
YESIM NAZLAR: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the EURALO Board Meeting held on Monday, 26th of September, 2016 at 19:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Wolf Ludwig, Jordi Iparraguirre, Yrjö Länsipuro, Erich Schweighofer, Matthieu Camus, and Sébastien Bachollet.

We haven't received any apologies for today's call, and from staff we have Silvia Vivanco and myself, Yesim Nazlar.

Finally, I would like to remind everyone to state their names before speaking for the transcript purposes.

Over to you, Olivier. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yesim. Today's call is the first one in many, many, months so we have to catch up on things and there are a number of things that we need to discuss today, primarily just hot topics, EURALO Task Forces – a quick going through that. We have to discuss an At-Large Structure decertification and we also have to discuss the plan of action, especially the Outreach and Engagement Strategic Plan which is due at the end of this month apparently I've just been told, so we've got four days. It's not huge. We've already got last year's Outreach and Engagement, and we'll have a link to that and we can build from this.

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.

Is there any other topic that anybody would like to add to the current agenda that we have?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up so the first item on our agenda is a welcome to Erich Schweighofer who has taken the seat that was left vacant by Mikhail Medrish who stepped down earlier this year. Welcome, Erich. I don't know whether you wanted to say a few words. I'll hand the floor over to you just to welcome you.

ERICH SCHWEIGHOFER:

I'll just say welcome and [inaudible] to be on the Board and at the moment have to learn what you're doing in detail. I hope I can be an engaged member. Mostly at the moment I'm doing a lot on the CCWG group mostly on this kind of accountability stuff. So I hope I can do a bit more and also in outreach. I also have some discussions here from our [inaudible] 2016 [inaudible] for the Outreach to these informatics communities.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Excellent. Okay, well then I guess we've got to get you to work, get some things done.

Alright, let's get things going then, first with the EURALO hot topics. That's agenda item #3. There is on a previous call of the EURALO monthly call we had presented a paper which was key ICANN-related policy issues for EURALO and European end users. This was a document that had to be produced pretty quickly so I worked with staff to put this together. We did get some feedback from the community at various

levels of drafting this, although it was very short amount of time. But something was suggested. The suggestion was made that we put this document on a wiki page, which is what now has been done. We've got the document here which is version 3, and we also have all the background on the document which sent this over to the advice statement.

We've had some responses already from people on the Board. We've had the response from Rinalia that it's all been taken into account and it was passed on to I think it was one of the senior people at the Commission as the Board had its meeting, it's retreat, in mid-September in Brussels. So that already had some impact but of course, this is a document which I think could be a living document and we can certainly add more things to this.

What I was going to ask you all is what would be the best way to do this because at the moment the document is in pdf form. We could do various things. We could cut and paste it and put it into the EURALO Hot Topics page just as normal text and then ask for people to comment underneath, and regularly we could update this. Or we could have it on a Google Doc and get people to comment on the Google Doc and amend it accordingly as well. There are various different ways that we can do this and I wondered if there were any suggestions here as to how we could deal with this.

The idea really is that perhaps every month the EURALO call could revisit this document and have a look at whether there were any additions and call for people to add the topics or amend the topics that are listed there.

I open the floor here for some comments on this process-wise primarily as in how should we make use of this document and how should we collect more input for it? I note that Matthieu writes in the chat that Google Doc sounds fine, but that is there a privacy issue, if there is no privacy issue with this document?

The document is public so it's nothing that's behind closed doors and in fact, quite the contrary. It's really for everyone to be able to participate and contribute.

Any comments? Any thoughts? Any suggestions? Erich Schweighofer mentions Google Doc is okay. So we've got two people who think it's a good idea to move forward with Google Doc. Yes, Yrjö as well. Okay. Let's then do that. We'll put it as a Google Doc and we'll send a call on the EURALO mailing list for people to update it. I know that Sébastien Bachollet, you had a few more that you wanted to list in there, so I gather you'll probably be the first person to add things to it. Whatever online works – there's Jordi. Okay.

I see Sébastien's hand up. You have the floor, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Olivier. Yes, I have comments but now it's the document went away and it was not open for comments until two days before it was sent to the Board and I think it was a Board of ICANN, I think it was a bad practice. I put my comments. They were not taken into account because it was too late but then I have no need for this to discuss now. We need to revisit this in six months or nine months. I don't think that it's something we need to fear too much about right now because it was

used for what it was supposed to be used. If we want to keep a list of hot topics, and I don't think Google Doc is the best place. We need to have something on our wiki or even on this website. We have a list of topics we think that it's out for European users, and if we need to discuss one single item – and yes, we need to do a Google Doc. But right now if we have to do something, it's to list the hot topics we want to add to the current version. Not too much enter to detail. But you know that's just my point of view. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks for this, Sébastien. I think at this stage we really have to think that this is a living document. You're saying revisit this in six months. I think we might actually be asked to share another version of this document or an updated version in less than six months' time seeing that we are getting increasingly involved with a number of things. Maybe one of the interesting things is that for any new members to say, "Well, what does EURALO do? What are you working on?" This document would definitely be something that we can point new At-Large Structures to or even existing ones that want to get active. That points them in the right direction.

Alright, I see no other hands. Let's get moving then. Let's go to the next topic and that's the EURALO Task Forces. This is just an update from the two task forces. The first one is the task force on the review and revision of the Bylaws. As you know, the task force was primarily being driven forward by the work of Mikhail Medrish who did a lot of work in analyzing what we had, etc. We then had a meeting in – it was a long time ago already – in Helsinki and one of the problems that we were

faced with was to actually have somebody who's well versed in writing Bylaws, a lawyer who knows how to write those things and our work was a little slow without having such help.

There was an action item for Michael Yakushev, Vice President for Eastern Europe and CIS countries, to look into this and try and find out if we could have some form of help in the guise of someone from ICANN staff who could draft these things for us. So we would basically put the comments in and then somebody would be holding the pen on that.

The feedback – I finally received an e-mail back from Michael Yakushev a few days ago saying that this was all fine. He had apparently had a debrief also from Mikhail Medrish on where we were, and what he suggests is that the moment things slow down a little bit when it comes down to IANA Stewardship Transition, which really means another week or so hopefully, then there could be some spare cycles from someone from Legal to be able to help us out in that. So he will come back to me in due course, and hopefully then we can get that Bylaws Task Force back on track again with the help of someone who can draft those things for us which is really I think really good and really helpful.

That's the update on this. Until now it's just been waiting. We haven't had any further call because it's useless to start on something if we're not going to have the help that we require on this. So this is where we are at the moment. Are there any questions or comments on that?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up. Okay, so that's the first one. The second of our task forces is the one at At-Large Structure Engagement, and Yrjö has drafted a letter that he proposes to be sent

out to the At-Large Structures. Perhaps I should let Yrjö speak about this. Yrjö Länsipuro.

At the moment I see there's something coming out of your microphone but we can't hear you, Yrjö. It's not working. We can't hear you. Yesim, can you check please, what's going on there?

YESIM NAZLAR:

Sure. I'll keep you posted.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

I'm afraid we are not able to hear you. So in the meantime I'll describe the letter myself. What it basically asks in a one-pager is to get an idea of the knowledge that is in each one of our At-Large Structures. So the letter would be sent using some kind of a mailman type system that basically personalizes each one of the e-mails and it would basically say, "Thank you for being a member of EURALO," and providing a little bit of background of the pieces of advice that we do but explaining that we do need to have a more efficient way to be able to get the input from everyone. And if an At-Large Structure has a specific competency in topic, then it could please let us know about it.

I had some concerns originally that this might be a little long letter, but Yrjö made it a lot more efficient and a lot shorter than it was before. So really this is the last time we're looking at it before we can proceed forward with sending it out. I don't know whether, Yesim, are you trying to get hold of Yrjö separately because it looks like his connection via Adobe Connect is not working.

Now we can hear you, Yrjö. Yes, welcome.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO:

Okay, thank you. Basically I think Olivier did just explain this letter. It was the first version was longer. This is a one-page format and I got comments from Sébastien and Erich, and I tried to incorp them so that as far as I'm concerned this is ready for sending.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, Yrjö. Thank you. Are there any comments, other comments from anyone else? I see a green tick from Sébastien, so it's good to go for Sébastien. How about everyone else? Jordi? Fine with you as well, good. And Wolf as well. And Erich. Right, well then let's move forward with this. What I'll do then, I'll work with staff and probably will find some time tomorrow to send this e-mail out using the system that we have, and hopefully we'll start getting the answers as soon as possible.

I just had one question which was, where did you want that information to be sent, Yrjö? Do you think people should just reply to me and then I'll forward them over to the Board, or how do you want this? Or I'll forward it to staff and then staff can compile a table?

YRJO LANSIPURO:

No, I think to send it to the staff might be the best way unless the letter goes out over your name but I think that your inbox [inaudible] by all these dozens of answers so staff would be the return address. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Yrjö. What I'll do is to copy staff in the e-mail that I'm sending out. I don't know... Wolf, shall I copy you as well so then we've got quite a few people looking at this? It might fill your mailbox. It is 37 e-mails.

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. No worries.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alright, cool. That's fine then. So that's the first action item I guess. Let's proceed forward with sending out this letter. And as I said, I'll work on this tomorrow.

Good. Well thanks for this, Yrjö, and hopefully we can move things forward. Maybe I'll copy Yrjö as well so then you'll also be tied into the replies if people reply all. Excellent. And staff will then be able to put the responses on the table for us to look at or rather for the working group on At-Large Structure Engagement to look at. Yrjö, anything else on the Task Force of ALS Engagement?

YRJO LANSIPURO: No, Olivier. I think this is it for the time being. Let's see whether this letter gets any replies and let's start working from there. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Now let's move on to the next thing, and that's the ALS decertifications. The At-Large Structure decertification process is a process that's already been used a number of times to decertify At-Large Structures that have been dissolved, that have disappeared, or that are not responding to e-mails and we have no idea on how to get hold of them. There is a link that is provided that is in your agenda that will take you and that shows you the process that is being used. EURALO has used it already on a number of occasions. I noticed here from the list of decertified ALSes that the CLUSIT – the Italian Association for Computer Security – was decertified, KEPKA was decertified, [inaudible] was decertified, Yinternet.org was decertified, and if you have logged in into the wiki, you would be able to see further details when you click on each one of them. You can actually see further details of why they were decertified, etc.

At the moment we have one ALS that's been very difficult to reach, and that's ISOC Luxembourg. It's listed at the bottom of the page in May, 2016. I have followed up with ISOC Luxembourg. The request for decertification, if you want, was initiated after we received an e-mail from Patrick Vande Walle who was the previous Chair of ISOC Luxembourg telling us that effectively the ALS was defunct. But I did follow up with the Internet Society and I was given the details of one

person who was still active in that At-Large Structure, a gentleman by the name of Brent Frère. We had an e-mail exchange and the situation is a little bit of, as in any complex situation, when you might have some people that created an At-Large Structure and then moved on and then new people come in, etc. The situation is a little bit confusing and certainly confused in that there appears to be still a bank account for the organization and the organization still exists but there are no members, there is no Board, and this gentleman is trying to put back together a Board but it might take not even a few months. It might take up to six months, maybe a year. And so that person is basically saying, “Well, please don’t decertify us as such. But at the same time, I can’t get involved because I’m just by myself and I need to rebuild this organization before we do things.”

This is where I’m now asking you as the Board of EURALO, what should we do next? Should we proceed with decertifying ISOC Luxemburg and then when they have their house in order we could always recertify them. They can apply again and they can be certified again. That’s certainly a possibility. Or should we suspend ISOC Luxemburg? I don’t know if there is anything in our Bylaws that allow us to suspend the participation of an At-Large Structure. Or should we just leave the situation as it is?

The concern for us is that whenever there is a vote, there needs to be a quorum. And when you have one more At-Large Structure on which the quorum is based, that certainly makes the figures slightly more difficult to proceed with. So that’s the situation we have at the moment. I’m opening the floor for your suggestions.

Wolf, by the way, since you have been operating the EURALO in the previous decertifications, you're of course extremely welcome to comment on this, perhaps even provide us with your thoughts on that.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Yes, if you allow me. Thanks for the floor, Olivier. Yes, in fact in the past the whole decertification discussion was always a touchy subject. We realized from the very beginning that we had a number of dead ducks among our members over years. But we hesitated for a long time until to take active steps and it was on the Secretariat level, they're all RALOs together and we discussed it repeatedly and finally I think we were on the forefront to take the first steps by contacting the ALSes which have never responded. Some of them have never attended over years face-to-face General Assembly, even when it was funded, etc.

A special example was an ALS we had in Greece, a consumer [org] we had in Greece from the very beginning but they never responded to any, any, any, of my e-mails. And then we had a case in Germany and we had a case in Switzerland and finally we set up some criteria how the procedure should be conducted sending them a final call and a reminder, "If you don't respond again within four weeks." So we continue. We listed them for certification and it's not EURALO who can certify, it's ALAC who has authority to do this like the certification itself.

In one case, we found out it was [inaudible] in Germany, an old ALS and then we realized that the contact person [Haiku] had passed away in the meantime and when we contacted the organization they told us, "Listen, it was [Haiku] who was very interested in this issue. The

organizational capacities of [inaudible] Germany are not like that we can follow up on ICANN related issues. And then they asked themselves for decertification.

I think it was in spring 2014, it was just a couple of weeks before the ATLAS II when we suggested to ALAC and we decertified our first four ALSes. And now meanwhile, we have a number of other candidates, Olivier and I, on our list. We are hesitant usually to poke around, to spread rumors, etc., or to talk in public about this because it can be also touchy and confidential. But here on the Board level, I think I can say that in the meantime, we have ISOC Luxemburg on our list because our previous contact point Vande Walle is unfortunately since many years not available anymore, not interested anymore. As far as we had understood, Olivier exchanged several e-mails with the new leadership. They are in a critical phase at the moment how they can continue as an ISOC Chapter, etc. and whether they may have any complementary possibilities.

We are looking closely on our list also discussing cases that should be discussed In Olivier's, in my opinion, and ALSes who have finally responded to invitations to face-to-face General Assembly where funding is provided, anything is prepared for them, etc. but do not participate in any, any, other activity of EURALO like a long-term case in Slovenia. Again, in a consumer association, this is somehow not really satisfactory. We know that the organization is active in Slovenia. Okay, we at least have knowledge about this but they do not really follow and do not really show interest in regular EURALO activities.

I think we should at EURALO and it would be my preference and wish to do this in close collaboration with the Board. What finally is now in existence for more than a year and has showed some working capacities and can provide feedback I think it's [actually] issues that should not only be dealt with between the leadership – Olivier and me – but on the Board level. And due advice in this respect before we take any further steps would be in my opinion very much appreciated. So we will keep you in the loop as far as next week or potential candidates for decertification are concerned and I would very much appreciate if we could discuss this together and find solutions and approval together.

That's all for the moment. Thanks for your patience.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Wolf. Whilst you were speaking, I put a link in the chat which links up to your June 2011 letter that explains the procedure that you were proposing to eventually end up with a decertification of those At-Large Structures back then. If one looks at the procedure, and there are seven steps here, the current one that we are discussing – the ISOC Luxemburg – so a friendly reminder to the focal point of the ALS if known. That's been done. The second less friendly reminder. Well, I still remained friendly, so the second one was also done. We did get a response so three doesn't stand in there. I did discuss decertification with the At-Large Structure and they said, "Oh, please don't decertify." But at the same time they were totally unable to give me a date at which they could actually operate again.

Consideration and decertification decision by the ALAC, which is what we have not reached yet because the way that it works is that EURALO would then make a recommendation. If EURALO was to decide on decertification, EURALO would make a recommendation to the ALAC and it would be ALAC that would decertify the At-Large Structure. That's the current system.

I saw earlier that Matthieu Camus had put his hand up. So I want to give him the floor and then afterwards we'll have Yrjö Länsipuro. So let's go with Matthieu first. Matthieu Camus.

MATTHIEU CAMUS:

Good evening. I completely agree with Wolf, and I just read the procedure to deal with inactive ALSes. [Inaudible] process, the steps one to three may be done in a time and [inaudible] between six months and a full year if you agree. And if I may suggest that if there is any response until the end of the step four as the EURALO could send an official letter to the ALAC to – I don't know already – to send a message for the response of the ALAC. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Matthieu. Do you mean so the EURALO should send a message to the ALAC to ask for decertification or for the ALAC to contact that ALS?

MATTHIEU CAMUS:

Yes, for the ALAC to contact the ALS because if the steps one and two and three stay without any answer, the ALS has to justify the silence.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Matthieu. I don't know if that's possible because I think that it's for the RALO to be in touch with the ALS. I've not heard of the ALAC being in touch with the ALS before that. But let's see. Maybe Wolf, you'd know about this.

Let's first have Yrjö Länsipuro, and then we'll get back to Wolf.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Thank you, Olivier. First of all, if we have text on the books about how to deal with the inactive ALSes, we should follow that. That is one to keep our credibility. The other thing is that this ALS is also an ISOC Chapter, and what I could do is that I could have a [inaudible] talk with Tommi Karttaavi who is the Manager of European Chapters of ISOC. Of course, he is here in Helsinki and we talk every week. I think that it would be good to find out whether there is a problem with the ISOC Chapter as such and whether it's disintegrating or whatever, or if it's just a problem of their participation as ALS in the ICANN At-Large.

I think we also have to think of the possible outreach possibilities in Europe, and one of them if we were to reach out to the existing ISOC Chapters which are not ALSes so that we could start that with the decertification [of] the Chapter would not be in that sense [inaudible]. So I propose if I talk to Tommi and we try to find out what's the real problem in work and we proceed from that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Yrjö. I might have not been clear with what I did. I got in touch with Tommi and with Joyce Dogniez. Joyce Dogniez is the Manager for all Chapters in I think actually not even in Europe but worldwide, and they are the ones who gave me the details of Brent Frère to say that's the last person that exists that would respond to your e-mails. It was after a couple of e-mails that I then managed to get that person to respond and we then had an exchange of e-mails, and it's that person that told me that the Chapter itself has a bank account which no one can access, a non-existent Board, and that he – Brent – is the only person that is still left to try and he's trying to put together a new Board and get a call for new members, etc.

The situation is pretty desperate in there. The Chapter itself is not in rejuvenation because ISOC is giving it another few months before they launch rejuvenation process. The rejuvenation process is one where a Chapter is in bad shape and needs to have a new team come in or some help to relaunch itself.

That's where we are now. So thanks for offering to talk to Tommi about this, but I think we've gone further than... It will take several months to reactivate the Chapter if it ever does. The question really now is do we proceed with decertification? Do we do nothing and wait? Or, option three, do we suspend the Chapter? In other words, we put it in a state where we do not count it within our quorum.

Wolf, if you can explain what that would [entice] please, that would be helpful.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thanks again, Olivier, for the floor. Decertification so far was in my opinion always a kind of a worst case. Please, believe me. I never did it with any pleasure in the four cases we had so far. So I'm sorry about any member we lose. On the other hand, we discussed over years and this wiki page which was given, I just realized I wrote this procedure how to deal with inactive ALSes, I wrote this back in June, 2011 already and this means it's a long lasting [pain] and we need to have some kind of a balance between those members who are active, who are participating regularly, some who are not really participating regularly but who are responding whenever it was needed for a rotation, etc. and also staff and those members who never ever cared since they became certified. Those are the worst cases.

Another option besides decertification would be like it is handled at NARALO (North American Regional At-Large Organization) where they have some sort of different criteria or handling in between. A member who has not participated in monthly calls of NARALO for a year, this member will be delisted from active voting. Such a member could be delisted from getting invited for attending the next General Assembly face-to-face and funded by ICANN. This would be an option in between, and I must admit I have certain sympathies for such an in between solution before really finally decertifying them to have such an interim step what was not mentioned in my proposed procedure from 2011 because NARALO was still at the time on the way to develop their step in between how to deal with such candidates.

It could be an option for EURALO as well to say, "Okay, if they need time," as in the case of ISOC Luxemburg, what Olivier explained in detail, they don't know how to solve the problem right now, they

cannot give us an immediate answer, etc. We could give them a grace period for another year by saying, “Okay, take your time. We don’t ask for your decertification right now. We give you a grace period of another year where you in case cannot participate in voting, where you won’t be invited to come to the next face-to-face General Assembly.” And if the situation where an ISOC Chapter or any other member is not reactivated after 12 months then we can easily, in my opinion, consider tell them, “Listen, we do not see a solution and you cannot offer us a solution. Therefore we think the best way would be to ask for your decertification. “

This would be an option in between in my opinion to be considered by the Board. I do not have a final opinion on this issue because it’s a touchy and a critical issue, etc. and I would appreciate any further advice and opinion from the Board. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Wolf. You made very good points. I hear and I’ve noticed also Jordi who has written in there he would agree on suspending for X number of months and then if there was no progress on the At-Large Structure side, we would proceed with decertification. So we could suspend – although this is not in the Bylaws, this could be a Board decision, and if the Board agrees to this then we could proceed forward with therefore suspending it and informing them that they are suspended but we would need to also let them know how many months.

Wolf, you've mentioned 12 months. Is that too long? Well, I can't imagine it's not long enough. If you can't work yourself up in 12 months. The NARALO procedure actually goes as follows – and let me try and see if I can copy this – “When an ALS does not contribute or comment on ICANN policy to a collaboration on the At-Large [discussion] within 12 consecutive months, it automatically loses its voting rights and active status within the NARALO.”

I think that goes a little too far maybe, and it's something to think of but certainly it says here that it goes – it's 12 consecutive months and then it's got another 12 months to participate, otherwise the Chair will submit the ALAC with a request for decertification of that ALS. “In the case of apparently dormant or non-existent ALSes, the Chair may also recommend that the ALS be decertified providing evidence of such rationale.” That's what they're doing in NARALO and the Board here could unilaterally say alright, let's move forward.

I see yes for suspending from Erich Schweighofer, and Jordi says let's add this to our Bylaws. Well, maybe we could think of this. And notice Yrjö saying, “Yes. Let's suspend for 12 months.” Okay.

Everyone okay with 12 months? Yes, go ahead, Wolf.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thanks, Olivier. I would also say we offer 12 months. If they come back earlier, they are on the best [waive] that suspension will be lifted. But they have to prove after they have not participated 12 consecutive months, they are suspended and during the next 12 months they have any chance to step in again. And as soon as [we] realize that they have

capacities and interests, etc. to come back again, they are highly appreciated.

Then we could even discuss to say if they come back after six months and suddenly they contribute regularly, then we can say, "Okay, Board can decide we shorten this to nine months or [lift] the suspension immediately because now they have found the right person." So we can be flexible on the 12 months of suspension but they must prove that they come back by themselves during the 12 months and if nothing happens in the second 12 months while they are suspended it, in my opinion, somehow proves that they haven't found a solution.

This in my opinion is a fair offer how to handle it. I would not be in favor to write this into our Bylaws. This can be in the rules of operation, etc. This can be, and I think it should be, handled because there are some confidential elements. It should not be discussed on the list, etc. It's a typical Board issue in my opinion, and whenever the Board has looked into a particular case the Board will have the authority to decide, "Okay, after they have been suspended for not participating 12 months," we say, "Okay, now you will be suspended probably for the next 12 months but in case you are coming back, we can shorten or limit this grace period." Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Wolf. Whilst you were speaking I noted a green tick from Yrjö Länsipuro, a green tick from Jordi Iparraguirre. Do we have a green also from Erich Schweighofer and Matthieu Camus? I see a green tick from Erich Schweighofer, and Matthieu, if you can't use the green tick.

Yes, you can as well. Fine. With four Board members out of five agreeing to proceed forward with this, we will be suspending this ALS for 12 months. We'll be telling them accordingly and if at the moment they tell us they are back on track and back in action they be can be [inaudible] reintegrated and be welcomed back.

Excellent. Thank you, everyone, for this. We've made a good decision on that. I'm glad we have. This has been going around in circles for a while.

Number 6, the CROPP wiki page. And I note we have only a couple of minutes to – no, not a couple, seven minutes to discuss this equally important thing.

The Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program is the system where we are able to send some people from our region to either a large meeting, that we've done so far by sending them to EuroDIG or to send them to other meetings in Europe. But one of the things that needs to be – and as you know, we've had some discussions during our EURALO calls about this as to what strategy we were going to use this year.

Last year's EURALO Outreach Strategic Plan was drafted by Wolf and put on the wiki page which I've put a link to, and it's also on your Adobe Connect. It basically lists the different concentration of EURALO and related activities first on the annual EuroDIG events all over Europe, the annual ICANN Studienkreis meetings in Europe, the European Summer School on Internet Governance, the National IGF Initiatives, and also here talking about the CROPP for our five members or potential candidates to attend EuroDIG meetings.

The question is, we now have to do a Strategic Plan or an Outreach Plan for 2017, which actually is Fiscal Year 2018 would you believe it? It's always one year ahead. So we effectively need to update this and we have a few days to do so. What I was going to ask is are there any big changes to last year? Do you have any suggestions of anything else that we could add to this?

Sébastien Bachollet, you have your hand up. You have the floor.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Olivier. I have no really proposal but I think we need to come back to what we are saying since the first Summit how we can have at least one ALS in each and every country. That might be our guidance to know how to do outreach, where to do outreach, and how to find those organization in those countries because if we really want to have more diversity and to have a broader voice representing end user, it's really where we need to go. I don't have an answer on how to do it. I think it will need more than seven minutes to discuss that, but I think we need to keep that in mind and try to see how we can do this going in that direction to have one ALS at least in each and every country in our region. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Sébastien. Next is Wolf Ludwig.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thanks, Olivier. I agree completely with Sébastien. It's our longstanding goal. It was reiterated in each of our annual reports over the last eight

years since EURALO's inauguration. It's nice to have such a goal and to reaffirm our goal year by year. The question is how it can be done?

In the past it didn't work, I must admit, because it was understood this is a leadership job. Nobody from the other members, according to my observations, felt concerned about it so leadership has to provide this type of outreach, etc. We tried plenty of opportunities at EuroDIG's previous EuroDIGs at ICANN's Studienkreis meetings. I used ISOC Chapter meetings in Switzerland, in Germany, etc. and a lot of other opportunities as long as outreach and finding identifying new ALSes is not considered as a broad-based, cost-cutting obligation of existing members. I think we can never ever reach our ambitious goal having one ALS per all European countries.

It's taking time. It needs a lot of initiatives talking repeatedly and Olivier I have seen over the last years whenever he was in Meissen at the European Summer School on Internet Governance he was handing over EURALO leaflets, he was always active, etc. So far, I think that Olivier and I in this respect have been amongst the most active. We have besides EuroDIG because EuroDIG has now [our] own funding scheme inviting people and organizations from the South and Eastern European countries, so I think we should next step for [2017] diversify our outreach options.

I'm not so much convinced about National IGFs. National IGFs happened we have more than 20 in Europe over the last years and attending National IGFs in my opinion – and I've seen some of them – haven't proved so far being very effective. I think we have to look at big events like re:publica in Germany which is year by year assembling 7000 and

more participants. Re:publica is not only conducted in German, it's also conducted in English. There are 40% or even more English speaking participants by now. This in my opinion would be the right next options for being considered in our outreach strategy for 2017. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Wolf. It is the top of the hour. If we could have just another five minutes on this that would be helpful. Thanks for the points you have made here. You've touched on a number of things. I don't see anyone else putting their hand up at the moment. I was taking a few notes and I thought a few things that we could do.

The first thing that I was going to suggest is that we take what you had written for last year as a basis for this year's plan with just some amendments on this year's plan. I note that you mentioned the EuroDIG which now also has its own fellowship system. We had discussed this during the EURALO call with Sandra Hoferichter as well and the suggestion was made that perhaps we wouldn't use the five CROPP slots to send someone to EuroDIG, we could use one or two perhaps and use the other three slots for to send people to other meetings.

Certainly identification of big events attracting a large number of participants would be one step forward, and we can put in our strategic plan that we will be identifying such big events. We can even quote re:publica you have quoted as being one of them. I was going to suggest perhaps that on the national IGFs we could be asking our At-Large Structures to report because often they do take part in their National IGFs. So they could report to a EURALO monthly call let's say on a

National IGF that has taken place whenever there was an actual topic that dealt with domain names or with ICANN or with things, just maybe a one minute report of this.

Next I thought we would also mention, certainly Sébastien mentioned one ALS in every country. That can be something we need to add back to our strategic plan, maybe just in fact as the overarching title “One ALS in every country.” And then one thing which we didn’t really have last year and which we now have this year and that’s the individual members. Initially it started a little bit slow with the ALS that was created for individual members. It’s now gaining pace and I have found through talking to people that it sometimes takes months, if not more than months, to either identify an At-large Structure that already exists and then join the At-large Structure or create a new At-Large Structure which takes even more time, and often the first step into being involved is to become an individual member and I certainly have found quite a few people that have now taken that step. So our individual [ascertainment] is actually growing very fast which is great news and I thought we should perhaps mention this as well as this is part of our outreach strategy – people starting as an individual member and perhaps then finding the time or the drive to build their own organization or even convince their own organization that it’s important for them to be there.

Certainly on one occasion at least I have found that an organization has been reticent to joining At-Large for a very long time and now they have one of their leadership team that has joined as an individual member that will therefore be able to report back.

In addition to this, and Sébastien mentioned the contact with Centre and RIPE. We do have a discussion on this, and this is one of the things. The other RALOs have done work to sign an MoU with a local top-level domain group of some sort, so Centre for example, is – I can't remember where they actually meet there – but when it comes down to RIPE, I have had some informal discussions so far with some people from RIPE because I think nearly all of the other, if not all of the other, RALOs now have an MoU with their local regional Internet registry. That's an important thing that we need to have as in we could provide our local regional Internet registry with the end user input which they often do not have in their ranks and which they often search in order to have. So that's one of the things I don't know really why we haven't proceeded forward but certainly all the other RALOs have.

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

WOLF LUDWIG:

Yes. Thanks, Olivier. Only your last question you don't know why we haven't followed up. I think I've mentioned this in the past repeatedly, one point was why I as a previous EURALO Chair who was always closely involved in EuroDIG [inter] Secretariat. We pushed two years ago an [MoE] with RIPE what was successful and what was signed I think 18 months ago, and there was a sort of a conflict of interest. I as a EuroDIG Secretariat member was in my opinion in a bad position as a Secretariat member and then just taking another head and saying now, "I'm EURALO and I want the same thing done with RIPE."

This was a little bit complicated when I discussed and I agreed with Paul in the past that it was not one of their priority but now since you, Olivier, are in charge of EURALO you are the Chair, etc. you are part of the EuroDIG Board but it's a completely different issue now. And I think it would look completely different if we would push it from now on. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Wolf. I wasn't aware of the ins and outs of this and so on and I appreciate that you mentioned this. I wasn't 100% sure on that. Any feedback on this by anyone?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up at this stage. You probably all want to end the call very soon. This is all part of our strategy and it's pretty important at this stage that we get your feedback because you are the Board at the end of the day so you would be the ones that would be saying yea or nay.

Sébastien Bachollet, you have the floor.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Olivier. Just short, I think there were a document I guess with a list of who were for the European country member of the GAC, the one with the ccTLD member of the ccNSO and the ALSes. I guess it was done by Oksana or maybe this document can be [available] at least can be share with the Board member. I don't remember where it is but and as I lost all my e-mails for the last two years I wouldn't be able to

find it again. But I am sure that you have it, if not we can ask Oksana.
Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks very much, Sébastien. It's actually linked to the home page of the EURALO Task Force on ALS Engagement. It is indeed Oksana that's put this document together and we have it – I don't know if I have the time while talking to actually point you to it. But yes, that document will be a helpful document for us.

Our focus here is just now the document we have in front of us. What I suggest then is that Wolf and I work on this document, or I might just work on this. I'll cut/paste, put something new, share with the Board, and I'll require your response pretty quickly since we need to file this by the 30th of September. Are you okay with that?

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. Okay, well we've got green ticks from Erich, Matthieu, and everyone. So that's all there is today. Any Other Business? Are there any other questions or points that you'd like to raise? Erich, and I'm putting you on the spot again, you have any specific questions or things on procedures and whatever?

ERICH SCHWEIGHOFER: [Inaudible] I will study the documents more in detail and then I may come back also [bilaterally] to you if necessary.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Erich.

Right. Well, everyone, thanks very much for joining on this call. I think it's been productive. We've managed to move forward on the ALS and we've had some good input on the outreach strategy that we've got here. Yrjö, I'll copy you on this also since you're Chairing our ALS Engagement and obviously CROPP is all part of ALS Engagement, so we have to work on this pretty quickly but I will liaise in the next 24 hours.

And with this, I'd like to thank you all and without further ado, we're 11 minutes past the top of the hour. This call is adjourned. Thanks and have a very good evening, everyone.

YESIM NAZLAR: The audio will now be disconnected. Have a lovely rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]