
YESIM NAZLAR:

Okay, let's please start the recording, and I will go ahead with roll call. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the EURALO Monthly Call taking place on Tuesday, the 18th of April, 2017, at 18:00 UTC. On the call today we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Wolf Ludwig, Yrjo Lansipuro, Anne Marie, Joly, Sebastien Bachollet, Matthieu Camus, Georgi Kirov, Andrei Kolesnikov, Erich Schweighofer, Yuliya Morenets, Tatiana Tropin, and Voidiu Popeti. From Staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, and myself, Yesim Nazlar. We have received apologies from Gabriella Schittek, Roberto Gaetano, Bastiaan Goslings, Oksana Prykhodko, and Sandra Hoferichter.

Finally, I would like to remind everyone to state their names before speaking for transcription purposes. And now I would like to leave the floor to our chair, Olivier Crepin-Leblond. Thank you very much. Over to you Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Yesim. It is Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Today we have a pretty long agenda with a lot of policy public consultations going on, and quite a few updates afterwards on the work that has been taking place, and of the course, a quick update on the EURALO meeting that took place in Copenhagen. I wanted to ask first whether there were any additions to the agenda, any amendments to the agenda that is currently displayed on your screen. I think that you all have scrolling ability. So are there any amendments to be made, or any additions?

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.

Going once, going twice, not seeing anyone put their hand up, so the agenda is approved as it currently is on your screen, and we'll quickly and swiftly move to the action items from our last monthly conference call which was back in February, and also the General Assembly that took place a few weeks ago in Copenhagen. First the second call, all of the action items are complete, apart from Jean-Jeacques Subrenat suggesting that EURALO and ALAC refer to the seat currently occupied by Rinalia Abdul Rahim to be called simply Seat 15. I think we can tick that box, we'll refer to it from now on as Seat 15.

And secondly, Jean-Jeacques to send a question to the EURALO mailing list to start a discussion on attributions of specific work for EURALO board members. In fact, I haven't seen such a discussion on the EURALO mailing list, but I have launched a process in the EURALO board member list for board members to consider, and now following specific tasks and being allocated tasks and responsibilities, the discussion is starting, and I think that perhaps we can relay the decision and the followup back to the EURALO community during the next call next month. If in the meantime you're interested in the deliberations, you can certainly check on the EURALO Board mailing list archives, which I believe are open for everyone to read through. So that's the first thing on the last monthly call.

And then we had the General Assembly, and if you click on that link, you will find at the bottom of the agenda there are three action items. The first one is for Silvia Vivanco to work with me and Dan O'Neill, Dan O'Neill, visited us in Copenhagen and is in charge of the document production program, pilot production program, and Dan O'Neill, on developing primers on the issues outlined in the EURALO Hot Topics

document. That process has not started yet, but I'm sure that Silvia and I will be working on it very, very soon, indeed.

Second, the EURALO Board to discuss the issue on how to divide the task work among themselves during their next call. We haven't had a call on this topic yet, so we haven't had a "next call," but that certainly will be on the agenda.

And thirdly, the EURALO Board is to report back to RALO, well, as I just said, that is what is going to happen. And there appears to be a bit of a muddle here. EURALO ALAS is to send a brief summary and a photo of outreach and engagement activities to At-Large Staff and the EURALO Chair. At-Large Staff to post this information on the Wiki and for the web page. I think I've seen a page somewhere, a Wiki page with some pictures of EURALO activities, perhaps that is what we will be looking at next. Are there any comments or questions on the action items? Silvia Vivanco.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Hello Olivier, this is Silvia. I just ask to update you on the document development pilot project. I just contacted Dan O'Neill the consultant, and I have provided the list of EURALO hot topics for him to review. I am awaiting his feedback, and once I get it, I will get in touch with you so we can go and work through these items and see how we organize it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Excellent. Thank you very much, Silvia, it's Olivier speaking. That's great. So more will be shared with everyone else soon, I guess. Watch

this space. I don't see any other hands up, so let's move swiftly on to the public consultations, upcoming and current public consultations. As you know, the ALAC and the At-Large Community is there to bring the input of venues through the ICANN Policy Processes, and at present there are quantities of statements currently in processing, drafted, and discussions taking place.

First, I think we have actually something afterwards, just discussing very briefly the At-Large Community response to the At-Large Review draft report. So we will have this. But the first thing that we have here in the statement in process, is the interim paper, cross community working group on the use of names of countries and territories that is top level domain. There has been a huge amount of discussion here that took place between the generic name supporting organization and the government advisory committee.

Because of the sensitivity of the topics having country and territory names as a top level domain, so these would effectively be generic names, but they would obviously be in competition with the country code names, from the country code top level domain and in many cases the country code names are actually run by government based entities or entities that have a green light from government for being able to run that country code.

But when it comes down to full names of countries and territories, there wasn't any rule about this at all. So there has been a paper that was drafted with the country code names supporting organization and the generic name supporting organization, and of course, much input from the government advisory committee going into that.

There is a first draft of the paper that you will find on the link in your agenda. Maureen Hilyard, who is the liaison of the ccNSO, the country code name supporting organization, and so if you are interested in this topic, please read through this first draft and please comment. You have to log in through the Wiki, but once you've logged in, you can click on the comment point and comment on the draft. The feedback and all that has to be back in very soon, because the whole conversation finishes on April 21. That's only a few days' time.

Next, the Competition Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review team draft report of recommendations for new generate top level domains. That's again a very important process. It's one of the two main processes that might lead to a new round of generic top level domain applications for new generate top level domains to be created. The Competition Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review is actually an affirmation of commitments reviewed that was mandated during the affirmation of commitments that was now ported to the new bylaws, ICANN bylaws, and it's important because it has the ability to basically say whether a next round would be desirable, bearing in mind that the current route was meant to enhance competition, enhance consumer trust, and enhance consumer choice.

So, if those conditions are not met, some of the recommendations could well be that one has to wait until these conditions are met. An important report with very important response as well, and I really urge you to have a look at the first draft that was put together by – who was it actually – I think it was Holly Raiche who drafted the first draft, but working with Alan Greenberg and with Leon Sanchez. I just brought into this the feedback regarding the current other process that is taking

place at ICANN, which is called The Domain Name Health Index, which effectively is the implementation of all of these reviews and this monitoring of the new top level domains to see if they are doing well, or if they are not doing well.

The second of these consultations is the draft Fiscal Year 18 Operating Plan and Budget, with a five year operating plan update. This is all part of the process of fiscal years and financial year planning. If you're interested in this, have a look. I know that we have a finance and budget subcommittee that is looking at this very carefully, we as in the At-Large community and the ALAC has a finance and budget subcommittee. A couple of our members are on this and hopefully there will be some good feedback on that.

Next, the generic name supporting organization committee did comment on new gTLD subsequent procedures policy development process. That's the second part of the process to launch new generic top level domains. I spoke to you about the competition consumer trust and consumer choice review.

In parallel, this policy development process has been working to collect all of the input that has been received so far, including the one from the competition consumer trust and consumer choice review team, and is slowly but surely moving forward to come up with recommendations as to what should happen next, whether a new round, under what conditions should a new round take place, if there is one to take place, et cetera. Very, very important processes and Alan Greenberg and Cheryl Langdon-Orr are currently drafting a statement. We have until

May 1 to respond. So it's still early on, but please, have a look at the report and let us know your input, because that's vitally important.

Next, the draft 2016 African Domain Name System market study. Wafa Dahmani and Seun Ojedeji are currently drafting a statement. I gather this doesn't directly affect our own region, but this is a study that was of course started out, because the African domain name market is I guess a bit less developed than the other continents, the other parts of the world, so it was interesting to have such a study. If you're interested in this, please have a look at it.

Next is the proposed fundamental bylaw changes, to move the board governance committee reconsideration process responsibilities to another board committee. Ah, how many times have I said consultation is important? This one is too, would you believe it. And why is it so important? Because so far, when there a reconsideration of a board decision, it used to go through the board governance committee, and now with the new committee powers that have been created, thanks to the INS Stewardship Transition process and the ICANN Accountability process, which as you know, are processes that have taken a year-and-a-half, nearly two years, I guess, to put together, the board has decided that in order to make things more streamlined, I guess, and perhaps less conflicted, there should be another board committee in charge of looking at reconsideration requests, rather than the board governance committee itself. So a small change, but quite important, as well. And Leon Sanchez is currently working on a statement.

The deferral of the country code name supporting organization review is a process which the country code name supporting organization has

asked, seeing the amount of work that was created both in the generic name supporting organization review, but also in the At-Large Advisory Committee, the At-Large Review, which has taken a lot of our time in the past year. So again, if there is any such decision being made, because these reviews are bylaw mandated, public comment is needed, and so Alan Greenberg is currently drafting a statement in consultation with Maureen Hilyard, who as I said earlier, is our country code name supporting organization representative.

And then finally, and I'm going to reach the end of this list, the recommendations to improve supporting organization and advisory committee accountability. The accountability cross community working group has not finished its work. We are still deep down in Workstream II, and so a set of recommendation have now been published, again, a very important process, since it really affects all parts of ICANN, and it would ultimately enhance not only the accountability from supporting organizations and advisory committees, but all of ICANN. And this is something that is particularly important, especially when it comes down to questions that are always being asked about ICANN being accountable. So both Alan Greenberg and Cheryl Langdon-Orr are drafting a statement.

I'm going to pass over the other statements right now, the ones that have been stalled are on the side for the time being, I guess probably because we just haven't got enough time to look at it, the recommendation to improve ICANN's transparency, it is important, it closes on April 10, so that has already somehow past the deadline, and then there are two public comments that the ALAC has not yet decided on, enhancing accountability guidelines for good space and the proposal

for Ethiopic Script Root Zone Label Generation Rules, I believe that's for Ethiopia, and I think that judging from our experience, we don't specifically, we as of the ALAC, our community doesn't specifically comment on these label generation rules, except if something is majorly wrong and one notices that something is majorly wrong.

I open the floor for comments, questions, and so on. We've taken quite some time on this, but it's a long list, and I'm absolutely open to questions or discussion on any of these topics. I don't see anyone putting their hand up. I note a very wise comment from Tatiana saying that it's probably going to take another 20 years for Workstream II activities and the accountability process. So yes, if you don't have the time now to respond to the public comments, you will no doubt have some in the future. Maybe not 20 years, but a while. I don't see anyone putting their hand up. I guess I've put everyone to sleep. Oh, no, Christopher Wilkinson, you have the floor.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hello, good evening. Thank you Olivier. Could you give us a first reaction as to how the ALAC and RALO service review has been received in ICANN? Is there any feedback yet from the large documents which the RALOs and the ALAC published? Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Christopher, it's Olivier speaking, and I have seen Alan putting his hand up. Alan Greenberg, the ALAC Chair, and he probably has much more information about this than I do. So, I'll pass the floor over to Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Actually, I put my hand up for something else altogether, but I'll say, then I'll try to address Christopher, just to note that either you're looking at an old version or you misread the policy list. The root zone label generation rules and the guidelines for good faith, we decided not to do a statement on.

Christopher, I only heard half of your question, I think you were asking how has the report been received? Well, the short answer is the final report is not yet out. We are expecting it out within some number of days. The draft report was received varying by various people. The ALAC's comment, and not dissimilar from the RALO comment was that we support a fair number of the recommendations, but we do not support perhaps the most crucial one, on what would have been effectively a massive reorganization of At-Large and the ALAC.

Other groups submitted comments which vary. In general they said things like, aha, we know there was a problem. Some of them said yes, since there appears to be a problem, and the fact that there are problems is not new, we've been saying that ourselves for quite a while. Some recommended implementing the recommendations as written. There were a few comments that like the ALAC one, said there may be a problem, but we're not sure this recommendation is the way to go ahead. So they varied all over the place, and we're waiting to see what happens with the final recommendations.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks Alan, it's Olivier speaking. The question that I was attempting to answer was whether ICANN has provided any feedback on the input that the two statements that we've had. So the RALO statement and the ALAC statement, and my response was I've heard absolutely nothing, so I thought perhaps you had heard something.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, we certainly had some informal comments in Copenhagen on how they were responding to the general input they were getting, but not specifically to the comments, most of which had not been submitted at that point, and we've heard nothing more since then, nor did we expect to hear anything before we saw the final report.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Christopher Wilkinson, a followup? Christopher is muted.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Sorry, I muted again. No, no further followup. I appreciate a lot of people are sitting on their hands until they get the final report from ICANN, but some of the issues are really quite significant and important. I confess I wrote a fairly detailed comment of my own, but in so far as both RALO and ALAC covered most of the ground, I did not submit it.

But I suppose my final query would be to say, well, if and when ICANN proposes revised bylaws based on all the processes reviewed, will those go to public consultation, as well? So, later this year or even next year, there will be an opportunity to actually comment on the proposed changes that the Board has accepted.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, in general, reports do not propose specific bylaw changes, although virtually every report ends up resulting in some bylaw changes. There are a lot of steps between now and then. So yes, there's going to be plenty of opportunity for comment, and in the case of bylaws, every ICANN bylaw change goes up to public comment. That has been the norm for years, and is now a requirement of the new accountability measures, and in fact, if it happens to change a fundamental bylaw, which it could, would require community approval to enact.

But that's a lot of steps away from now, and changing the bylaws typically are just adjusting the paperwork for changes that have been agreed to through other processes way before the bylaws are drafted. So we're still a way away from that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Christopher?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Olivier, this is the last request to the floor on this particular point, sorry to keep you all, but in that case, in so far as ALAC and the RALOs have accepted a number of the recommendations, in so far as they can be implemented within the framework of the existing bylaws, would it be tactful, or tactfully positive to just go ahead and implement the recommendations that you agree on? So it would eventually reduce the

scope for specific arguments over contested recommendations down the line.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. The process that is in place is once the final review is submitted, and as I said, we're expecting it within a week, you know, plus or minus, then it goes to the review working group within At-Large, obviously with consultation with the rest of the ALAC and At-Large, to make recommendations to the Board Operational Effectiveness Committee on what we recommend be done with the recommendations, and it could be anything from yes, we support it strongly, let's get to it, so we think this is dumb and we strongly recommend the Board not support these recommendations.

They then go forward, once the Operational Effectiveness Committee makes its decision and it goes to the Board, and then the Board passes judgment on those recommendations, at that point it goes into implementation, and conceivably some things will be implemented quicker than others, some things may take a lot of time, and of course, there's nothing to stop us to the extent that it is within our power, you know, if it doesn't require budget or other resources we don't have access to, nothing stops us from implementing something a week from now, if we think it has merit and it's something that we can do on our own. So the things will progress at different speeds, depending on which item it is.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alright, thanks very much for these answers, Alan Greenberg. I think we've already eaten much into our next agenda item, which is to talk about the response to the At-Large Review draft report. I was going to ask again whether there were any questions or comments on the previous section, the one about any of the policy statements?

Going once, going twice, I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so I just wanted to add one more thing on this topic. I really do hope that you can spend time reading through, I'm not asking you to read through all of those topics, but the one that you're interested in, and we will actually touch on EURALO ALS expertise later on in this call, which might actually help towards being able to identify people who can lead into looking into these topics.

But it's a coordination of our community to bring the input into these statements that are being drafted, and this is where we can make a real difference. This is where what we write as individuals, as groups, as EURALO, as At-Large, as ALAC, make the real difference and have an impact on ICANN policy. And that's something I can't emphasize enough. And unfortunately, we haven't had enough input from EURALO on all of these topics.

So I really hope that you can focus on a few of these, and of course, I'm not asking you to become a penholder right away, but you can see that there are quite a few people that can be more involved and the more input we get, the more legitimacy we have in what we're basically saying and the input that we're bringing there, because it's input from

the edges, from the grassroots. So that was just my minute of advertising for the policy statement. I think it's quite important.

Agenda Item 4, the RALO statement, I was just going to touch on for one thing, and that's first to thank everyone for all their input. As you know there were two statements, one drafted by the ALAC and going through the ALAC process for ratification. And one that went through all of the five regional At-Large organizations, and one thing that hasn't been publicized is how this was all ratified by the different At-Large organizations.

Three of the five RALOs conducted the poll in the AFRALO poll, so that's the African Region At-Large organization, 57.69% of the 52 ALS's voted, and that actually made 30 At-Large structures in favor, 0 abstentions. In our region in EURALO, 61% of our 26 At-Large structures participated, 20 of them voted in favor, and 1 of them voted against, and 1 of the At-Large structures abstained. An in the NARALO poll, 87% of their 24 At-Large structures voted, and there were 19 in favor, 2 against, and no abstentions.

So we could see that our At-Large structures in our community was in favor of the statement that was given there, and that amounts to quite a few people, bearing in mind that At-Large structures have anything between 20 members for the small ones, to tens of thousands for the large ones. And I'm really happy to have seen that we've managed to do a process under very tight time constraints, and have the support of the community.

Of course, some At-Large structures have voted against, I think in our region the individuals were not particularly happy about the statement itself. But that is really the start of a discussion that we need to have. And I really hope that we'll be able to have more discussions on this, and how to improve the ALAC and At-Large and the RALO is something that is not just left to the seasonal reviews that we see, but as Christopher just said here, and as Alan Greenberg also mentioned, it's something that we can take to heart and do as a continuous thing, to enhance the way that we work.

So, I don't know how we can continue a discussion on this, if you have any suggestions, then please bring them forward, either on the mailing list, but I'm certainly very open to discussion and to continue to improve our processes. We're far from being perfect, I can tell you that, and I get frustrated sometimes that we can't improve things at a faster rate than we can, but we're all volunteers and we just don't have 24/7 time to spend on these things. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Although I always like people to completely agree with me, I think it's really healthy when we have some disagreement and people voting against things. It means they're really engaging and thinking about it, not just blindly saying yes to everything that is proposed. So I think that's a sign of health, not a sign of a problem. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I hope I didn't sound as though it was a sign of a problem. I think it's certainly great to

have seen some good debate going on, and I think that for some of us it's gotten us to do a bit of soul searching, looking at ourselves, thinking, well, wait a minute, we're not as great and wonderful as we think we are, perhaps there are a number of things that we need to improve on, because certainly we don't have unanimity, so that's what consensus is all about, it doesn't need to be unanimous, but it needs to be following the wish of the majority.

Let's continue, I don't see any hands up. So let's go to the update on ICANN58 in Copenhagen. We had a General Assembly and we had some outreach going on over there. That's where the link to the pictures is. In your agenda, the second link is the At-Large outreach and engagement photos from ICANN58. You'll see a few people smiling, you know, quite a few activities that were undertaken over there. There was a booth, there were a number of events that took place.

Obviously the General Assembly, but also a Capacity Building session with Tatiana Tropina. It was a joint Capacity Building session with the NCUC, Noncommercial Users Constituency, very well attended. So I think altogether, the outreach was really great, and I'm looking forward to receive a number of applications from the Scandinavian countries. I certainly have hooked up, and in fact colleagues have hooked up with people from Scandinavian countries.

I would like to thank Yrjo for bringing many of these people forward, Yrjo Lansipuro, and hopefully we might even get some more people or applications from Eastern Europe, and I certainly think that we've also received a number of applications from the individual associations. So it's been good on that point. The General Assembly in itself has run

pretty well. We had a good discussion about the actual – well, a number of things basically.

First we had so many people around the table, which was pretty good. Unfortunately, we didn't manage to reach quorum because of the number of meetings that were taking place simultaneously, but we were just, I think, one person short of having quorum. So thankfully we didn't have any decisions to make, specifically the agenda was looking at the updates of the Bylaws taskforce the At-Large structure engagement task force, and discussing a hot topics list, whether we wanted to update this hot topics list, and ultimately we also had a very good conversation with Jean-Jacques Sahel, who is the Vice President for stakeholder engagement for Europe and with Michael Yakushev, who is the Vice President for stakeholder engagement for Eastern Europe, Russia, and Central Asia.

So both of them spoke to us, and I think we were pretty much in line with them, coordinating well with them on how to continue spreading our wings, to achieve the aim at some point of having at least one At-Large structure in every country in Europe, one active At-Large structure I think is important in every country, and of course, having more than one At-Large structure is even better, because we have more people from more communities engaging. But certainly engagement is very important.

So the people that met there were very engaged, they participated not only in the EURALO work, but in the work of the ALAC and in working groups, and so on, and altogether I think it was a pretty good meeting. I don't know if there are any questions or comments by anyone, or any

feedback from anybody who was there, or anybody who followed remotely?

Okay, so that's all there was. We are supposed to be having a transcript of the meeting, so if you haven't been able to attend, a transcript will be ready soon, and we'll publicize it when it's ready, so you'll be able to see the discussions with Jean-Jacques Sahel and with Michael Yakushev. You can, of course, listen to them in the meantime, as well.

Now we have two taskforces in EURALO. One is the bylaws rewriting, because our bylaws are, well, our currently bylaws don't quite reflect the reality of things, and that was started quite a while ago. And the second one is a taskforce on At-Large structure engagement, and that I alluded to a bit earlier, and that is building EURALO At-Large structure expertise tables. Let's first have an update for the EURALO bylaws taskforce.

Erich Schweighofer and [inaudible] have submitted a document that is linked to your agenda that has the detailed updates, but I'll let Erich take us through a quick summary – ah, well, the document is on your screen, there you go. I'll let Erich take us through a quick summary of where we are and how soon can we expect some news or draft of new bylaws to be ready. Erich Schweighofer, you have the floor.

ERICH SCHWEIGHOFER:

Thank you, Erich speaking. We are now identifying the open issues and drafting the open questions and we will present a document about two topics we are addressed a lot after the meeting. The question is of resources, if EURALO should have its own resources or not. The other is

about is dispute settlement. We are strongly in favor of EURALO having the possibility of getting their own resources, either mostly funds by others, maybe also some membership fees, but that's not expected.

But still, it will give us some kind of more independence from the ICANN organization. It's quite easy to do that, it's a possibility. It's considered to be used now, but maybe in the future, more options or people willing to make some money for EURALO. The second issue would be dispute settlement. That's the difference between [inaudible] involves some widening of bylaws, but it's quite helpful to have some kind of arbitration infrastructure available. So people from ourselves are acting as traitors in case of a dispute. But it is mostly the easy way to settle disputes.

And the other one, concerning the quorum, I took a look also to old tuitions and it still seems to be, it was well up to, we have quorum about the board quite strong, [inaudible] and the majority of the votes, and also for special votes, a qualified majority. So I guess a quorum question is not so difficult to do. And then this one question, we also solved, we must have the possibility to change [inaudible] easily if ICANN organizations requires us to do so.

Because of a lot of our rules are mostly taken from ICANN and also developed ICANN At-Large. They accept members, they also end membership, actually a lot of what we're doing is [inaudible] ICANN, and we should have some kind of form in the bylaws and an easy change of these bylaws, not by assembly, but maybe some other way to do so. That's the update for now. And having some feedback of this

meeting, we expect to have another meeting of the At-Large folks maybe in some weeks. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Erich. I open the floor for questions or comments. And I heard someone, I'm not quite sure who it was. Any questions, any comments?

ANNETTE MUHLBERG: Yes, Annette here speaking.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, Annette, yes, please.

ANNETTE MUHLBERG: Annette Muhlberg for the record. I would just like to know was that a question to ask, that you still want to take a decision, and you need some input on this? I did not understand if you have a real question in place here. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much, Annette. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Really, this is an update and I guess Erich can answer any questions that are asked on this, but I guess not to great detail, because if one wants to go into great detail, then I would suggest that we have another call of the working group itself. If you have a light question for Erich Schweighofer, then that's absolutely fine.

ANNETTE MUHLBERG: Okay, sorry, can I say again?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead.

ANNETTE MUHLBERG: Okay. Erich, I just did not get it right, if you were asking, if you want to take a decision and you have two ways, and you want to get input by us, this is what I just want to clarify. Was there a clear question you have to ask?

ERICH SCHWEIGHOFER: Erich speaking. I have two points concerning resources and also concerning dispute settlement. The dispute settlement question seems to be what do we do from a legal point of view. The other question concerning resources, also. So we have the possibility of having our own resources, it's good to do, it's not much change, and it seems to be helpful, even if we don't do it now.

ANNETTE MUHLBERG: Okay.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alright, thanks to both of you, it's Olivier speaking. And I note in the chat suggestion that maybe there should be a conference call soon for

that taskforce, it's been a while since the last one, and since Erich Schweighofer and Florin Hueler, and Wolf Ludwig have met in Vienna to kickstart or reboot the work that was done so far. So perhaps we should have an action item, if all parties agree to have a working group call for this taskforce on bylaws, EURALO bylaws taskforce. But thank you for your update, Erich, that's been really helpful.

And by the way, if anyone is interested in joining this taskforce, I've noticed a few new names on the list, if you're interested in joining, please just drop either me a note or drop a note to Staff at atlarge.icann.org and they will add you to the mailing list, and you will therefore be in the taskforce.

Let's go to the next taskforce, and that's the one on At-Large structure engagement. Yrjo Lansipuro is leading this, is chairing this taskforce. Yrjo has been doing amazing work with his group. I guess we can just go directly over to Yrjo Lansipuro.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Thank you Olivier, this is Yrjo Lansipuro. This is basically an update to what has been done. We now have the EURALO ALS expertise table as a living document a Google document, that covers 33 subject areas and on each of them, there are EURALO ALS's and individuals in those ALS's that have said that they have expertise on those. So we checked that with ALS's once again, it was reviewed by ALS's, and we got some more information.

So that part we can say that we have implemented the recommendation 28, however, this is just the beginning, because the

proof of the pudding is really to use this information to leverage the expertise at the ALS's in the work they do in giving advice to the policy processes. So basically what we need now is a procedure whereby we continually can match the requests for public comments and other opportunities to express views, to match these with the available experts at the ALS's.

So what I suggest is that every time we have those requests, the opportunities for telling ICANN what we think from the end user perspective, that the EURALO Chair and the EURALO Board take a look at this table and if there are quite possible matches between the expertise available and the subject matter, then we notify the ALS's in question, or those individual members that have declared that they have expertise in certain areas, and ask them to comment.

I would stress that the ALS's, when they did the comments, if they can somehow draw upon the knowledge of local grassroots interest experience in their contributions, that would make the At-Large input reflect the real diversity of the end user community. So this is what the taskforce, I think we also should have a taskforce meeting pretty soon, and we could develop these thoughts further.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Yrjo. It's Olivier speaking. I'm always amazed about the amount of knowledge and competency that we have in our community. The table reads like a dream come true. I think we've been speaking about this for quite a while, and seeing names of At-Large structures next to specific topics is really great. I'd like to open

the floor and find out if there is any feedback or any thoughts on the process that we could use for this.

Certainly the process that you have suggested to the EURALO Board sounds like maybe one possible avenue. But we're designing things here, and it's something that I think EURALO is ahead of other RALOs. So it's a bit pioneering, I guess, and it would be certainly good to have some input both on this call and in the taskforce as a followup. Any feedback or thoughts on this? I notice, Annette you have your hand up? Is the hand for the previous topic or this topic?

ANNETTE MUHLBERG: Sorry, no, no, that was not meant to be.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alright, any thoughts on this, any feedback? Yes, you've all been tapped now, we know what knowledge you have, and we will be calling upon you for this. I wonder, Yrjo, whether maybe a test case could be done so we could select a specific public consultation and then email the At-Large structures that have knowledge in this, and ask for their input specifically, I don't know, really. I note that Heidi Ullrich has put her hand up.

So maybe Heidi can suggest a few things that could be done. You have the floor, Heidi. And you might be muted at the moment. And you probably are muted, so let's go for Yrjo Lansipuro in the meantime. Yrjo, you have the floor.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yes, Olivier, this is Yrjo. Absolutely, we need a test case. I was actually looking at the policy ICANN we have this time, but we didn't find anything there, but absolutely, when we have a case, a public comment request or whatever, then let's make this test and see how it works. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Yrjo. Olivier speaking. Heidi apparently was not muted, so, I certainly couldn't hear Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, can you hear me now?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We can hear you, welcome.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, Idigo had possibly muted me earlier when I had some background noise. But, I just wanted to actually say congratulations to Yrjo, you are way ahead on this particular point in terms of the hot topics, that document that you have, and then this activity as well. And this is something that I would ask that Olivier as Chair of EURALO, that you wish to pick up on the next series of regional leadership calls to serve as sort of a way forward for some of the other RALOs on this.

I think this is very much needed in some of the RALOs and I think that EURALO is really the first in the line of other RALOs that could start doing these sorts of activities. So, thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this Heidi, it's Olivier speaking. I'm certainly happy to take this to the other RALOs, and see if they can also do something similar to this. I understand that NARALO has taken the expertise table as an example, and they're also asking feedback on their side. I've seen this going on their mailing list, and we're hopeful the other RALOs can also pick it up. But as far as we're concerned, it would be good to see what we do next, and how we can test this system out. I note that Sebastien Bachollet has put his hand up, so Sebastien, you have the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Olivier. Yes, the question, now that we have this table, who will take the responsibility to try to map out against the public comments, we need to fulfill, because I think it's the best way to start something. If we look to the list of topics you told us earlier, sorry for them, but they are usual suspects who are writing the comments for At-Large and ALAC and if we want to enhance this work using the competency of LACs and user, it will be very important to try and map those competencies against the question raised by the public comments. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this Sebastien. That's one way forward. I note a few other comments in the chat that are not related directly to the discussion at hand. But I note that Heidi is saying the logical next step from the earlier EURALO were work on preparing the hot topic document, EURALO hot topics is listed here in the chat.

Right, I see that we have a couple minutes until the end of this call. We have one more item to discuss, and that's the CROP update, the Community Regional Outreach Pilot program. Let's follow up on the mailing list regarding the taskforce on ALS engagement, but thanks again Yrjo for this excellent piece of work, and thanks to your group for having put this together.

The Community Regional Outreach Pilot program, I must admit, my responsibility in failing requests on time for other important meetings that have taken place over the year. We have seen one forthcoming meeting that is Republica, and unfortunately we were too late to file any requests for any of our colleagues to travel there. We've missed the meeting that took place in Brussels just a few weeks ago. Thankfully the regional vice president managed to help us out on this one, and got Bastiaan Goslings to go.

And unfortunately Bastiaan couldn't make it to the call this month, but hopefully he'll be able to give us some feedback during our next call next month, or perhaps even by email. But now we have only a few weeks to go until the end of this fiscal year, and we have filed after a process that involves asking for applications from our community and a selection process that involves the EURALO Board. We've got give

travelers to go to the EURODIG, European data of internet governance. A trip proposal which was filed on April 10.

The only thing that I'm a bit concerned about is I see that the trip proposal is pending, and the outreach strategic plan draft which I had submitted in September of last year is also pending, and I'm not quite sure what comes first, whether it's the egg or the chicken, or whether there is neither a chicken or an egg, but there's just a trip, and it's just stalled at the moment, and I'm a bit concerned about the deadline that we have here. Wolf Ludwig, you filed the trip proposal. Do you have any feedback on what has to happen next? Because I'm a little confused.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thanks, Olivier, it's Wolf Ludwig for the record. Well after I have filed on April 10, this was I think last Monday, there was a short reply from Janice pointing to two questions, one was the so called pending outreach strategic plan, but it's not really pending, but in my opinion it was always considered work in progress and it's true that you filed the last version in September 2016 already, which somehow was not considered by the review team, and was not approved for reasons I don't know.

And two points that Janice asked, I answered the two questions, and you responded to this email, as well, clarifying about strategic plan and we have submitted our five candidates with one backup option for candidate. And unfortunately there was no response from the review team, and that is where the ball is, in my opinion, on the other side.

The only thing from our side we could do right now is to submit our request now immediately to Jean-Jacques Sahel and to Michael, to the European stakeholder engagement people who are in charge, because we also need their approval, and before we have another response or approval from the review team, we could already speed up a little bit by making this other step right now, and asking them for their approval as soon as possible.

In my opinion, that's the only thing I can do. I don't really understand why the CROP review team so far is not responding. But no response has to be considered as silent approval, et cetera. We submitted in any case our request on the 10th of April on time.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much for this Wulf, it's Olivier speaking, and thanks for this quick update. Please follow up with Jean-Jacques and with Michael to find out what's going on. I have a feeling that it might be Jean-Jacques Sahel is still on holiday, which doesn't help at all. So we probably need to check, maybe also through the Staff channel, and see what is going on there.

It's just highly bizarre that on the one hand we try and do all this work, to do outreach and inreach, and talk to as many people as we can, and on the other side, something as straightforward as CROPP that provides the ability for those five travelers to go to EURODIG meet with us and be more active, and on there, by the way, there are two travelers are seasoned travelers, Andrei Kolesnikov from Russia, well known in our

community and is very active in At-Large, Annette Muhlberg who is on this call is also very active in EURALO.

But [inaudible] is a brand new At-Large structure representative who has now taken over in Moscow, so that would be his first step into the wider world of ICANN and internet governance, and it's important that we meet, because Russia is a very important part, and Eastern Europe is a very important part of our region. Mattias Hudovnik is an individual user, and so is Rim Hayad, and I think that we also need to help out the individual users and get them to contribute more and to be more actively involved in the individual user application, getting more people out there to join.

And what more, what better to have a call for individual users made by other individual users. Clemon Jonti who is listed as a backup is currently doing a PhD in internet governance, and specifically in domain names, so if any of the previous five travelers are unable to make it, then Clemon will take their seat. That is, of course, if the whole process runs through, which at the moment seems to be a small problem. So, that's how it is at the moment. Any questions or comments on this? I realize we are a bit beyond our official end time.

I wanted today, in the past there has been some criticism about the choice, you know, how the choice for the travelers was made, and I think that this year we've done something that was much more open, much more transparent, and that certainly really opened the door to have people that are complete newcomers be more active. I certainly didn't know some of the travelers here, I don't think anyone knew them, but they've applied and they were selected on their willingness to

do something, to be active, and also on their competencies and on the demonstration they really want to do more for this community. So it's been, I think, a good process.

Anyway, I'm rambling a little bit too long. I see that people are starting to leave. So we move into any other business, AOB. Going once, going twice. It is the evening, after all, in Europe. So I'd like to thank you all for spending the past hour with us. I hope it has been helpful. Please do give a think to all this policy stuff. Look at it, you can't tell me that none of that affects your At-Large structure or affects you, because we now know what affects you and what affects your At-Large structure.

So please have a look at those things, let's try and work better and smarter together in the next month and the next future few weeks. Thanks everyone. I hope it's been a good evening for you all. Have a very good evening and speak to you next month, and of course, speak to you on the internet, on our mailing list. This call is now adjourned. Thank you and good night.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]