MARIO ALEMAN:	Good Morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the EURALO Monthly Teleconference Call on Tuesday the 23rd of January, 2018 at 19 hours UTC.
	On our participants list we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Wolf Ludwig, Oksana Prykhodko, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Yrjö Länsipuro, Andrei Kolesnikov, Danko Jevtovic, Juhani Juselius, Sebastien Bacholette, Salve Nilsen, Narine Khachatryan, and Annamarie Jolie. We have apologies from Annette Mühlberg. Bastiaan Goslings, Olawale Bakare, and Erich Schweighofer.
	On behalf of the staff we have Silvia Vivanco and myself, Mario Aleman, doing the call management. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for our transcription purposes. And with this, I will turn it back over to you, Olivier. You can please begin the call.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much, Mario. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking and I wonder if we've missed anybody in the roll call. Was anybody's name not pronounced that is on the call, but maybe not on the Adobe Connect or something, no?
MARIO ALEMAN:	Yes, we have one more participant, Sandra Hoferichter that just joined the call.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for that. So, my name is Olivier Crepin-Leblond. I'm the chair of EURALO. We've quite a number of new people on the call, so I wanted to welcome everyone on the call for this new year. This is the first call that we have after the IGS, so it's also I think one of the first calls where we have the new EURALO board that is fully in operation that actually met at the IGF, so we'll have a follow up on that shortly.

As you know, our ALAC members haven't changed, so we still have Bastiaan Goslings, Andrei Kolesnikov, Sebastien Bacholette as our ALAC members. And the EURALO Board is made up of Annette Muhlberg, Yrjo Lansipuro, Roberto Gaitano, Erich Schweighofer and Jean-Jacques Subrenat. Our NomCom delegate is still Sandra Hoferichter, and our secretary, Olawale Bakare was unfortunately unable to make it on today's call, but he will be listening to the recording and making notes from the recording itself.

So, welcome everyone. I do not actually know whether any of our newly elected board members who are on the call wish to add anything to my welcome note, but I do open the floor for them to say a few words. [AUDIO BREAK]

Jean-Jacques Subrenat, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUE SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. I just want to take this opportunity to say hello and thank you. I'm glad to be on the board

of EURALO and I hope to be able to contribute something useful, thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Indeed, we actually had not only a face to face meeting in Geneva, but there was a EURALO Board call earlier this month in which Jean-Jacques actually did what I forgot to do, which was to wish everyone a Happy New Year. I don't know whether it's too late now that we're the 23rd of the note. Perhaps we can still have a happy new year, and I hope that you all had a chance to relax over the holiday period.

Let's then now move to our action items, but just one more thing actually before we move that, I note that Slave Nilsen is here on the call. Salve is from our newest At-Large structure, the ISOC Norway, so I wanted to recognize his arrival, and to encourage him to get more involved with EURALO and get his members involved in EURALO. Salve was at the internet governance forum and many of you who have traveled might met him over there. There is even a picture of him I think at the EURALO booth.

But we'll be speaking about our activities at IGF a little bit later, and let's go into our action items from our last call, the one that took place last year. I might be on the wrong agenda. Yeah okay, here we go. Sorry. Clicking on the action items, there is only one that is unchecked and that's for the EURALO Board to address the procedure for the votes and selection criteria for the EURALO board. That's something that's on the side, we will be addressing this soon. But there were other issues that

were more pressing to deal with and several of these were the ones to what we need to do next, projects that we need to launch within the region. So, moving swiftly on from this, we can then go to the policy consultations.

Now, as you know, At-Large comments on things that happen at ICANN and one of the big chunks of work is the policy consultations. There were quite a few consultations recently, with statements being approved by the ALAC, and as you know, the way that the process works is to put the consultation on the Wiki page, ask for comments that anybody can comment, At-Large structures, ALAC members, non-members, individual users, etc.

Everyone can comment on this and the pen holder, or the people who are holding the pen have to put these comments together and make a first draft, and then it goes to a second draft after more commenting. Then it has to be approved by the ALAC. A final version is approved by the ALAC through a vote, a 15-member vote, ad then that gets sent over to the consultations.

The vote has taken place on a number of recent statements. The first one is the recommendations to improve ICANN's Office of the Ombudsmen. That is a set of recommendations that came out of the accountability, cross community working group work stream. So, it's good that recommendations have come out and we've sent some comments to that. The agenda is all clickable, so if you click on the actual text, it will send you to the whole statement, etcetera, and the way that the statement would go. That was final before the deadline, which was the 19th of January.

EN

Recommendations on ICANN jurisdiction, another work stream that came out of the ICANN cross community working group on accountability. Recommendations to improve ICANN staff accountability. That's the third one. So, you can see there were quite a few in parallel. These three were three work streams.

The one after that, the recommendations on competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice review team, there were new sections that were added to the draft report of recommendations. That's a review team that is independent of the Generic Names Supporting Organization and independent of the processes of the cross community working group, that is a review of the work that was done to prepare recommendations that were going to improve competition, improve consumer trust, and improve consumer choice by adding new generic top level domains.

The previous, we would call gTLD round, had a number of promises that were there, so there was a review of the types of things that needed to be tracked to make sure that we are more aware if the domain names, this expansion of the domain name state has actually helped with having better consumer trust, etc., etc.

This report, these recommendations, are now going to feed into the GNSO's policy development process of the subsequent procedures policy development process, and that's the group that is putting together if you want the program for the next round of new generic top-level domains. It was called subsequent procedures because when it started, it wasn't quite sure whether it was going to be another round.

In fact, I guess it's still not sure whether there will be another round opening of new applications for generic top-level domains, but they wouldn't be doing all this work if it wasn't at the end of the very long tunnel, an ability to have an enhanced process by which another round could be opened. Perhaps, a permanent round, but that will still need to be decided in the future.

So these competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice review team results will feed into the subsequent procedures policy development process. That was a long way, but I thought I'd explain to you how the whole thing fits together, because there are a lot of things that work in parallel, and that sometimes are a bit confusing for people who don't keep a close eye on this.

Enhancing accountability, recommendations for diversity is another one of those work streams from the cross-community working group on ICANN accountability, and so as you can see, that also needed a statement to be sent in the process by the ALAC.

The next steps, what happens after statements are approved by the ALAC is that they're actually sent into the commenting process. Staff that are in charge of this public commenting process then take the input from all of the different people and organizations that have commented. They make a report. That report is sent to the people that are leading this process, and then this might be made based on the feedback that was received in the public comments. Then, the amended report is then sent over to the board, and it's down to the board to actually implement it. The board might even issue another round of public comments on it.

So, we are not finished with all of these recommendations. It might be that the board takes it, puts together an implementation plan with staff, and then that goes through public comments, so we do have quite a few chances in the future to comment on these different issues.

These are the statements approved by the ALAC. Let me open the floor for any comments on these five very significant statements. Sebastien Bacholette.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLETTE: Thank you, Olivier. Sebastian Bacholette speaking. I just want to comment on your description of what is happening with reference to the four recommendations we are having a chance to comment on now. The subgroup that was in charge of those within the CCWG and Accountability work stream 2 already met, and for example, the one I am a rapporteur on already met twice and we think that we will need at least one, maybe two other meetings before making any recommendation to change our report.

But I have a few things I want to say. The first one that's here, and sorry, I see that it's the same as with the ALAC [inaudible], but I don't see why it's OOO at the end, Office of the Ombudsman. It must be ICANN Office of Ombudsman, it's IOO, and the second point is that you missed one step in your description, Olivier.

After we got the finalization of each subgroup report, the CCWG and Accountability will issue a full document and will eventually raise an issue, overarching issue or cross subgroup issue who could be discussed in the comment period that will come before June because we hope

within the CCWG and Accountability to finalize a report for the meeting in June, and then it will be sent to the chartering organization. They will have the possibility to adopt or not adopt, and if they adopt, this document will go to the board and the description you made is exactly what will happen. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sebastien. Just a quick question. You mentioned that the overall report by the cross community working group on accountability, will that go through another round of public comments?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLETTE: Yes, Olivier, definitely. Sebastien speaking. It will go through another round. It's why we are quite in a hurry to finalize the subgroup reports to be able to discuss in our meeting [inaudible] previews the next meeting in Puerto Rico. What we want to achieve with this full report where we are questioned, and for example, if there are other places in the report that we talk about the ombuds, we need to make sure that there is no contradiction between what one group has said, again, the one in charge of the ombuds office and I can take other examples, but it's just to give you one flavor.

And yes, it will go through a public comment. I will try before the end of this meeting to give you the information about when it will happen because we have a deadline and you should give me some minutes, I will be able to give you the answer when will be this public comment period for the full document. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank for this, Sebasiten. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Let's then continue through our policy discussions, and so in the line of the sort of follow up of what we've seen and with the statements approved by the ALAC, there are three statements currently being drafted and being put together with plenty of time to be able to comment for everyone to go to.

The first one is the draft, financial year '19 operating plan and budget, and the five year operating plan update. ICANN, as far as finances is concerned, has got a number of processes in place, one being the cycle for the strategic plan, and one being the cycle for the operating plan. As with everything going on, the plans have to go through community consultations.

I would have thought that this is a business as usual type attitude and say, "Oh, the budget will be pretty much the same as last year," etc, and not very much to point out. Perhaps point out areas where there could be some improvements. However, a recent blog post which I think was shared on the ALAC mailing list and on our mailing list, has shown that because the revenue in ICANN didn't follow the forecast, an increase of revenue at the same level as what was originally intended, there are significant discussions at present into reducing ICANN's costs.

That means reducing ICANN's budget, and therefore, the draft FY19 operating plan and budget comes with some changes basically, and of course, some of the obvious things could be that there would be a reduction in the number of employees in ICANN, but there are also a

reduction of funds for some projects that could include Outreach, that could include the work that we do in reaching out to end users and getting end users to be more involved with ICANN.

I certainly have read that there might be a reduction of travel. I've read that there could be some reduction in travel for the government advisory committee members, so ICANN funded travel, of course, and a number of other things in there. I think it's quite important that we have a look.

We have a couple of our members that are on the At-Large finance and budget subcommittee, but I know that we have more people in our community that have a good head for numbers and it would be good if they could have a read through this operating plan and budget, have a look at what Tijani Ben Jemaa, our penholder for this, has drafted or is in the process for drafting, and really focus on things which we are a bit concerned about, because when there are changes like this, you basically do not want to throw the baby out with the bath water and unfortunately, in such organizations such as ICANN, focusing on its core budget might effectively mean focusing on technical things and on operational things and on policy in the Generic Names Supporting Organization and pushing away all of this capacity building that is being done in our community.

And that, in the view of our community, is basically making ICANN less bottom up, because what it does it is centers the powers of defining ICANN's future policy into the hands of a handful of people that are already involved with it at the Generic Names Supporting Organization level. [Inaudible], defining ICANN policy for generic names. I'm always

talking about generic names and so on and so forth. So it's significant here for this, so please have a look at that.

Second one is the proposed incremental changes to the ICANN meeting strategy. That, again, has some implications because there could be some calls from other parts of the community, or even from our community, to reduce the number of ICANN meetings across all of ICANN, so we usually have three public meetings per year, and we have had some feedback from our GNSO liaison on yesterday's ALAC call that it might be that the GNSO ask that there could be a reduction from three to two public meetings now that there are more specialized meetings taking place.

So the GNSO and the different constituencies are funded by ICANN to attend other meetings and face to face meetings where it's just GNSO people together, or it's just contracted parties together, or it's just non-contracted parties together in what they call intersessional meetings.

That again, is something which we have to be quite weary about of course, because their whole meeting strategy -- and I'm sure Sebastien might wish to say a few words on this -- their whole meeting strategy was meant to continue ICANN rotation around the world so that we continue to bring ICANN operations and discussions closer to end users in the different parts of the world. That might be a bliss. Who knows? So, we definitely have to comment on this.

And then third, the data protection and privacy update, public feedback on proposed compliance models. As you know, data protection and privacy is a huge thing at the moment with the general data protection

EN

regulations that are coming up, the GDPR. So, there's some discussion going on, specifically on the GPDR, but some proposals being made on data protection and privacy, and that was a block post that was sent out with three different types of proposals coming out to try and comply with this GDPR proposal, three models, basically.

And it does make use of some jargon like Thick Registration Data and Thin Registration Data. Yes, there are links as to what thick and thin mean, and what are the thick and thin registration data entries. It's all to do with WHOIS, and thick is when you have all of the information in a single database and thin is when you only have pointers in the main database, and it points to sub-databases for the registration data to be held across the world.

Three models here. I'm not going to go through the three models in detail because it might take another 15 minutes, but please have a read through these and make up your mind as to which one you think would better serve end users. Let's open the floor for comments and questions. Sebastien Bacholette.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLETTE: Thank you, Olivier. Sebastien Bacholette speaking. Yeah, I would like to stress what you say. It's very important that we comment on most of these three drafts or proposals because obviously when it's about money, it's always complicated, but I think that there are very important issues raised with this budget shrinking. We knew that it will happen and I have the impression that the staff have decided that it's the other; we need to decrease their expense.

Just for your information, when I was a board member and we reached the number of 100 staff, and we are currently more than 400 staff, I say we need to start to stop this increase of staff, but now it's 400 and if they are looking to decrease the costs, they ask us to travel less, to have less meetings, to do less things and I think that it's a reverse that might happen, but we are in a very deep struggle here.

The second point it's about the meeting strategy. I understand you have been to the discussion, that there are some people, and GNSO in particular, who might wish to us for two meetings. It's a long story, but to make it short, it's not supposed to be a discussion on the number of meetings in this one. It's to see how we put ICANN organization incremental changes, and to go from three to two meetings, it's not an incremental change. I understand that some will take this opportunity, but we need to stick, I guess, to what is proposed and to make our comment on that.

My comments here, I am always surprised when it's still TBD, as I have already put one proposal comment for At-Large, and there was already a change in discussion on that. Maybe God needs to decide who is a TBD, but the work is starting as it was the first of February.

The last point I wanted to raise is the data protection and privacy update, and the question of community feedback on proposed compliance models. It's very short, a very very short time. It's not a comment period. It's why even in addition to what we need to say that it's not fair to have a real comment period on that issues, because the comment period is 40 days. Here, we've got a blog from the CEO who said, "We would like to have your inputs for the 29th of January."

No process, just an email address to send the comments, but it's not organized as the other points. That's a very troublesome system because we can't see the other comments. Just the staff gets it, and that's not a very transparent way to work on that issue. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sebastien, and thanks for your additional input on these points, which I absolutely agree with. On the incremental changes to the ICANN meeting strategy, there was some discussion on the ALAC call yesterday regarding a few points that you made at the end of your suggested text, and I'll let people read through it. There's still some time to read through this, but I just want to alert everyone to have a look at the parallel language sessions, which did raise a number of eyebrows in the ALAC.

Now, with regards to the data protection and privacy update, my understanding is because the general data protection regulation is going to come in place in Europe only months from now, the time pressure for finding a solution is extremely high.

As you know, the solution needs to be designed, needs to be proposed, needs to be adopted by the board and then needs to be implemented, and we're talking about less than two months for it to be [inaudible], so I can certainly understand that it might have been the case on this specific issue that because a public comment period is 40 days minimum, they didn't have that 40 days and so they decided to try and go for some accelerated way by getting the CEO to ask the question etc.

But I take your point, and let's hope that this is not going to be a regular occurrence.

I realize that time is ticking, but we are taking more time today on the policy items due to the seriousness of the items that are before our eyes. Not seeing anyone put their hand up, there are two public comment requests to which the ALAC has decided not to submit comments.

Oksana, I'll come back to you in a second. I'll just go through the two that the ALAC has decided not to submit comments on for the time being. One is the maximal starting repertoire version 3 for root zone label generation rules. That is to do with internationalized domain names, and it's been quite a while that we've sent our last comment on internationalized domain names.

In general, the process for generating root zone labels has been now in place for such a while that it's a well-oiled mechanism, it's very technical, and it's worked very well, so no comments were deemed necessary on this.

And the operating standards for ICANN specific reviews is another one of these things. We have ICANN reviews that are mandated by our bylaws, so you review the ALAC, you review the consumer trust element of the process, etc, and then we have a review of the review, and that's really what the review was.

In fact, this was the review of the operating standards of the actual reviews, and at the end of the day, it wasn't deemed to be compared with all of the other public comments that were around. It wasn't

deemed to be a priority, so for the time being, the ALAC has decided not to submit statements, but if you feel there needs to be a statement, please let us know. I'll let you read in your own time the upcoming public requests. Oksana Prykhodko, you have the floor.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: I'm muted. Thank you very much, Olivier. Oksana Prykhodko speaking. I would like to ask my question in chat. How does this reduction of travel influence our participation in face to face meeting general assembly, and I would also like to comment the GDPR issues.

Europe is an extremely difficult region because part of our European countries are members of the EU, and are influenced directly by GDPR, and other countries, for example Ukraine, is not a part of EU, but we are also influenced by GDPR. What do you think about any general recommendations for Eastern European countries? Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Oksana. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. So first, regarding your first comment on the reduction of travel issues, it appears that there will be certainly be less sponsorship from ICANN going to non-ICANN meetings. For example, regional Internet Governance Forum, etc, there might be a reduction in the funding of these things.

The general assemblies that we've had, if you recall, and maybe not all of you might know, but we have a sort of calendar that we put together

of rotation of General assemblies and At-large Summits. The rotation was such that each one of the regions has so far now had its funded General Assembly and so we should be looking at the Fiscal Year '20, not the next year, an actual At-Large Summit taking place, not Fiscal Year '19, but in Fiscal Year '20, which will takes us to the meeting that will take place in Toronto. That is under question. I'll be very frank with you. There is no guarantee that this will take place. The board has committed to this --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Montreal, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Is it Montreal? Sorry. Yes. Montreal, not Toronto. Thank you. It's in Canada, you know. For me it's a big expansive, very cold land. Oh dear.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sorry, it's Quebec, Canada.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. But it doesn't take away the thing. There is no guarantee that we will be funded for an At-Large Summit in Montreal. We will fight for it, of course, because we always have argued that it was the right way for us to do things. We've kept to our side of the deal, which is to effectively do our rotation of general assemblies and a multi-year budget so that ICANN could prepare for this.

But it's very hard because, as you know, the budget will need to be approved by the community, just like we are going to be approving the budget and commenting on the budget process, other parts of ICANN are going to be commenting on the process, and if we are in a dynamic at the moment where ICANN needs to reduce its costs and suddenly we have 250 At-Large structures, the estimates are that there will be 250 At-Large structures and a budget of over a million dollars for them, it might be that some of the other communities object to it, and we're going to be have a very hard time to convince them that we absolutely need that. So, at the moment, it's not off the cards, but it's certainly under threat.

Regarding your second point on the GDPR, you're absolutely correct that it's not only European Union companies that are subjected to this. It's in fact, any company that treats data about a European citizen, and there are a number of webinars that are being put in place. I know that there was a webinar, was it yesterday, on this topic, that the ALAC had. There was also a more general webinar across ICANN.

Whenever there is a webinar that talks about these issues with experts that come to speak on these webinars, I try to forward it or ask staff to forward it to the EURALO list, because I know it's something that is of high importance for our region, and I would suggest that you ask this question that you've asked on the webinar, because that's what the webinar is for, for our community to be able to ask those questions when there are experts present that will be able to provide a good answer for these questions.

We're planning to have another webinar soon, I think in the next couple of weeks, including one that will look at the implementation of GDPR for EURALO At-Large Structures and individuals, and for EURALO itself, but we'll make some announcements shortly, as soon as we have a defined date for these webinars, because as I said, we need the experts to be all available at those times.

So hopefully by early February, we will have further information and further webinars for this, so please ask your questions there. I've seen, certainly in the UK, some webinars being offered by commercial organizations and they're asking, or even face to face meetings about GDPR, they're asking for a lot of money, so take this as a potentially free advice regarding GDPR issues. Jean-Jacque Sebrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thanks, Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. Just a quick comment to what you said in answer to Oksana's question, and I would like to add, hello Oksana, there are two aspects. One is for companies and as Olivier pointed out, companies or corporations etc, will have to respect the GDPR whether or not they are incorporated in the European Union or one of its countries.

The second aspect, and that's interesting, is that of course the European Union has no legal power to enforce GDPR anywhere outside of the European Union, for instance, in Ukraine, but what has happened historically for all sorts of issues, is that when the European Union or the Council of Europe for that matter has implemented a regulation which is very favorable, generally, to the user community, then it

becomes a reference for other countries. Of course, they are then free to imitate or not. But it usually has an effect as a driving force. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Jean-Jacques.   Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. You'll notice in the chat that Silvia Vivanco has mentioned that the GDPR webinar will actually be held tomorrow, so you haven't missed it. The webinar is from 13:00 to 14:30 UTC, and of course, you need to adjust this to your time zone. It's open for everyone to be on there. It'll be run by Chuck Gomez and Thomas Rickert, who are two of ICANN's real experts on this topic.

In fact, Thomas, in his life outside of ICANN is an advisor specifically on these issues so when I mentioned, take this as free advice and free consultation, I think that's a really good value proposition here. You can ask questions to Thomas and you're not going to be billed for them. It's a 90 minute webinar and they've got 60 minutes of presentations and then 20 minutes of questions.

So, please make use of that webinar for you. Tell your colleagues as well. There is no limit as to how many people you can invite to come on this webinar, and all you need to do is click on the Adobe Connect link and then type in your details and then you're on the webinar. Very helpful, and I'll certainly try my best to be on that myself. If you miss it and it's on the wrong time for you, you're at work, there will be a recording of it later on, so you can watch the recording later on. But you won't be able to ask questions. Right, thanks.

So, let's then continue in our agenda, and so now we can move to the next part of our agenda, and that's the review of the Global IGF Activities that took place in Geneva. There was quite a large At-Large contingent of people that were present in Geneva for various reasons. In Europe, we certainly got a community regional outreach program funding for Wale Bakare, but many of our other members and colleagues went to Geneva because they were either self-funded or got funded by other parties, so for the EURALO region, although we didn't have any specific workshops that were going to be funded through the additional funding, we still managed to get quite a few people there.

There were other regional At-large organizations that had workshops that sent a couple of people, so we ended up with a booth as well. The booth was very well attended and we made a lot of contacts. I think we have at least 25 to 30 names that I've followed up with, many of whom are probably going to join maybe as individual users. I don't know if Roberto is online, I can't see him yet. He said he might join a bit late, but we might get a number of individual users joining in to taste the waters, and then they might get their organization to join in at a later stage.

So, outreach was really good. The good thing is that we had our board members, so the EURALO Board was there. Not all the board members were there, but we felt because we had several of them that were there, it might be a good idea to congregate in a circle and have an adhoc brainstorming session. This is what took place.

You will see that overall, we'll think about the board action and so on in a moment, but overall, the activities were really good for At-Large, and I

think that we got enough leads and contacts and so on, that it was a good step forward for us. You also have to remember that EURALO is involved with EuroDIG, European Data Internet Governance, and EuroDIG itself was also represented there with a booth that was just opposite the At-Large booth. We managed to get a lot of chocolates from them, so thanks very much for that.

We managed to get people to be interested in At-Large by distributing some power adapters with the At-Large logos. That's one of the reasons we managed to get quite a number of people, and they're not that expensive, by the way, so something to think of in the future if we want to go for further promotions.

And the budget for IGF activities originally also included At-Large pins and included also some temporary shelves that one could set up for the booth. Thankfully, the shelves were purchased locally by ICANN and went on another budget, and the pins, unfortunately, didn't make it to Geneva, so that was taken off our budget, which means we still have in the region of about $1,000 that we could spend until June for promotional items not related to travel, so if you have any idea or suggestions, please send them over to the mailing list and we can discuss those.

I know several people on the call were in Geneva, so I call upon them to provide with some feedback from their perspective. Oksana Prykhodko, you have the floor.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Thank you very much, Olivier. Oksana Prykhodko speaking.   It's extremely important for me to comment on the joint declaration of Maria Gabriel, European Commission representative, and Michal Boni, head of European Parliament Delegation. So, [inaudible] regarding internet governance issues from the European perspective.

Again, from Ukraine's perspective, it's extremely important to join common European approaches to internet governance. Could you please [inaudible]. I would like also to say that we are preparing our round table in Ukraine on February 16 with the participation of Michal Boni , and we would like to invite everybody to participate remotely or in person in this event in Kiev. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Oksana. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Will the event be interpreted into English or other languages?

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Finances insures its interpretation.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Any other comments from people who have gone to Geneva? Not seeing anyone put their hand up, okay. Then, perhaps, there will be more discussion from people who attended the EURALO board meeting a few days ago last week. That was a follow up on the discussions which took place amongst the various board members that were in Geneva.

You'll see a link to the EURALO Board Teleconference, and in that teleconference, you'll notice one thing being the follow up on brainstorming sections at IGF Geneva. There were four main projects that were somehow pointed out, four proposals that were pointed out.

The first one is to set up a webinar about the GDPR practical implementations with Thomas Rickert, [inaudible], Chris Bruckridge and Pierre Bonis. That's one thing that I'm taking under my wing and I'll be in touch shortly with different people to try and find at what time it would be best to have that webinar. Probably likely to be in February.

The second proposal is to conduct human rights impact assessments on any policy development and commenting taking place at ICANN within the GNSO and within the ALAC. This is part of the results of the implementation of the whole human rights process that was seen in the cross community working group on ICANN accountability work stream two topic.

So, any policy basically, will be subjected to a human right's impact assessment, and we need to think on how we're going to be doing this in At-Large. As you know, we're very strong on human rights in Europe, so other regional At-large organizations might well point to us and ask us as a group of people to lead the way on this issue.

In fact, we do have a couple of our At-Large structures that are specifically focused on human rights. So, we might wish to ask them to provide us with a webinar and at the same time, we also need a webinar on what we call the framework of interpretation to find out how ICANN decides to implement it.

The third proposal is one about studying the tradeoff between privacy and security with these discussions ongoing about the registration directory services and the second security and stability review team's work that is currently taking place, [inaudible] has started and then was stopped by the board for various reasons, one being that the level of knowledge that was required for this security and stability review might have not been available in house with the current team of people, so they're making it wait until we've got a [inaudible] view of registration directory services and where we're going with it.

RDS by the way is a replacement to the WHOIS system, which we spoke about 10, 15 minutes ago. So, it's still the same thing. Privacy, security, identity, all of these matters are connected together.

The fourth proposal is one where we need to put our heads together to improve our communication to the edge, to the grassroot, to the people that you are all representing that you have back home. How can we improve this? Can we make use of the resources that we have, such as Twitter, such as Facebook, such as anything else out there these days. Instagram. Who knows?

I don't know what the best way is to reach people out there and to keep the communication going, so that fourth proposal is there to be led and we definitely need a curator for the Facebook page. I know that Wale has been looking at this, but we also need people to write articles for that page, and as you know, on Facebook, you can post on a page that is not yours, the notice board is there. We need to enliven this community, so that's the fourth proposal that was discussed by the EURALO board.

The rest of the discussion that the EURALO board had in its meeting, let's talk about the CROP requests for Fiscal Year '17, but we're going to be touching on this in a moment, I think. No, we're not. Okay. So, we basically looked at the different potential meetings that were coming up in the next few months. The current CROP cycle, Community Regional Outreach Program finishes on the end of June, and it takes eight weeks between the time you file the request and the time you actually send someone to that meeting.

We had a look at the various meetings that were there coming up, and certainly EuroDIG was one option, but we also had an option of Republica taking place in Berlin, and I forget the last one, unfortunately. Maybe it's in the action items. I try to do this from scratch. Yeah, RIPE 76, that's the one. RIPE 76 will take place in Marseilles from the 14th to the 18th of May. Republica from the 2nd to the 4th of May, and then we'll have two slots that we've sent for EuroDIG 2018.

Of course, as you know, we have a memorandum of understanding with RIPE, The Regional Internet Registry for Europe. I haven't done that, unfortunately, it's a good reminder for me to look at this; I have to send a reminder to the people in RIPE and ask whether there is a possibility to get a fellowship for a EURALO member to go and attend the RIPE meeting in Marseilles in a few months time.

There was also a discussion on the Outreach and Engagement Calendar with the existing events calendar needing to be populated. There's a lot of work to be there in store for the board, and I'm very happy to see that the EURALO board is taking these tasks into their hands and moving forward with it. Sebastien Bacholette, you have the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLETTE: Thank you, Olivier. Sebastien Bacholette speaking. Two points. The first one, I have the agreement of Pierre Bonis to participate in the webinar about GDPR, the four you have just to check with him and the others when it [inaudible].

The second point is about the RIPE meeting. I think it will be interesting to have a fellowship from them, but if they can [inaudible] the cost for the member of ALSes in EURALO, it would be great to increase the participation of end users in this meeting because if I remember well, they ask for something like 350 Euros to participate, therefore, it would be part of your negotiation with them to allow more participation from us. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Sebastien. Are there any other comments or questions? I'm taking note for myself, I will email the people at RIPE tomorrow, and I'll also follow up with Pierre Bonis and Thomas etc. for the webinar.

I see that we are reaching close to the end of the hour, so let's move quickly then. The next thing is the fiscal year 19 additional budget requests, and there were a number of budget requests that were filed by our community, by EURALO. I did send a request out, a number of people have responded and sent those over to me. We've put together a system by which we had Google Docs in place for each one of the requests that we were making.

The ALAC is making a couple of requests. These are additional budgets that get spent by ICANN. As I mentioned earlier, there is going to be a reduction in this overall envelope that is given for additional budgets. So it's going to be a bit tough this year, even harder for us this year to get the budgets that we're looking for.

We filed four of them, as I said. The first one is diversity and ICANN leadership body. That's for a study that would go on for several ICANN meetings and perhaps even finishing with sending people to the IGF to present the results of the study. Looking at the what is diversity, what are the data that needs to be collected in order to look at diversity, the evolution of diversity in ICANN's various groups, whether it's the supporting organization, advisory committees or even the leadership groups such as the review teams and the cross community working groups, and then how to enhance diversity in ICANN leadership groups. That's one.

The second one is a project on the internet of things of the increasing governance challenge ahead. That's a potential for a workshop to take place at the internet governance forum.

The third one is support for the participation of individual users in EURALO. As you know, EURALO has set up a system by which there is a separate At-Large structure, a quasi At-large structure if you want, for accepting individual users' input and managing individual users, and what we're basically asking for is for the level of support for these individual users to be the same as in the other regional At-Large organizations.

In fact, I think some of the feedback that was received by staff in the recent finance and budget sub-committee call was that perhaps we should be asking for support participation of individual users in At-Large and make this a more global thing than just for EURALO, so there will be some amendments made to that.

And then finally, a joint NCUC-EURALO town hall event at ICANN63 in Barcelona. That will be, I think, in October 2018, and you might be wondering why is it fiscal year 19 when we're talking about October of 2018, and that's because the fiscal year ends at the end of June, so it starts from the first of July to the first of July. So, first of July 2018 is the start of fiscal year 19. A bit confusing sometimes.

So, EURALO and NCUC organized an excellent Town Hall event at the ICANN Copenhagen meeting, and so what we'll do here is defining a request for some funding in case we need to send people a bit early on. Perhaps there needs to be some funding for some food to be served. If it's a four hour session, we can split the session into two two-hour sessions with half an hour in the middle. All that requires a little bit of financing, so reasonably, hoping that there will be some reasonable response to this. If both the NCUC and EURALO ask for this, there is a high chance that this will be granted, and I'm in touch with NCUC and they've agreed to submit the same request as us.

That's the current requests. Are there any feedback or questions or comments about any of our requests? I really sincerely hope that all four of our requests will be agreed. I have real concerns that just because there are so many requests being made both by us and by other parts of At-Large, there might be a case of, "Well, you've made 10

requests, we're only going to fund five. Choose your five requests that you want funded." Then we'll have a problem. But, that's a bit of a concern that I have in the back of my head at the moment. Sebastien Bacholette.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLETTE: Thank you, Olivier. Sebastien Bacholette speaking. Two points. The first one is that the additional budget request was set up to allow the organization to engage expenses before the final budget of ICANN be decided, therefore, it's supposed to be for the manifestation or activities that take place during the first semester of the next fiscal year.

One of the problem with the requests we are putting, for example, for IGF 2018, we don't know where and when it will happen, therefore, we have a risk that they say if it's not in the first three months and if we don't know the date, it will not be this type of additional budget request.

Therefore, we have to have a second request, I will say, it's to look at the budget itself, if this would be budgeted and taken care, because if not, we will be in trouble. We have to be sure that all except the one link with IGF, it's something that links with something at the beginning of the fiscal year. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sebastien. It's Olivier speaking. Good points that you're making here. We'll just have to hope for the best. I don't see anyone else putting their hand up, so that then, I guess, takes us to any

other business. I think that we had Jean-Jacque Subrenat who wanted to bring a question forward or a topic forward for AOB. I do apologize. I didn't ask at the beginning of the call to record any AOB. Jean-Jacques Subrenat, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. I also mentioned one point under AOB because my experience on the board of ICANN and then on ALAC, and now on the board of EURALO is such that over the years, I've seen several features which are quite prominent. The first is that there are so many layers of people reacting to or writing opinions on policy, so that when it comes to the RALO level, any RALO, actually it's already quite diluted, because in theory at least, in ALAC all the regions are already represented etc. etc.

So, this had led me to put forth one or two questions. The first is, how can we improve the relevance, at least at our level of a RALO within ALAC, how can we improve the relevance of our work by focusing even more on user communities use, must we go to all the trouble of really commenting so many of the policy issues which have already been treated by ALAC? And the second question is replication. Aren't we doing a lot of replication work?

So, I have a concrete proposal after putting these two questions, and that is, would it not be worthwhile making a small study just on our own, and it costs nothing, there's no budget requirement, to find out a couple of things.

First, within the whole of ALAC, what are the various RALOs doing? Are they all doing the same thing or are there some RALOs which are perhaps doing some more original work and perhaps more relevant work in certain areas?

The second idea or request is that at least for EURALO, I as a new member of the EURALO board would really like to have from staff, for instance, a complete list of all the ALSes with certain characteristics. [AUDIO BREAK]… membership; do they have a website or not? Is it updated? What are the activities they engage in? Etc. That would give us a very good basis for a comparison, and that in itself would tell us then whether [AUDIO BREAK] --

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Is it just me, or is Jean-Jacques breaking up sometimes?

MARIO ALEMAN: This is Mario for the record. Yes, it is breaking up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It is breaking up. Okay. Jean-Jacques, I'm sorry. You did break up a little bit a couple of times. But I think we've got the main part of what you were mentioning with regards to the survey and finding out the record and details that one holds.

Now, as you are a member of the board of EURALO, could I ask that you follow up with Silvia on this issue and see how we can coordinate this across the five RALOs. Because I'm not sure what the rules are with

regards to having access to these records. I know that even as EURALO Chair, I haven't got full details. There is no area which I can go to get all the details of all of our ALSes, including their contact details and so on. But I do have them on demand when I have to email everyone about something or remind everyone about something.

So, let's follow up with Silvia, Jean-Jacques please, and then we'll follow up with the EURALO board on this. I like the project very much. I hope that there will be others who are interested enough to also want to take an active part in it, and it seems to be very much in line with the future challenges working group, as in making At-Large and making the ALAC more forward looking and more active and more productive rather than running around. Jean-Jacques Subernat?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBERNAT: Thanks, Olivier. I put on the chat, but that was quite a way up, so we've lost it from sight, that I was prompted in making these remarks and suggestions precisely because in ALAC, when I arrived, I flabbergasted at the number of routine stuff which was pumping energy out of each and every member of ALAC and there was not much forward looking work, so that's why I take the same approach for EURALO, thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next is Sebastien Bacholette.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLETTE: Yes, thank you, Olivier. The first thing I guess, part of the answer isn't the study made by Yrjo about the ALSes last year and could be a useful input to the new member of the EURALO board?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Just to remind everyone, that's a survey of all of the EURALO At-Large structures providing details of their knowledge and of their interests, so that certainly is part of the thing, and the survey and its results is actually available in the EURALO working group on At-Large Structure engagement. So, it would be good to perhaps -- Silvia, if you could put the Wiki Page link, that would helpful for that thing. Back to you, Sebastien, sorry.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLETTE: Thank you, Olivier. Just to answer the question you raised earlier about the Work stream two and when we will have the possibility for a public comment period for a consolidated work stream two recommendation focusing on interdependency; it's supposed to be from the middle of April to end of May, and hopefully, the plenary in the March meeting will take care of that. I have a little doubt because we didn't start really, but it's still in the planning for doing that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much. And is there any question or anything from anyone else? Any additional AOB? Rather than the Wiki page. Silvia has put the page on the ALS table, with ALS and relevant expertise [inaudible]. Perfect, excellent. Thank you for this, Silvia.

I haven't checked the link, but I gather that actually has the At-Large structures. It's a table that has got all of the expertise of our different ALSes, and of course, Salve, since you're new here with ISOC Norway, perhaps if you could just drop us a note as to what your knowledge and what your interests are, that would be really helpful as well. Interest of course of you, of your colleagues, and of your At-Large structure. Sebastien Bacholette.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLETTE: Yes, sorry to delay the end of this call, but thank you, Silvia, for this link and it reminded me that maybe it is a good time to ask the people who put their name in data protection knowledge, and we have quite a few, that would be useful to take them now on work about the GDPR situation. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Sebastien, and I note that we are 13 minutes past the official end of our call, so we're quite late, but it was a packed call today. I see people dropping off.

So, thanks to everyone who has called today. I don't see any further hands, and therefore, our next call will be next month, but please follow up on the mailing list and have a very good evening, everyone. This call is now adjourned. Thank you and good bye.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you. This call has been adjourned. Please disconnect all remaining lines.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]