, as well. And I note in the meantime that Wolf is also mentioning SEEDIG, the Southeastern European Dialogue on Internet Governance, as well. Thanks for

mentioning that you are not proposing to scrap all of the EuroDIG slots, but perhaps to make a few of them available for other things. And in response to Lutz earlier – Lutz was asking and mentioned our goals, and certainly trying to find out what happened in the Eastern European countries, rather than the Western European countries. We actually have one goal, which was set a while ago, which was to have at least one At-Large Structure in every country. And we have not reached that goal yet. Perhaps there is a good idea to focus our outreach in those countries, or for those countries that have not currently got an At-Large Structure. That probably is one step forward.

I know Oksana Prykhodka has put together - it's actually a link on the Outreach and Engagement of the EURALO Task Force and At-Large Structure Engagement – there is a link which says here, “EURALO Dashboard” and that shows which one of the countries in Europe has an At-Large Structure, and which one has not. Maybe we can draw up a list that there are a dozen countries that don't even have a single At-Large Structure there. Once we've got that list, we can find out an event or something, maybe even a regional event, that would reach those countries. And from that point onward, we can work on finding out who we can send there.

I'm not too concerned about the idea of language, because I think that – I just returned from Georgia, to give you an idea – and I found that Russian is also used as a common language in many of these countries, and so we could have someone from an Eastern European country – they could go and address in another or in a regional setting. If they spoke both English and Russian, that would probably be able to help in both ways.

Anyway, let's continue down the list. Christopher Wilkinson, you're next.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hi, good evening. Can you hear me?

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

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: That's good. First of all, I think it's desirable that we should have an At-Large Structure in each country. But from the political point of view of actually influencing ICANN in the lateral user's interests, and the public interest, more generally – I think the real priority is to increase the number of people who know enough about it to participate actively in the ICANN policy development processes, particularly Work Stream 2. From that point of view, I think we need to make better use of the members – the ALS that we already have. I would envisage a more active approach to the existing ALS, to invite them to designate individuals who would have specific interests in particular branches of ICANN policy and activities.

I would suggest that we have a system of – yes, in French, *parrainage* – in American, a “buddy system.” The idea doesn't really travel in English. But the point would be that leading members of the existing EURALO community would take a responsibility to train, to encourage, and to assist to participate new people, because the scope of ICANN's work is now so vast – and let's be frank, the dominance of the GNSO and its

various members is a [inaudible]. But unless you organize the local participation of representatives of the users' interests, a lot of the other work that we do – these are the outreach – would risk going to waste. So I would really like to focus on – in the short term, say over the next 12 to 18 months – getting a larger group together from the new At-Large Structures, who would be confident enough about their knowledge of this subject matter to participate directly, especially in conference calls. From that point of view, there may be cases for using [inaudible] travel budget. I haven't fully understood exactly where this money is coming from and who would decide how it would be used, but since most of the hard listing is actually done in conference calls, I think the travel aspect is secondary to getting a larger number of people directly involved with the policy discussions in ICANN. Coming back to the *parrainage*, you may ask who should take the lead. Well, I think the people who have taken the floor in this conference call – it's an interesting self-selection of people who think that they know enough about it to speak about it, and they should each look to making sure that one or two other people, within a short period of time, get up to speed on the matter to their extent. Thank you, Olivier; I've been a little bit long, but I don't speak very often, so I'm not going to apologize. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Christopher. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. You've mentioned *parrainage*, which is "mentoring" in English – I think it's "mentoring." In fact, other RALOs have done that. There is a mentoring system going on in LACRALO – I think it's in LACRALO – that I'm aware of, so it's a good point you've made here. We are trying to focus here

on the CROPP program, but you've come up with very good points here, so I didn't want to cut you off. But we really have to look as well at the angle of being able to send people out there, both to strengthen At-Large Structures, but also to find new ones in the gaps that we have. Sebastien Bachollet, you're next.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much. Just as a joke, it was interesting to see a Frenchman giving an English lesson to an Englishman, and I think that's where the culture, or the inter-culture, it's starting to be really interesting. But nevertheless, I wanted to [inaudible] Christopher's point, and one in particular. He talked about Work Stream 2, and we are not talking about Work Stream 2 in our meeting, but we can talk about policing the [inaudible] and we forget about what is happening with this transition, and I would like to support that we need to involve more people in those discussions. I will not do now the summary of where we are on this issue. I think that there are ten different groups, and there are ten different topics, and I am sure that you could be interested in one of them. And I am sure that, inside those groups, there are enough people from At-Large who can mentor any new people who want to start, and as I am a rapporteur of one of them – the one on the [inaudible] – if somebody is interested, I would be willing to help anyone wanting to start on that. But I am sure that we can find somebody in other groups, as well, and just take a topic and we will find you a mentor or two to do that. I really think that this topic is very important, and the idea of Christopher is very good. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Sebastien Bachollet. It's Olivier speaking, and we only have a couple of minutes left until the end of this call. I totally agree with the point that you're making on getting people involved with what you mean by Work Stream 2. These are the ICANN Accountability Work Streams; there are many of them. Just as a matter of news, I've asked for the Chair of the IANA Issues and ICANN Accountability At-Large Working Group that coordinates between all of the different inputs of the Work Streams – we have a Doodle that will be sent out shortly, or that might have already been sent out for a call next week, and there will also be – because there are so many new Work Streams now – there will be a call for members to join our Working Group, which feeds in through the people that are into all of these Work Streams. So, the call is imminent, and I hope that it will have plenty of people from EURALO that will volunteer for this. That is important. And hopefully, we can have a discussion during our next call about the Work Stream 2 topics. Are there any other comments on the EURALO CROPP program? What I have understood so far is that we probably would need a mix of a number of people that we send to EuroDIG – maybe one or two – a number of people that we will be sending to other fora that need to be yet identified based on the needs that we have, both in parts of Europe where there is no At-Large Structure – mostly, there are several countries in Eastern Europe that are in that case, so the SEEDIG – so, Southeastern European Dialogue on Internet Governance – sounds like a good location to send someone to. Not necessarily a newcomer that we'd send there; we might have to send somebody who's already versed into what we do, who has the knowledge and who can act as our

ambassador in that location. We can certainly check on that. And we can also see in other parts of Europe, if we have At-Large Structures that are currently not active, and maybe we can reactivate them by restarting the dialogue.

I note here from Mirjana Tasic, “For the new At-Large Structures coming from Southeastern Europe, the main problem is to provide some finance for functioning. It would be good if somewhere exists a paper with advice, how to provide basic funds for functioning.” I wanted to answer that. The basic funds for functioning of an At-Large Structure is not what ICANN would do. When you apply for an At-Large Structure, there’s no funds that are given to an ALS for functioning. The only thing that could be given is the ability to travel through the CROPP program, or to an ICANN meeting, or contribute to ICANN-related activities. But I think that when you sign up as an ALS, you have to say that you are financially self-sufficient. Self-sufficient, or self-supporting. Mirjana Tasic, quickly.

MIRJANA TASIC:

Yeah, Mirjana Tasic speaking, for the record. Yeah, I understand you, but you are coming from a different society. And we are new in all these things, and we need some kind of support, or at least advice, on how to proceed to provide functioning for us. We don’t expect ICANN to finance us, but to give us some advice and support on how to deal with this. For example, I have never worked – I have always worked with the government, or with some companies where someone other provided the money. But when I started my new – when we started our ALS in Belgrade, before five years, we still have problems to provide

self-sufficient finances. Is there any chance that EURALO or any other association can provide us with advice? Not funds.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. That's very helpful, Mirjana. And I think that – I'm hoping that others on the call would be able to answer this, and would be able to follow up on that. I notice here [inaudible] Foundation was a good address for NGO support in Eastern transition countries so far. I'm sure there are others, and I ask others if they wish to have your email address. Maybe you should drop this as a question on our EURALO mailing list. Because at the end of the day, there is also an advantage in being in EURALO – it's to also network with your colleagues and other EURALO ALSes that might have some points forward. And that certainly is mentoring, that Christopher Wilkinson has mentioned here. Mirjana?

MIRJANA TASIC: Yeah, thank you very much. Thank you. I'll drop the mail to the EURALO list. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. Thanks for this. Okay, so we've moved a little bit forward on this, and I think we're going in the right direction. I note that we are at the top of the hour, so we need to – as much as this discussion is moving forward – we need to close the call soon. We just have one more thing, and that was in the "any other business" category. There was a discussion, quickly, a couple of words on Article 19. Currently, there was a discussion with the due diligence being sent out; certainly,

some concerns were expressed by some people, that Article 19 did not have actual members, but they certainly had a lot of interfacing with end-users, because you could take part in Article 19 activities and support it in a variety of ways.

If I could summarize it, there were concerns – I haven't seen anybody actually completely object to Article 19, and so my inclination would be to provide advice to the ALAC that EURALO would be positive on this. I wanted to ask whether there were any additional comments here. Wolf Ludwig, and Mirjana, is that an old hand, or is that a new – ?

MIRJANA TASIC: Sorry, I might have made some mistake. Let me see what I have done.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No worries. Okay, Wolf Ludwig is next in the queue. Wolf, you have the floor.

MIRJANA TASIC: Sorry, I didn't [inaudible] to send anything more [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Mirjana. Wolf, you have the floor.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, thanks, Olivier. It's Wolf Ludwig, for the record. I think you have partly summarized the discussion of exchanges we had on our mailing

list over the last month from our last monthly call in August. And what I have seen was a lot of support, some reservations; they are not substantiated, and I see no objection. And under these given circumstances, and compared with previous cases, when I asked Regional for their advice, if there are any objections, etcetera, we hardly ever had so much positive support by our members. Therefore, I really think it would be a good idea to express our Regional advice to ALAC being positive; that means that we support this application from Article 19. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for very much for this, Wolf. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Any other comments? Any other thoughts?

I don't see anyone putting their hands up, so I take it that everyone is okay with this. So, if everyone's okay with it, then we'll have the action item as Regional advice being positive to accredit this organization to become an At-Large Structure. And, obviously, by the way, this is just a recommendation to the ALAC, and then the ALAC will either ask us more questions or ask the applicant more questions, or then proceed to a vote, and they have the full choice of whether they want to proceed forward or not. We just provide our advice.

So with this, it's eight minutes beyond the top of the hour. Is there any other "other business" that anybody wishes to discuss?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so I'd like to thank everybody for being on this call. It's been, I think, quite good. I hope to see you active in Working Groups, in Work Streams, on the policy development

process. And if you – as as I said, if you have any questions, or any comments, on any of this, please email the list, or email me directly, or email Wolf; and I really hope that we can get the ball rolling with more activity in our region and help our At-Large Structures.

With this, thank you all, and have a very good evening. This call is now adjourned. Goodbye.

UNKNOWN 2: Thanks. Bye-bye, bye-bye.

UNKNOWN 3: Thank you. 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]