
YEŞİM NAZLAR: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the EURALO monthly call taking place on Tuesday, 16th of May, 2017 at 18:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Oliver Crépin-Leblond, Wolf Ludwig, Matthieu Camus, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Sandra Hoferichter, Isaac Maposa, Matthieu Camus, Georgie Kirov, Wale Bakare, Christopher Wilkinson.

We have received apologies from Yrjö Länsipuro, Bastiann Goslings, Sébastien Bachollet, Annette Mühlberg, and Anne-Marie Joly.

And from staff we have Silvia Vivanco, Gabriella Shittek, and myself, Yeşim Nazlar.

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

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yeşim Nazlar. Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. And today's agenda is going to have guest visit from Dev Anand Tellucksingh, telling us about the community onboarding project. It's a new project that is currently being developed to help with newcomers, engage new people and newcomers into ICANN, and into At-Large, and into EURALO, etc., in a better way.

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.

So, Dev is going to talk about this to us first, then we'll have a review of our upcoming and current public consultations. You can see on the agenda that there are quite a few of them going on simultaneously. ICANN certainly keeps us busy. That will have EURALO bylaws taskforce update. There was a call of the taskforce that took place, so I know that Wolf Ludwig, Erich Schweighofer, and [inaudible] will be telling us about the current question in front of the taskforce.

We'll have a quick follow-up on the EURALO elections that have, which process has just started. We'll look over the EURALO internet governance forum proposal, and then we'll have a discussion, hopefully 10 minutes or more actually, of the WHOIS issue in context of the implementation of implementation of your opinion is general protection regulations, GPR.

It's big, big news at the moment. I've heard a lot of discussions going on it in government circles. And Christopher Wilkinson will be taking us into the recent discussion in ICANN regarding the updated ICANN procedure for handling WHOIS conflicts, the conflict being, of course, with the European privacy laws.

May I ask, at this point, if there are any additional business to add to this agenda? Or, are there any amendments to make to the agenda?

I'm not seeing anyone putting their hand up, so that's, the agenda is agreed as currently displayed, which means we can move swiftly onto the review of the action items from our last call. And a quick click of the mouse will send you to that page, to let you know that everything has

been agreed. A quick update. So, the bylaws taskforce have held a teleconference, and we'll have an update in a moment.

Glenn McKnight have led a session with the regional leadership team, explaining the EURALO and the NARALO At-Large structure expertise surveys. And the other RALOs are now considering and performing similar to the activities in their region. Wolf has followed up with Jean-Jacques Sahel and [inaudible] on the approval of the EURALO community regional outreach pilot program 2017.

And I'm glad to announce that our travelers to EuroDIG will be Andrei Kolesnikov, [inaudible], Anna [inaudible]... The feedback I have so far is apparently the trips have been arranged, and the hotel is going to be announced pretty soon. The only thing, if any... And I've spoken to a couple of the people, if anyone hasn't, on this list, hasn't had any, the flights aren't setup or things are not, please convey, drop me an email or drop an email to staff in At-Large earlier rather than later.

It's easier to fix things now then to fix it three days before the trip. The next action item is the suggestion of Christopher Wilkinson, we should talk about the WHOIS issue. That's exactly what we're going to do on this call. So, that's the action items from our last call last month. Don't expect anyone to have any views on this.

I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so we can certainly move on then to our star of the day today, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, for the community onboarding project. Dev, I understand you have some slides. Staff are putting them on the Adobe Connect. If others are interested, the slide deck is also linked from the agenda and Dev has

also put the link to the Wiki page that deals with the At-Large community onboarding.

And without speaking any further, Dev you have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Olivier. Welcome everyone, and thanks for allowing me some time to be on your call today. So, the community onboarding pilot program is a collaboration between ICANN and the various ACs and SOs, to more effectively integrate new community members into their volunteer role.

So, the idea is to try and create a structured [inaudible] process, tailored by each of the various groups. So, we in At-Large, and by we, a core team within the outreach and engagement community, comprised of myself, [inaudible] have been working on this onboarding project. I want to take some time just to briefly show what we're doing so far to get some feedback and to encourage comments on our work that we have done to date.

So, we are looking at this onboarding process as a sort of cycle. You know, we promote At-Large to get people to understand what is At-Large. And then once they join, they then become engaged, and then as they become more engaged, they can then help to promote At-Large. You know, sort of a circle of life so to speak within the At-Large community.

The things that we are facing though, as At-Large representing the interests of internet end users, is that you know, the challenges. We

have so many acronyms, CNS, TLDs, ccTLDs, gTLDs, IANA, post-IANA stewardship, BCT RT, you know. I can spend the entire hour rattling off acronyms. And the challenge is, you know, how do we...? What do all of those things mean? And what are their relationships? And how are they interconnected?

Most of all, most of the target audiences that we are trying to reach, you know, the end users, civil society, consumer groups, the members of our existing At-Large structures, that are part of the At-Large community, they don't have an understanding of what these terms mean, or misconceptions of what these terms mean, and hence, there is no appreciation they should care, or why they should get involved.

So, we sort of need to really look to develop a set of, or series of ordered lessons or presentation, that can for a toolkit for At-Large members, in educating the wider public, for the At-Large structure representatives to use to educate members in their organizations, to get persons in their organizations to get them to be more interested and get more involved in the At-Large community.

And also look to make it be available online as well as offline. So, for those who have bandwidth issues, for example, they can still be given a set of presentations so they could watch on their laptop or computer or tablet, for that matter. So, we'll work with the outreach and engagement subcommittee. And so far, we've developed at least a whole set of ordered presentations, with a fifth one being planned.

And the presentations are a start here, which represent a sort of like guide persons, depending on the topic audience reading the slide. So

that, if for example, you're coming from an existing ICANN community, you probably don't need to know what ICANN is, for example. So, you will then be directed to a certain set of directed slides, or course work, or outline for you to follow.

The next presentation we've developed is what is the DNS, and who coordinates it. We introduce the concepts of what is the DNS, introduce concepts of like what is ICANN the corporation, and ICANN the community. The policy challenges. This is a slide deck... The policy challenges in the DNS, sorry. This is a slide deck to help new and potential At-Large community members learn about the policy issues, and why should end users care, and how the At-Large community is involved in these issues.

And the fourth slide deck is the introduction to the At-Large community, which talks about the key activities, it's how to engage with the At-Large community. And the fifth one we're planning to work on is navigating At-Large. And what that will do is [inaudible] to the existing At-Large community members, as to how to deal with the organizational challenges of you know, what are differences in each of the regions, and how the At-Large community operates, and also the operational challenges as I described it.

You know, how do you use Adobe Connect? Learn to use the calendar to track events and so forth. So, I just quickly will just not going to go through all of these slides, but I'm just going to show highlights from each of these presentations. So, for example, here is the idea on the concept of the [inaudible] for the landing page, or the start here. So,

you try to target the various audience members, and then would direct them to the course outline that they can follow on their own.

And the next slide is, what is the DNS? We try to find informative infographics to try to explain it in a very simple and as least technical as possible, and trying to reduce the jargon as much as we can. The next slide is the policy issues, and perhaps I might want to go full screen chat quickly, just because it's kind of a detailed slide.

So, what I've done is created a slide deck with all of the key policy issues of the At-Large community. And clicking one of those policies will take you to a policy summary. And the policy summary tries to explain what the policy issue is, along with related ICANN videos, not just ICANN videos but videos from the At-Large community has done on these issues.

And the next slide will then take you as to why should end users care? And then, how At-Large is involved in this particular policy issue. The goal is, again, [inaudible], is that it's not necessarily meant for persons to present all of this in one goal, but to just pick one or two key issues, and then share that with the target audience.

And the introduction to At-Large slide, again, this is something that was started by the outreach and engagement subcommittee over the past year, looking at trying to describe what is the At-Large community, the key activities we do, various working groups and how you engage within At-Large.

I guess, in a sense, this is kind of geared toward the Fellowship and NextGen students, but we think this could also be used for ALS representatives to explain what is At-Large to its members.

So, I would just like to stop there, and again, answer any questions that you have. And there is a link there to see the full links to all of the presentations and you can click through and see what we have done so far. And that will continue to be updated, and you can leave comments there on the Wiki, or by coming to the outreach and engagement subcommittee working group call.

And again, we want to hear your feedback and your observations. So, that's it. I'll stop there. Thanks.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Dev. Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. And the floor is open for questions and comments. Whilst people think on whether they want to put their hand up or not, I have a couple of questions. The first one is to do with the format used for this onboarding. Are these PowerPoint presentations that are linked to each other with a link or is it a different system?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Olivier. This is Dev. So, we are doing it in Google slides, but they are hyperlinked in the sense that, you know, the links work with each other. However, we are looking at possibly using ICANN Learn to also put these on ICANN Learn. So, but we're looking to just develop

the core material first, and then we'll migrate to try to put the content on ICANN Learn, and see how that works.

And we have to figure out ourselves, we have to figure out how to use ICANN Learn and how to structure the various modules and so forth. But the intent is to have both, the presentation so At-Large structures can use it themselves on their various outreach. If a person is travelling on CROP to give folks, to the public or to possible potential At-Large members, they can use the presentations.

And then we could also direct existing persons to use the ICANN Learn, for example. So, the answer is...

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Olivier speaking. Second question, how much of this duplicates the information that is contained in the beginner's guides? The ICANN beginner's guides. Or is this meant to replace the beginner's guide in the long run?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev. I would say it's not really explicit going to replace the beginner's guides, but I guess I think one of the challenges for onboarding, and we have experienced it time and time again, is that there is no easier way to really get a person onboarded within the At-Large community. So, I think what we're trying to do is not try to consolidate a lot of the information.

So the beginner's guides won't necessarily go away. I mean, we can use it, but what we are intending to try to do is to at least get a person

involved, and then they can look at the beginner's guides for more detailed study on particular issues and so forth.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Dev. It's Olivier speaking. And another question is, when do you expect these, this onboarding to be ready for launch? And how do you expect to publicize it with our community?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. While we are trying to see if we can accomplish this by the ICANN 59 Johannesburg meeting, so the community onboarding pilot team would be meeting at Johannesburg. So, we want to try to complete, have our materials ready by that time. So, in about a week or two, we would like to see that fifth slide deck, at least a draft version being shown to the At-Large community for comments.

So, and in terms of raising awareness within the At-Large community, since I became involved in community onboarding, just before the Hyderabad ICANN meeting, we've publicized this work on the outreach and engagement subcommittee calls, on discussions on that mailing list, and we've also taken the opportunity to try to go to each of the RALOs, and including this call, to raise awareness of this onboarding environment.

And of course, we probably would want to, we probably will be talking on the ALAC monthly call next week.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Dev. It's Olivier speaking. And final question, if one is interested in helping out with this work, and helping out or joining the outreach and engagement working group, how is that possible? Do you have to email someone? How do you get involved?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSING: Thanks, Olivier. This is Dev. It's very easy. Just email staff, and the ICANN At-Large staff saying you wish to join the outreach and engagement working group. And the Wiki page for the working group is posted in the chat. And some day, you know, you'll be updated as potential meetings, and the opportunities for, you know, giving comments or getting involved and helping prepare such materials.

So, that's how you get involved.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's opened to everyone?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: It is open to anyone.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. Well, thanks very much for joining us, Dev. It has been really helpful. I haven't seen anybody put a hand up, so I gather there are no further questions on this, but I think it's very exciting. I certainly have sensed people to, newcomers to read the beginner's guide, and

some of the feedback that I've received is that they are very helpful, and this really looks great as well.

And it's even perhaps more modern than having a guide, to have a set of pages that you can navigate like this in plain language, it's something that should be really welcomed. Thank you for the work that you and your colleagues have done on this, and the ongoing work that is taking place on this.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And now we can move to the review of the upcoming public consultations, our next agenda item. There have been four statements recently approved by the At-Large advisory committee. The first one has been on recommendations to improve ICANN's transparency. There was a public consultation that was open for a few weeks, actually. It was very tight, it's the usual timeline and so on.

The Wiki page that is linked to the agenda will give you the full details of the points that were made. But there was a focus on the document information disclosure policy, the DIDP, which is the process by which one is able to ask for any supposedly confidential documents to then be shared, or to ask for it to be shared, and the first point was that the accountability and transparency review team report showed that there was the use of tools, such as the DIDP would be significantly reduced if

the transparency, if you want, the actual transparency of ICANN wasn't in its DNA to start with.

The second point that was made was to do with the subgroup discussions, and the concern about the implementation, again about specific DIDP. And thirdly, one of the concerns that was expressed, and this is something that the ALAC has expressed in the part, is the apparent negotiations that take place between registrars and registries when the work towards improving or enhancing the current registry or registrar accreditation agreement.

Traditionally, historically should I say, it's not a tradition but it's history. The history has been kept out of the room for these discussions, and when we have asked for observer status that has been refused. So, what can be so important to be discussed behind closed doors? The second point, the second statement that was made was on the interim paper cross community working group on use of names and countries and territories as top level domains.

We had Maureen Hilyard, who is our country code name supporting organization, ccNSO, liaison, draft a short statement, supporting recommendations one, two, and four out of that report. But supporting a subsection of recommendation three with regards to the, accommodating the ccNSO's policy development process, and the GNSO, the generic name supporting organization policy development process.

A complex matter because it's all to do with a lot of internal workings, but if you're interested in this topic, please have a read of the

statement. I hope that you've had some chance to read it in the past, it was on last month's call.

The draft fiscal year 18 operating plan and budget has been published and the five year operating plan update has been shared with the community, and the ALAC has commented on this as well, but going to go into details since we haven't gotten very much time for this. Again, we've made our [inaudible] and budget subcommittee, led by Tijani Ben Jemaa, who followed the comment on this, and then the draft 2016 African domain name system market study has also been commented on by the ALAC, with [inaudible] and Seun Ojedeji holding the pen on this one.

Again, an interesting, good work that is being done, but that can be improved, and frankly colleagues in AFRALO have been on the ball for this. Currently in process, there are quite a few statements being drafted, or in comment, or in a vote. The proposed fundamental bylaw changes to the Board governance committee's reconsideration process responsibilities to another Board committee, has currently reached the ratification point on the ALAC.

It's, gain, a procedural matter, moving this reconsideration process that happens only when the, someone asks for reconsideration on a Board decision, and the Board would only agree to reconsider and to change its, or to put the matter again on the table if it agrees that it hasn't followed its own procedures. Here the idea is to move it to another Board committee from the current committee that it was on, which I believe was the Board governance committee.

Competition, consumer trust, and consumer trust review of the draft report and recommendations, the new generic top level domains. That is very, very important thread because this is one of the two main inputs that goes into the considerations for the decisions to agree whether there should be another round of new generic top level domains being released out there, or a new round of applications, or whether there shouldn't.

Or if there is supposed to be one, in what way that next round should be? And obviously, the competition, and consumer trust, and consumer choice is a very important thing because at the end of the day, domain names are really for internet users. They're not there to sustain the industry. They're not there to sustain any method, but they are there to offer consumer choice, and to be trustful, and to have a good competition so that they remain affordable.

The ALAC is finalizing a statement on this. Please, time is short. It is going to be closing on the 19th of May. You've got a couple of days to read through this, and point out anything that might not have been addressed so far. The referral of country code names supporting organization review. The ALAC has just finished its review cycle... Well, not completely finished its review cycle, but the one part of the cycle has been completed.

But the independent reviewer, the contractor, outside contractor reviewing the ALAC, has been quite disruptive and has certainly taken a lot of cycles and a lot of energy from our community. The current state of things, with so much going on in ICANN, the ccNSO, the country code

name supporting organization has asked for their review to be deferred for a while so that they can focus on other matters first.

The GNSO community comment on the new gTLD procedures policy development. Well, this is the policy development process that is working towards making a decision on a new round, next round, another round of applications for new generic top level domains. So, that committee, that policy development process will receive the output from the competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice review team report, and integrate it in their work.

As you can see, there are quite a few people who are drafting a statement together. It's good to see quite a few people have stepped forward. Alberto Soto, Andrei Kolesnikov, [inaudible], Evan Lebovitch, Leon Sanchez, Maureen Hilyard, and Satish Babu. And it's a big thing. So, if you can help with this, please you know, volunteer for this.

As with anything, make yourself known that you're interested in this, and start drafting or commenting on the Wiki page. The recommendations to improve the SO AC accountability, SO is supporting organization like the GNSO and the ccNSO. AC is advisory committee, like the ALAC or like the GAC. There are recommendations to improve their accountability.

Alan Greenberg and Cheryl Langdon-Orr are currently drafting a statement. There are 10 days until the closing of the consultation. So again, short time span. And the proposed renewal of the dot net registry agreement. There have been some discussions as to whether the ALAC should comment on the renewal of a registry agreement.

At the moment, the registry running dot net is VeriSign. It has been doing so ever since dot net was created, or VeriSign, the company that was there before VeriSign, that got purchased by VeriSign. But there could be some points, amendment that might be required, or some points that the ALAC wishes to make with regards to this renewal.

So, you're very welcome to please comment on this. At the moment, no statements are stalled. There is a public comment, which the ALAC has decided not to publish statements, and that's to do with the use of country and territory names in a whole flurry of top level domain. Traditionally, it hasn't, or historically, again, the ALAC has not commented on such points. So, these remain quite neutral, so there is no statement on that.

And there are new statements out there, new public consultations that have just come out. The revised ICANN procedure for handling WHOIS conflicts with privacy, not process, and guess what? This is what we're going to be talking about shortly on this call. And the draft framework for interpretation of human rights.

There is a process in ICANN that deals with the framework of interpretation on this topic. There is a cross community working party. And Article 19, one of EURALO's ALSes is working on this topic. We haven't decided so far whether we as in the ALAC, we ultimately haven't decided so far whether we wish to proceed forward with a statement.

That was a long review. Quite a few things going on. And I open the floor for any comments or questions.

Yrjö Länsipuro, you have the floor.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO:

Yeah, this is Yrjö Länsipuro. Hi. This point E, this new public comment requests on revised procedure for WHOIS conflicts, and also the draft framework for human rights. I would propose that we use this as a pilot project for involving ALSes in the drafting for the advice on these statements.

I'm pleased to say that we could now put this Google documents we've prepared for use. That is to say, in the Google documents that lists and maps the expertise at the various ALSes, we have five ALSes who have announced that they are interested and they have expertise on the WHOIS questions. That's number 33, at the end of the Google document.

And also on human rights, a couple of ALSes are interested and have experience and expertise on human rights. So, that I just propose that these ALSes will be sent all available information about these new issues, and ask for a comment. Thank you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Yrjö. Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. It sounds like a great idea. I don't see anyone else saying yes or no to this, but that could certainly be... We have enough time to drive it, and we have about a month for this to be driven. So, quite earlier on in the process, that would be pretty helpful.

The question is, then, who would be driving this? And I guess, Yrjö you've suggested this. I'm ready to drive it with you, if that's okay.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: That's okay for me. This is Yrjö.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perfect, okay. [CROSSTALK] Thanks, Yrjö. So, it's Olivier speaking. We'll have an action item then, on these two public comments requests. The revised ICANN procedure on handling WHOIS conflicts with privacy, law, process, and next steps, and the draft framework for interpretation of human rights.

And for Yrjö Länsipuro and I to contact those At-Large structures who have experience and qualifications on these topics, and interest in these topics, for them to be directly involved with potential drafting on a statement on this. Excellent. Thank you. Any other comments on the ICANN policy work and the public comment consultation?

Seeing no hands up, let's then move swiftly to the next agenda item. And just before I go into the next item, I should just say, of course, this policy development process is an ongoing thing. It just doesn't happen once a month. So, you're extremely welcome to constantly check on these. The Wiki pages that...

There is a main Wiki page that shows policy consultations as they arrive, as they come in. And of course, the earlier you go through this, the earlier you are aware, the more time we have to formulate a response if required.

Let's move to our next agenda item. That's the update on the EURALO bylaws taskforce. And the taskforce have met a few days ago. For an

update on this, I'm not sure who wishes to take the floor. Should we ask Erich or Wolf or both of you?

WOLF LUDWIG: I vote Erich.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Wolf. So, Erich Schweighofer, if you could please let us know what happened on the last call, and what's the big question today?

ERICH SCHWEIGHOFER: Thank you. Erich Schweighofer speaking. We discussed open questions on [inaudible]. So, [inaudible] and also quorum, and also funding. [Inaudible] we found some [inaudible] agreement, we have done the ombudsman, some arbitration in the role of the General Assembly concerning the quorum.

We're still discussing it. Maybe Wolf can come in on that [inaudible] meetings where we don't have sufficient number of participants if it goes lower, and under which conditions, and also what's the minimum number of voting members concerning funding. And the position against that, we may have an optional provision that, if needed, we can do that, but it's not [inaudible] on that.

And then we have something that's mostly work. We have then add to the draft the required elements [inaudible] our bylaws. That's it. Thank you very much.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Erich. Wolf Ludwig, do you have anything else to add.

WOLF LUDWIG: No, not at the moment. Thanks.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Wolf. It's Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. And you've got on your desktop here, those of you that are on Adobe Connect. You have a table that the different members of the working group have been filling, with the quorum for the funded face to face meeting, for a funded face to face meeting vote, when a vote is required or something.

For funded face to face meeting quorum for a non-funded face to face meeting, and for non-funded face to face meeting vote. And then, of course, for an online meeting. And you've seen the levels, somehow a different on the funded face to face meeting quorum, there appears to be agreement from everyone that there should be at least 50% of the At-Large structure represented in the rooms for the meeting to take place and be able to take decisions.

When it comes down for an actual vote to take place on important matters, some are advocating for two-thirds majority, some are advocating, sorry. A two-thirds of the At-Large structures to be there. Some are advocating for half of the At-Large structures to be there. For the others, I'd let you read the members. There are a few points.

Of course, if we have a higher requirement for a higher turnout, one of the things that knowing the quorum is that you then, sorry. Let's start again. If you have a requirement for a higher turnout, you might have a problem reaching quorum in a meeting, and reaching a position where you're actually able to take decisions, and that's quite unfair on the people who are sitting in the room, or that are online actually attending the meeting.

So, that's the idea why the quorum could be lowered. On the other hand, of course, if we start lowering the quorum, it means that when there is a split vote, there would be a minority of At-Large structures as part of the overall member of At-Large structures in EURALO, that could pass through a vote that would agree to do something. And so, that's the idea why there should be a higher quorum, two-thirds rather than just 50% of the At-Large structures.

You're still in discussion on this. And I'll open the floor for a minute. So, anyone who is not in the working group, if you wish to express their thoughts on this. We're currently taking quite a time on it [inaudible], but if you have an idea and a point, either speak now or if you may... You've got a link in the agenda to the Google Doc. There is a link also on the chat, you can add your name underneath the other names and put your point of view there, and please also explain why you chose those thresholds.

I don't see anyone on the spot putting their hand up. So, you've been advised of this work, and hopefully we can reach consensus on that pretty soon. After that, the next agenda item is EURALO elections. This year, you've just seen the call for candidates that was released on the

1st of May, and we're now on the 16th of May. The call for candidates nomination period was open from the 1st to the 12th.

We, unfortunately, don't appear to have had many candidates for the positions that were currently held. Sébastien Bachollet nominated me to continue for another year as EURALO chair, and I have said that's fine with me. I'm happy to continue, not seeing anybody else queue up to try and take on that position.

As far as the ALAC member who is eligible for reelection, who currently is Sébastien Bachollet, having not seen anybody queue up for that position, I've agreed to nominate Sébastien for another term. And when it comes down to the EURALO secretariat, we thought this, leave it open and see if anybody steps forward. It doesn't look like anyone has stepped forward so far, so that position is vacant.

And what we will do, because this is what we've done in the past, in fact, maybe the lack of enthusiasm is cause by the fact that these positions will all start at the annual general meeting, which is in November of this year, much further down the road than now. This position is open until then, and we'll probably reschedule a vote, or a process over the summer, as we have in the past.

And I hope that there will be some people who will be interested in taking on the position. Of course, you know, I'm saying involved, if he wishes to continue with this, but we thought leave it open for the time being, and really get people to think... I'm just a bit disappointed that not more people have come forward, and that we don't actually have contested elections with voting and things like that.

And you know, meet the candidates and new faces, we definitely need new faces as well in EURALO. So, that's the status for the time being. The regular terms for office is two years, that's correct. Did I say one year? I don't think I mentioned one year, I think I said for another year. It is two years.

Next is agenda...

WOLF LUDWIG: May I make a comment for the action items?

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, please, go ahead, Wolf, you have the floor.

WOLF LUDWIG: It cannot be renewed at the AGM 2017. It must read until, shall be renewed until the AGM 2017, sorry.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Thanks for this, Wolf. Let's then continue, the next agenda item, number seven, is the EURALO IGF proposal. The internet governance forum. This year, we have been funded by ICANN to have an actual workshop taking place in Geneva, this year's European, this year's internet governance forum.

The proposal was filed, because what you have to do is to then file a proposal with the United Nations. And the multi-stakeholder advisory group, the MAG, then in the next few months, will be choosing the

proposals. I understand 250, 260, roughly 260 proposals have been received. I don't know by the top of my head how many slots there are, but obviously, there are less slots than the number of proposals. So, competition will be tough.

But we've managed to have a good panel, I think, that is quite nice and balanced both geographically and also on a gender basis, with Mark [inaudible] from the UK government, [inaudible] from the internet society, and [inaudible] is from Latin America region. Caroline Greer from Cloud Flare, private sector.

Nigel Hickson from ICANN. Many of you know him. [Inaudible] from the NCUC, and civil society, and of course, she's a Brazilian. [Inaudible] will add a little bit of spice to the discussion. He is with civil society and based in India. [Inaudible] with the NCUC and civil society, and she's based in Germany but she's Russian originally.

So, it looks like a good discussion on the public interest that we will have. Not only the public interest within ICANN, but obviously, the role of end users in defending the public interest on a worldwide basis. And that's an important discussion to have, with all of the fake news and all of the accusations these days of manipulation for the internet and manipulation of the entities that run the internet. It felt like a good proposal to have.

And let's hope that the multi-stakeholder advisory group, the MAG, agrees too. Anyone else on this?

I don't see anybody's hand up. So, we are now with agenda item eight, and that's the hot issue for you today. The WHOIS issue and context of

the implementation, of the EU GDPR, the general data protection regulation. Big thing going on out there. Obviously, with people's private information being shared, with the European Union doing some significant work on this to protect people from their information being shared with all sorts of organizations and governments and entities, without their knowledge, and ICANN having had some real conflicts with the handling of privacy when it comes down to WHOIS.

We have an expert on this. So, somebody who has been following this for a long time, Christopher Wilkinson. There is a link in the agenda to the actual ICANN procedure for the handling of these conflicts, but Christopher, you would be, please, very welcome to explain this complex topic to us. Christopher, you have the floor.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON:

Good evening everybody. Thank you, Olivier, for inviting me to discuss this. And I think it's useful to have a quick discussion, first of all, because as you say, it's a contemporary issue. Secondly, because I discovered in my recent browsing of the ICANN website, that the Johannesburg meeting does include a session specifically on the, what we've come to call the GTPR. And as you all have gathered, things are moving very fast.

Although we've known about these negotiations for several years, the final regulation was adopted in April of this year, and the implementation and conformity with the regulation is expected by May of next year. So, we're talking about a one year implementation period. And I believe this has raised the stakes in ICANN, because for reasons

I've set out in the emails that I've sent you a few hours ago. ICANN itself has dragged its feet on this issue of, for some considerable time.

I don't want to go over the details because the history is documented, but I think we now should look forward. Registries and registrars have, in European jurisdictions, have a year to implement the regulation. Furthermore, if they fail to do so, I understand the regulations provides for enforcement and for [finds?].

In the past, I've been surprised that ICANN wished to rely on enforcement only as the criteria for whether or not the law should be respected. I think that was wrong, particularly as the articles of incorporation require ICANN to respect applicable local law.

But let's pass on all of that and look forward. What has been outlined is this plan, this sort of policy forum in Johannesburg, is a 90 minute session on the afternoon of the 27th of June. And related to [EDPR?]. With no details. Somebody, somewhere has got a suitable subject, but has no idea what to say about it.

I believe that EURALO has the expertise and the interest to fill in the gaps and quickly, because first of all, this session is sponsored by ccNSO and by GNSO. Now, we know for sure that for years, the GNSO and in particular, the trademark interest in GNSO, that has blocked the application of privacy law to the registries and registrars. I think it's [inaudible] ALAC has not been up front about the major interest of the users in this presentation of privacy law.

So, my first suggestion would be for EURALO to make quite sure very quickly, that on this particular session in Johannesburg, the ALAC is

recognized as an equal partner in the sponsorship of the session. And secondly, it would be quite useful if the staff could tell us who, and what, and why have initiated this session, because the... It would not be difficult to identify the issues that need to be discussed, but it would be necessary to fund a significant number of participants who don't usually come to ICANN meetings, to address the question of, why in Johannesburg?

Because that's the next meeting. But we would need to identify the agendas, the participants, and in terms of experts outside the ICANN community, and to invite them and well in advance, like now, because it's in [inaudible], it has been less than two months. And finally, I would like to know, first of all, from among some of you here, how this is perceived outside the EU in Europe.

There are several EURALO members who come from areas outside the EU of course. But on the other hand, some of those areas already will respect European privacy law. So, how this affects the EURALO membership as a whole is a relevant question. And furthermore, I think it would be useful if Olivier could confirm to the other RALOs that EURALO has a specific interest in this particular subject in the next few weeks, up to and including the Johannesburg meeting.

Beyond that, and I've pointed out the question of whether or not ICANN really needs a legal review, and we're talking about the implementation of legislation, and we can inform of ICANN participants with national and EU legislation. Not really up to the ICANN legal service to review this. I think the ICANN legal service just needs to do a simple piece of

housekeeping to make sure that all of their contracts are consistent with applicable local law.

They just need to get done with it. They don't need to have a formal legal review. My experience with legal reviews in this subject matter is that it can easily take another 18 months, and unfortunately we know that in the recent past, some of the ICANN staff has, in effect, argued the interests of the trademark community at the expense of respect for the law and users' interest. [Inaudible] as we might say.

It's time that EURALO and ALAC take a very firm view on that aspect of the problem. Olivier, thank you. I think I've included in my message to you all a few links. Within the next few days, some of you may wish to explore and comment. For example, the transcripts of the Copenhagen session which, for personal reasons I was not able to attend, but [inaudible] lost my reservation.

The [inaudible] of, I really think that it's time that the staff issued their own summary and action items from the conclusions that they draw from the enormous cost, and time, and effort that went into the Copenhagen session about this subject. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Christopher. Next in the queue is Andrei Kolesnikov.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Hi, it's Andrei Kolesnikov speaking. I just want to mention that's not a new problem, because at least the applicants from Russia for the new

gTLD program, suppose not to give, not to share any personal data referenced to the whatever party who is demanding this data. In addition, today, it's a requirement to keep all of the data of the citizen [inaudible], within Russia.

So, this problem will address by the needs and registrars of Russia to ICANN. And what they do, they just simply give you the extent like, you know, okay guys, we understand the problem, blah, blah, blah. You know, take care. That's basically how it has been handled for many years, basically there were no conflicts on the ground, so far. But it doesn't necessarily mean that there will be none in the future.

That's basically... a piece of the information.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you for this, Andrei. Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I am mindful of the time. The queue is still open if anybody wishes to chime in on this. What I see from what Christopher and Andrei have mentioned so far is that we definitely need to follow-up with Yrjö on, as a first set, helping out with drafting a statement from the ALAC on this very topic.

You'll notice that the consultation period takes place before the meeting in Johannesburg, and so the second prong of this double action item is to get in touch with staff in charge of the facilitating the organization of the GDPR session in Johannesburg, and to make sure that the ALAC will have at least someone on the panel, but I think even more so, would be involved with the organization of this session.

Just as an answer to Christopher's question, the chairs of supporting organizations and advisory committees, have worked hand in hand with the meetings team this year. Have worked very well, and there was a call for issue topics that should be treated as a cross community matter across all of ICANN. And, as a result, there were suggestions made.

The reason why the ccNSO and the GNSO are listed on this is because they have made the suggestions that this topic be addressed in a cross community meeting. So, I think we should obviously welcome this. And we're EURALO, so the action item would be for EURALO to ask the ALAC chair for the ALAC to be actively involved in the preparation of the GDPR session in Johannesburg, and also for EURALO members to be actively involved with the preparation of the statement in advance of Johannesburg.

These are the two action items that we can derive from this. Anything else? Christopher, what do you suggest on this? Just to add one thing. When it comes down to actually having travel slots just for this specific topic, that's sort of impossible, unfortunately, and it might well be that there is the same topic being discussed again in Abu Dhabi at the end of the year, but again, we do not have the ability to release travel slots for subject matter experts, except if they are part of the cross community working group or part of the review team that has an official budget for these matters.

Christopher Wilkinson, do you want to say a couple of words?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Just one final point, thank you very much for supporting my suggestions regarding the Johannesburg meeting, and I'm sure that we can work on that in the next few weeks and make the best of it. I personally have some reservations about spending too much time and effort on commenting on the waiver proposal.

I've already commented on it in the context of the working group, and as I've mentioned in the email, I think it's now obsolete. We can't possibly justify proceeding on the basis of those cumbersome and case by case, five stage processes to, before you can reach agreement on a waiver of privacy protection in each [inaudible], European registries and registrars, one at a time.

My fundamental point in the working group, which I would sustain, is that ICANN must issue in, what in Europe we would call a block exemption. All registries and registrars, all together with one single decision, allowed to give [inaudible] to domestic law, priority of ICANN's current contractual requirements.

On that basis, ICANN will change its contractual requirement. That's all.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Christopher. It's Olivier speaking. It sounds as though you've already drafted the statement. I missed it being recorded, so hopefully our colleagues, and perhaps you if you would be involved in that statement, will be able to transcribe this over onto paper, to electronic paper, of course, and have a first draft of the statement ready pretty soon.

But I might add to invite both you and Andrei Kolesnikov to join, to volunteer to be part of that team to put the statement in. And I gather that the statement will then, or could then, constitute the basis of an ALAC point that would be made at the Johannesburg meeting, when everyone is face to face.

And with this, we are now seven minutes past the top of the hour. That was an interesting discussion, I hope all of you have enjoyed it. I hope you enjoyed the call today. We're now at the any other business part of the call.

I don't see anyone putting their hand up. I would just like to thank you all for joining us today. I wish there were a few more people to join us, but we'll publicize, of course, the call recording which will be made available, and the transcript will be made available within a few days' time.

And I think that was quite good content that we had today. Please, send your feedback if you think we could improve on things for this call. And with this, I would like to thank staff as well, and to wish you all a very good evening. Goodbye and take care. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]