
ANDREA GLANDON: Operator, you can go ahead and start the recording. Good afternoon, good morning, and good evening. Welcome to EURALO monthly teleconference on Tuesday 17th April, 2018 at 18:00 UTC. On today's call we have Anne Marie Jolly, Christopher Wilkinson, Erich Schweighofer, Roberto Gaetano, [inaudible], Olawale Bakare, we also have on audio Jean Jacques Subrenat, Wolf Ludwig, Oksana Prykhodko. For staff we have Silvia Vivanco, Claudia Ruiz, Evan [inaudible], Heidi [inaudible], and myself Andrea Glandon on call management. I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you and over to you Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOND: Thank you very much, Olivier Crepin-Lebond speaking and just as a quick note, [inaudible] is of course, Sebastian Bacholette, his name is getting shorter and shorter every day, everytime we see him. Good luck Sebastian in getting your name back. Right, welcome everybody for this first call on using Cisco Webex and well a little bit more challenging than the usual thing we're used to, with Adobe Connect. There are a number things that you can do with this screen as we are all discovering it. If you wish to speak you've got a little hand that you can put up, just below the list of participants that are there, you have a chat that you need to enable. The chat is actually for both the participants and the chat panels, can be swapped on and off on your screen. Then the rest is pretty much like Adobe Connect, so hopefully we'll be able to carry through this meeting... sorry, I think I just got attacked by mosquito.

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.

Today we have a long agenda, yet again, and we are going to start with the public consultations. Then we'll have discussion of the various EURALO webinars, brief updates for civil society outreach, upcoming outreach at meetings that are coming up, then a preparation of the ALAC and the RALO elections, selections, and appointments. Are there any amendments to the agenda at this stage? I'm seeing Sebastian Bachollette with his hand up. Sebastian, you have the floor.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLETTE: Yes, thank you Olivier. I would like to be sure that we will discuss the latest information events, about different topics around ICANN. One is GDPR, the only is the way... it is also linked with GDPR, but the way that the GNSO and all the board will act on that and how we can intervene or have our voice heard in that. It seems to be one of the most important topics to discuss because I am quite concerned with what is happening right now. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOND: Thank you very much Sebastian. The agenda item 4, we're supposed to be having that. I did ask to have someone from ICANN to take us through the response that was received, if there isn't anyone from ICANN, I guess we have to go through it ourselves and perhaps should I ask you Sebastian to take us through the response which we have received. There is a link in our agenda, email from Olivier Crepin-Lebond. So, we will address it.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLETTE: Sebastian again, just... we can't go to... on the agenda page we can't click on and go to any link. We need to have that done in chat and I don't know if somebody put already the link for the agenda for today but it will be greatly appreciated.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOND: OK. Thank you for this. I'll ask staff to do that please. OK. Let's then take the agenda as it is. This is really awkward way to do things, but we now to have review the action items from our last call, the one that took place on March 27th. There were several action items there that are still not complete, the first one is for me to follow up with [inaudible] when she is back from office to organize a webinar on the topic of framework interpretation and to develop a checklist of human rights impact assessment. Anetta hasn't... knowingly come back from the break. I know that she's been quite busy but in the meantime, I have myself followed the proceeds on the human rights cross community working party mailing list, I am a member of that working party, and they are currently asking members of that working party on how to proceed forward with a framework regarding human rights impact assessment and a proposal regarding a human rights impact assessment for any policy development of ICANN and also for policy commenting. I think it might still be a little bit premature for us to look into having a webinar about this if the actual topic itself hasn't been developed and what I would suggest that I follow up with Anetta on this and with those people who are on this cross community working party on human rights to see when would be the most appropriate time to launch that process, so as for us to be aware and certainly ready if things move in that direction. For the time being, it looks like there is no movement.

The other one that is currently unchecked is for me again [inaudible] to coordinate a second EURALO webinar with a target date end of April and the topic of GDPR, it's impacts on WHOIS, and the impacts of GDPR on end users. We've certainly, we've had two of them so far, we have one that, this is where we had the last EURALO webinars and so on, we'll speak about this in a moment actually in agenda item number 4, so let's wait until we've reached that point. In a jiffy, I think that we might still have to wait until we get more ALSes that come forward to share their feeling about the GDPR. That's agenda item 4 today, we'll be dealing with this.

The next one is for Sebastian to contact Nicola [inaudible] chair of ISO France regarding the topic of European ALSes to share what they're doing concerning GDPR, and I believe that Sebastian has indeed done so. That's all fine. On the checked items, the 24-hour consensus call to support the proposal [inaudible] to submit the nomination of [inaudible] for the ICANN ethos award, posthumous way. That has been done, and for identification of travelers to RIPE NCC meeting, we'll be discussing this in a moment and also with regards to participating in [inaudible] 2018. I guess everything is in hand. Are there any comments or questions on any of the points here? I am not seeing any hands up at the moment, so let's then move to the next part of our agenda and that is the public consultations.

Now contrary to the usual agenda, the consultations are further down in our agenda page. There were several statements approved by the ALAC. The first one was the plan to restart the root key signing key rollover process. The root KSK as it's called. That's a topic where in October 2018, the signing key for the root will be changed. The process

was delayed and there are significant concerns from the SSAC in particular and from certainly the security people at ICANN, that this might have a negative impact on some nameservers that are not running the latest type of software. We have developed, I think in quite a look of discussion on this, the ALAC and at-large community have been really pushing this one quite far, and have developed a good statement that has been approved and has been sent over to the process it needed to be sent to. The data protection and privacy issues, ICANN proposed interim models, that's of course the compliance models with the tiered access approach that was proposed. The ALAC agreed with this interim compliance model while remaining divided on many other issues, for example, the processing of WHOIS data, and the distinction between legal and natural persons. Some people in our community believe that there should be no distinction between the legal and natural persons, and there should be a blanket, a restriction of the data that is shared in WHOIS and others believe this is not the case. Anyway, the statement, I think quite well defined both the common approach and also the diversions in some of the points in use within our community. The third one is the draft procedure for community gTLD change requests. That's of course, a very important topic for at-large, since the at-large community has always supported the concept of having community top level domains. At the end of the day, that's what we push for and the ALAC supported the draft procedure on this occasion and also including the actual form by which community generic top holder domains could be changed. So, there are three [inaudible] articulated in our statement, we probably don't have enough time to go through the whole statement, but the three effectively would be, of the ones which are given, I can't quite find them there. They are within the

statement and, yeah here we go... if ICANN determines the request is approved. ICANN shall provide approval to the registrar operator within 30 days of the determination, then there is also a rejection, 30 days also to notify and state the rationale for rejecting the request. Quite a well put together statement as well.

Next is the ICANN fellowship program committee consultation, as you remember we were rather shocked that the fellowship program was completely scrapped, well 50% sorry was scrapped. So if there were 60 people, 30 people ended up traveling, and the ALAC suggested that some changes are required to achieve greater effectiveness in the program and also provided details of some suggestions on this. There are four statements currently in progress of being drafted, or commented on. The first one is, the data protection and privacy issue updates, soliciting community input on article 29 guidance. Now that's something that is very new, it is actually going to be very short as far as the writing cycle is concerned, we will be touching on this in agenda item number 4. Yeah. That's to do, of course, with the general data protection regulations. The second is currently at commenting stage, it's a draft project plan for the proposed name collision analysis project. That is the topic of these names like dot home, and dot court. The two most common collision names. These are names which are in use already with many many local area networks, either because they have been set as a default by Microsoft or Apple, or indeed other software vendors. Or, because they are used as example and so many people have used these as examples in setting up their local network. Dot home and dot court have... are actually two generic top level domains which some companies have applied for, and they have [inaudible] been

blocked, or been stopped from being released into the wild, because of this collision and now there is a whole plan for the SSAC to contact a project that would be providing further details on the extent of the problem, and perhaps not only extent into dot home and dot court, but to other top level domains.

There is also a draft on the ICANN reserve funds, the proposed replenishment strategy. Here again, it's one of these things which have happened because of some of the unforecast events. Now ICANN has always had a reserve fund for any rainy day, any emergency action that it might have to take. That emergency action happened when the US government proposed basically the end of it's stewardship for the IANA contracts, and so the process for IANA stewardship transition and also the second part of this, which ended up being the ICANN accountability cross community working group work, work stream 1 and work stream 2, so you can see it's a significant cost at the end. Seriously depleted the reserve fund, and therefore there is a strategy to replenish it one way or another, and of course as money doesn't grow on trees, it had to be quite carefully crafted so as to not take too long a time to replenish it, until the next emergency takes place, and also not impact the community too much. The more money you put aside into a reserve fund, the least amount of funds are available for community work.

Finally, another draft at the moment being put together is the IPC BC accreditation and access model. The IPC is the generic name supporting organizations intellectual property constituency. The BC is the business constituency. There is an accreditation and access model for non public data. It is not a formal public comment was formulated by ICANN, this is an informal requested from the IPCN, the business constituency to ask

our feedback on their proposed accreditation and access model, as far as there's no penholder assigned to it. If anybody wished to look at this [inaudible]. I think somebody is breathing into the microphone. You are encouraged to take part. At the moment no statements seem to be stowed and there are several statements which the ALAC has decided not to submit statements to, the first one is the uniform board member integrity screening process. The board members are screen in different ways, so when you are selected as a board member by the nominating committee, you go through a very rigorous screening process to find out if you're not a criminal, you haven't got anything to hide, etc. All sorts of questions of integrity that are being not only asked from the person, but a formal enquiry being made into the person's background. The other board members, ones selected by the different component parts of ICANN are not necessarily subjected to the same screening processes and therefore this was the proposal that was put there to the ICANN community, was to have a uniform screening process across both nominating committee and the different supporting organizations and advisory committee. Then a proposal for Korean root zone label generations rules, that's again to do with the internationalized domain names, the label generation rules are rules that are used when the same word can be spelled in different ways. There are some script where you can spell the same word in many different ways and actually several letters that might look different are actually the same letters. So, the label generation rules are there to make sense of this and make sure that one cannot use the script to register a specific domain when it's already registered but written in a slightly different way. I hope that makes sense, you know. Then new public comments request to which the ALAC needs to make decisions, and this is your time [inaudible].

SEBASTIAN BACHOLETTE: Please please please see your screen, you have people asking for the floor and I would like to go now and not to wait for the end of your speech please.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOND: I can't read the screen at the same time as I read the other one. Yes Sebastian, you are on the floor. Go ahead.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLETTE: Sorry Olivier to interrupt you, but two things about the uniform board member integrity screening process. First of all, just to twig a little bit what you say, NomCom and ALAC at-large selected board member went through a very long screening process. The GNSO, ASO, and ccNSO board member was not supposed to go through the same process, or through any process in fact. My second point, I am very surprised and I don't recall when it was decided, but I am very surprised that ALAC decide not to submit a statement. It is one of the main items we need to take into account to make sure that the whole board act or are selected the same way and with the same screening process. We need to support that definitely. I don't know who decides that but, I guess I was not part of this school when they decide that, and I think it's a very bad decision. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOND: Thanks very much for this Sebastian. Certainly yes, the point that you made is an important one. Any other comments on this by the way? I

am sorry, I am reading from the agenda rather than reading from the side. I don't see anybody else putting their hand up so I'll just quickly finish then. The new public comments that require attention, first the proposed by law revisions to by law section 11, additional voting thresholds. Now, this is again to do with the ALAC, and I'm afraid I haven't even read this... oh no, OK. This is to do with the board of directors, OK. I'm afraid I don't really know that much about this one, it's a very new one and it's... does anyone wish to speak about it? The additional voting thresholds. I am not seeing anybody put their hand up at the moment. I'm afraid I'll have to come back to you, because I don't know this one systematically. Draft final report of the NomCom 2 review, that's the second review of the ICANN nominating committee. So they've got a final draft, a final report on the points that they're making on the nominating committee and any changes that they might wish to affect. As you know, the nominating committee selects, I think it's about half of the ICANN board members, and we have 5 nominating committee people in our... 5 people in the nominating committee. Let me rephrase this. One of them of course is from EURALO and that is Sandra [inaudible]. So, what I might suggest is that we ask Sandra and any of our past nominating committee members to look at this one and to let us know whether they are fine with the recommendations that are made in the NomCom 2 review. The cross committee working group accountability work stream 2 final report, we thought that would never ever happen, but yes, all of the different work tracks appear to have now... now completed and so we have a final report on work stream 2, which incorporates most of the findings from the work tracks etc. That's a particularly important piece of work that has spanned several years. I know that our committee has been heavily involved with this, from start

until end, so I'm not expecting any of the points made there to be vastly different to what our views are. But, it's always good to check those and make sure nothing has crept in there that goes dramatically against the points that we have pushed for. Perhaps Sebastian, I could ask you to say just a few words on this in a moment. Then finally, the initial report on the review of the customer standing committee charter. The customer standing committee is a committee that liaises with the IANA work and the community. It's effectively a committee that looks at the performance of IANA and of the IANA functions operator, and it seems to be that there isn't anything that comes out of the ordinary or didn't strike as something particularly out of place in the current process as we are. Sebastian, do you want to speak a few words about work stream 2 final reports, please?

SEBASTIAN BACHOLETTE:

Yes, thank you. Sebastian Bachollette speaking. If I can ask that the microphone from the other participants would be shut down because I love to have somebody eating during out committee, but not very nice as a background noise, sorry. If we want to talk about work stream 2, yes we are almost finished. What is at stake here with the final report, it's not to comment on any specific, 8 different subgroups report was accepted and we through one or two already comment period, but here it's only to find if there is some discrepancy or difficulty between one or other subgroup report, to raise those issue. Therefore I think that there will be very few of them, and the next step after this comment period will be some work, [inaudible] eventually make some changes in this final report to get the final final one who will go to the supporting organization, sheltering organization, who charter this work stream 2,

and they will decide if they support or not. Like for work stream 1 report, and then if it is done, it will go to the board for final acceptance and decision on implementation. Therefore, the next big item will be, how we will implement all those recommendations, and there is around 100 recommendations, therefore it will take time. One of the questions, often is to know if it's... how we, and who will decide what are the first one we make. Did we start with the easy one, did we start with a difficult one. How we organize this work. It will be the next phase of the work, as soon as the report will be approved by the sheltering organization and the board. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOND: Thank you very much Sebastian. Olivier Crepin-Lebond speaking. Any comments or questions on this? OK. Thanks for that. Any comments on the current policy and public consultations? Roberto Gaetano, you had briefly put your hand up, or maybe not. Yes, Roberto, you have your hand up. At the moment, you appear to be muted. Can someone unmute Roberto perhaps, or...

ROBERTO GAETANO: Aha, thank you, I have been un-muted. Clicking but it was remaining red. No, I just wanted to make a short comment on the proposed revisions to bylaws section 11 additional voting thresholds. Basically, these are the voting thresholds of the GNSO as acting as part of the empowered community. It is a decision of participants in the empowered community. I don't think there are 7, 8 clauses. I don't... just wanted to say what that was about. If you want I can send the link

to the documentation for this part, but it's basically internal procedures of the GNSO for their voting mechanisms, not acting as GNSO but acting as a participant in the empowered community. Thank you Olivier, that was Roberto Gaetano for the record.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOND: Thank you very much Roberto. Olivier Crepin-Lebond speaking, thanks that is very helpful and it kind of reminded me now of this. Just as an additional piece of information, often one sees the GNSO council, the committee that has the different councillors coming from the different component parts of the GNSO as being the people that represent the different component parts. They represent the stakeholder groups, so as you know you've got the council that is divided in the contracted parties house, and the non-contracted parties house. Then in the contracted parties house you have the registries and registrars, and then the non-contracted parties house you have the commercial stakeholder group and the non-commercial stakeholder group. These are further subdivided. The thing that one often makes, the mistake that one often makes is that the council itself is actually directly selected and controlled by the stakeholder groups, and by the constituencies that are underneath the stakeholder groups and for some reason that I still can't quite understand, that is not the case. Therefore, the council can not report to speak on behalf of the stakeholder groups, hence, if the council was to do a vote based on the input of the stakeholder groups, there would have needed to be some process, internal process, for the stakeholder groups and constituencies to control the council vote and to know where the thresholds lie. I think that this is what these by laws, or section 11 additional voting

thresholds are speaking about, so that it actually, effectively is a reflection of the constituencies in the GNSO and not a vote of the GNSO council itself. All very internal stuff and I think it's quite helpful that it's a good thing that they're proceeding forward with this. Roberto, you wish to add something else? No... OK. Thanks. Now let's then move on, if I don't see anybody else with questions, let's go back to our agenda.

Now we're moving to the GDPR updates, general data protection regulation updates for ICANN's interim models. The article 29 work party discussions that are taking place. You know that we're currently working on having a third EURALO GDPR webinar, not a second one, a third one. We had a preparation for webinar and so on, and so the third one will have the input from our end users, from our at-large structures. In the meantime, the whole discussion on GDPR has moved on. ICANN came up with a layered model that it proposed to the article 29 work party into the data protection registrars in Brussels, and the model was called the calzone model, with a layered thing where you would have different types of stakeholders that could access different types of data, etc. That was sent and a response was received, and I was hoping that we would have ICANN staff that could take us through this response, but I was told unfortunately, they are quite busy actually dealing with the darn thing rather than being able to tell the community about it.

The response which was received by [inaudible] a week ago, was sent by the European Commission, well the article 29 data protection working party, and it was quite scathing. It mentions that work party 29 continues to have concerns regarding several aspects of the proposed final interim model, attached to this letter you will find the areas for which the work party 29 consider utmost importance, but ICANN can

either reconsider or further evaluate its current approach. The [inaudible] highlighted here are without prejudice to additional consents, further enquiries are findings been made by the work party 29 or it's members at a later date. There's then follows an annex of 4 pages, that are understandably quite strongly worded and with a number of points that are made where it looks as though the model that ICANN is proposing is not in line with what the work party is looking for. Now, and this is just taking a step back without going into details with this. We then reached the position where on the one hand, the US government has reaffirmed at the last, or just before the last ICANN meeting that a strong WHOIS model as it currently is implemented, is something that they want to keep and we have a work party 29 that appears to be pushing in the opposite direction. I'm not quite sure, I have any clarity on this, that there is, of course, a public comment that has opened. Very very short public comment on data protection and privacy issues, on soliciting community input on the article 29 guidance. This letter which was sent by this Mr or Mrs Andrea [inaudible], has several component parts in there and we're now seeking input from our community on this. I wonder if anybody here has read any of this so far and if there is any interest by anyone, to be part of a drafting team to write an answer for the at-large community? Holly Raiche has been assigned the main penholder status, but I'm no doubt... I am quite aware that she will no doubt, absolutely need some help on this. This is a very very short turnover. We are the 17th April, it is going to be closing on the 20th April. Any comments? It's a very quiet... you are either absolutely shocked by this letter, which I certainly was when I looked at it, or you are reading it at the moment, which is fine as well. We'll spend a few minutes on this. In the meantime I will go through the

queue. I can see the wonderful thing of Webex, with people hands going up and down for some strange reason. Let's start with Sebastian Bachollette, and I've seen Christopher Wilkinson's hand go up and down a few times before, but let's start with Sebastian.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLETTE:

Thank you Olivier. It is Sebastian Bachollette speaking. I didn't read all the document, it is a very tough job. I think a big effort on what you ask, you get the answer. We get it and now we have to implement that and there is no way that we can't implement that. The same time it seems that the ICANN staff is looking still to have one year in front of the organization to decide what to do and obviously it will not be the case. This regulation is already decided 2 years ago, and we're supposed to have 3 years to fill the gap between the regulmentation and what we are currently doing. I am very concerned with the way we communicate... when I say we, it's all of us within ICANN, we communicate around that. Sometime I heard that staff will decide everything. Then I heard that [inaudible] want to be engaged in the discussion, and then I don't see anymore staff taking a lead position. I don't know really where is the vote on all that. I am very concerned, not just on the topic, but also the way all this discussion was and is under today. There is some part of the stakeholder group who organize meetings and not completely communicate to everyone else, but they are leading the discussion. At the end of the day, we will be obliged to do what article 29 tells us to do. You see that there is some question... or some possibility that they will put more in our basket, because I say it not prevent any national government to come back with some specifics and therefore where are we going, how are we going, and the current

organization of ICANN, not Org but the full ICANN. I am not sure that we are well ready with a new organization to handle such topic in so short time. Therefore, it's a... I was not shocked by the answer. We ask a question that we may have answer ourself and decided what we want to do, and then to come to them, but we say: "Hey Mr and Mrs work party 29, or something like that. What's to tell us to do?" Then they will tell us what to do. They are happy to have more power. I agree with you Olivier in your statement it's... ICANN it's a middle, because the other end you have some governments, I think I heard that it was a position of not just the US government but some other government that wanted to still have the [inaudible], if it's not open we will have trouble with the GAC. How we will deal with all that, I don't know. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOND: Thank you very much Sebastian. Christopher Wilkinson, did you wish to say a few words? I think that someone will have to try and unmute Christopher as well. Go ahead, you are now unmuted Christopher.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Oh my goodness, [inaudible]. Briefly, I know about this letter but I haven't read it thoroughly yet. I've noticed that the US government has publically pushed back onto ICANN and insisted that ICANN should maintain open WHOIS, for reasons which we've heard about from the US delegate to San Juan. I've noticed Michelle [inaudible] latest comment, to the effect that as I think you've just suggested Olivier that [inaudible] 29 committee has in effect, perhaps rejected is too strong, been very negative about the proposed interim models. I very much

sympathize with Sebastian's political judgement, because we have known for years this was coming. I personally been deeply involved a couple of years ago with trying to persuade ICANN to adopt an international best practices policy, which was eventually reflected in the ALAC comments on the WHOIS [inaudible] policy. But, throughout this exercise, for years now, I think fundamentally is this intellectual property group, constituency in ICANN who rely on WHOIS for private enforcement of trademarks. This lobby has succeeded in getting the US government on their side in the name of consumer protection. Personally I don't regard trademark protection as entirely, or even mainly to do with consumer protection, but that's how it is. If you do constitute a working party, or a small discussion group with Sebastian, I would be glad to join it, but there are limits to what I can contribute further, because I am not a lawyer and as most of you know, I'm quite deeply involved with the geographical names and geographical indications issues in the PDP for new gTLDs, and this is unfortunately taking up rather more time than I had anticipated. I certainly will be interested in participating, but I think I need 48 hours to read in detail the latest material. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOND: Thank you very much Christopher. Olivier Crepin-Lebond speaking, and this indeed is a very, not only interesting, but critical topic for ICANN. I remind you all that WHOIS issues have been debated ever since before ICANN existed, and it appears that we are now reaching the final countdown on this topic. So much so, that there is actually a webinar that is taking place tomorrow, specifically about this and that will be having ICANN staff explain the details of the correspondence that was

sent to work party 29 and the response, and soliciting input from everyone. I am going to ask staff to let us know where this is taking place and at what time, and perhaps even to put a link on the chat about this. Sylvia, would you be able to let us know.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Yes Olivier, thank you very much. The webinar will take place tomorrow Wednesday 18th at 21:00 UTC to 22:30 UTC, for 90 minutes. The title is compliance of the WHOIS registration data, with GDPR interim model. The trainers are Alan Greenberg and Thomas [inaudible]. This is the second webinar of the capacity building working group. You all are invited to join this, very interesting webinar. I will post the links on the Webex.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOND:

Thanks for this Sylvia, that's really helpful and I think that we need to be on that. I just hope that we will also have ICANN staff dealing with this on the webinar. I gather that it is ALAC chair, Alan Greenberg will be running this. He is probably likely to ask for input, so I would certainly recommend that we all be on this webinar and that it's not just going to be a webinar as such, being taught what the issues are, but actually getting input and providing our input there. So, a webinar agenda with details, thank you Sylvia.

We need to move on ladies and gentlemen, and the next quick topic is to do with our own webinar, and the impact on WHOIS, mainly from an end-user perspective. This is just a reminder of an email that I sent last week, to the EURALO mailing list and asking about the fact that we've

had two webinars so far. We had one which was data protection, what do you need to know as end users about GDPR. We had a second one which was webinar on GDPR implementation. But now, what we wanted to try and do, and this is just a bit of an example, not example sorry, an experiment, is to try to get our at-large structures to share their knowledge and share their experience on GDPR. There is still time on this, so it would be important, I think perhaps if more ALSes came forward. I know of a couple of at-large structures that have come forward so far, we've got a potential, well input from some individual members who are putting together a massively open course on the internet about the GDPR, but it would be interesting to get more at-large structures to share their points of view and more members. Please, if you are still considering this and not quite sure what to do, if you have any questions, don't hesitate to send me an email. We're only asking for about 5 minutes of your time, basically to share things and share the way that you do things in your part of the world. Anyway, let's just hope that we have more. We haven't set a date yet for this, as far as I understand, but it would very likely be by the end of this month that we should stage this webinar. We have had some suggestions for two other webinars, one on cyber security, especially the protection of the European critical information infrastructure. Another one, which is the role of the European Parliament, European Commission, and Council of Europe in the communication between European internet users and the, I'm not quite sure what the CEO of social networks is, I have to check on that. I guess the CEO of social networks might be, our good old friend Mark Zuckerberg, perhaps. If you have suggestions for any other webinar as well, please let us know. Send an email to staff or send it to the mailing list and we can have a few more Euro centric webinars on

this. In addition of course, to the capacity building working group webinars.

Agenda item 5, brief updates on planning for joint [inaudible] society outreach at ICANN 62. This is just to let you know that I am currently in touch with the good folks at NCSG, non commercial stakeholders group, which is actually a [inaudible] or an umbrella should we say of the non commercial users constituency, the NCUC and the not for profit operational concerns, the NPOC. These are both the generic names supporting organizations, non contracted parties house, non commercial stakeholder group. We had several instances in the past where we had a joint face-to-face interaction with capacity building and introduction of our communities work at ICANN meetings. We had one in Helsinki, not Helsinki, Copenhagen. We had one in Abu Dhabi, we had one more recently in San Juan. It came really well, it worked really well and so if you want to be involved with this and not only in the preparation of it, but also be involved in the actual attending and you can attend remotely by the way, and presenting maybe a policy topic, then please drop us a note. It is great to see that we are increasingly doing some work with the civil society outreach and people as such.

Number 6, is... and I'm checking... Sebastian Bachelette.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLETTE:

I have [inaudible]. Thank you Sebastian Bachelette speaking. I want to come back to number 4 item, and I will comment also on the number 5. I am very concerned that we want to organize a webinar about things that's in the end of the end user, the one about cyber security. If we

want to talk about critical information infrastructure it's good, but I would like very much that we talk about as what we as end user can do or need to do to protect ourselves, or to protect our [inaudible], domains, and so on and so forth. The second it's I am always very happy to have the governments doing things on behalf of the end user, but maybe it is time to consider that we as a structure, as EURALO, or any other European end user structure can be a voice, and we don't need just to wait for the parliament, or for the European Commission, or for the Council of Europe to talk on our behalf to the CEO of social networks. On that matter, we are organizing the IGF France, 5th July, and I am in charge of one specific [inaudible] French, but it is the same in English, platformization of internet and it's a topic where we want to discuss the issue of which role the internet end user can have in all the situation, and to understand better what is at stake. That was number 4. For number 5, I would like very much that we keep, and specially when we talk on EURALO, a page about end user. I will not say once again that I don't think within ICANN it is a good idea to talk civil society, I lost this battle, OK, but at least for us, I would like very much to be end user and not a civil society. I am a civil society to IGF, but within ICANN, I am and I want to be still an end user. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOND: Thanks Sebastian. Olivier Crepin-Lebond speaking. Responding to agenda item 4, the cyber security. Perhaps could we then put this of course, cyber security, within the ICANN context, that obviously would mean, the domain name system, the DNS, and the DNS infrastructure, whether that involves the root servers, whether that involves the different component parts of the cyber security as relating to domain

names and IP addresses. Perhaps, could we build a webinar here, inviting someone from SSAC, someone from the security and stability advisory committee, someone from ICANN staff, I know that they're dealing of course with the cyber security and also someone from the RSSAC, the root server system advisory committee, since they're the root server operators. Let's try and see what we can build out of that. Regarding the civil society outreach, point taken. I think that we never ourselves tag this as being joint civil society outreach in general, we call it joint meeting of... or joint outreach from the... would be in this case the at-large and the NCSG, the non commercial stakeholders group. I guess this again, sometimes end up being called joint civil society outreach but I don't think that we've actually, consciously tagged it as such in at-large.

Let's move on, because time is of the essence and we're already 4 minutes beyond the official end of this call. Moving quickly down, the upcoming outreach at meetings, there are 3 meetings which have come one the table. As you know the community regional outreach program gives us a total of 5 spaces to send someone to meetings for outreach. We already used 2 of our slots so far, one slot was used to send somebody to the republica, in fact that's not taken place yet, that will take place soon. The other slot was used to, just this is stuck now... yes one slot was used for that and the other slot was used for... I can't remember what the other slot was used for, and this sent me to the wrong page, so doesn't help me at all. Anyway, we've used two of the five slots, we have three slots that are remaining. Yes, sorry, the other slot was used of course to send somebody to the internet governance forum in Geneva. That was Olawale Bakare. The one for republica is

going to be Matthias Hudobnik, who is a German speaker. He is Austrian, so he speaks German and you need to be bilingual to attend that conference, so that will be really great. He will actually link up with [inaudible] who are based in Berlin. Now, we were originally thinking of using one more slot to send me to the right meeting in Marseille, but thanks to some good French collaborations and the fact that I don't live very far from Marseille, or at least one of my homes is not very far from Marseille, we will probably not require a crop slot, in fact we won't require a crop slot for that. I will be attending the rights 76 meeting in Marseille. Sebastian Bacholette will also be attending it, and I also understand that [inaudible] will be attending it as part of his work as well. That is three of us and we will be making use of that time to do some outreach at right 76. Secondly, the [inaudible], that is taking place outside our region, but I have just before this call sent an email to the regional vice president for Europe Jean-Jacques Sahel, asking him to make an exception as [inaudible] is a very important meeting for us and we intend to send three people, therefore using three crop slots for [inaudible] in Georgia. Finally, [inaudible] Sofia, Bulgaria. This is a huge festival taking place in Sofia, and I met the person that was organizing it and has been organizing it for many years. I met him at the IGF in Geneva, and he invited me to come over. Unfortunately, I am not able to make it. I initially thought, perhaps should we make use of one of the crop slots for this and send somebody who is not going to Panama. This takes place exactly at the same time as the Panama ICANN Panama meeting. But, at the same time, we also have an at-large structure in Bulgaria. ISOC BG, and thanks to [inaudible], who is the, I guess the chair in meritis of ISOC Bulgaria, we got put in touch with the new chair of ISOC Bulgaria, so we will be making use of our local at-large structure to

attend this meeting, and Sebastian Bachelette and I actually next week, are going to Bulgaria for other, there's an IT European chapters meeting and we will likely meet with the chair of ISOC Bulgaria, and therefore will be bringing some brochures and things. We will be briefing him on pushing for EURALO in that part of the world. That's the update from me on this. Any questions or comments? I don't see any further questions or comments, and in fact, somebody if you had been paying attention should have asked a question, how are we going to choose those people to do to [inaudible]. This is where the EURALO board will be meeting tomorrow on a call, to look at the list of people that have put themselves forward. We have had several people that have, following a call last week on the mailing list have sent their name forward for the slots and according to the criteria of the different reasons for going there and the input that was put in those messages, the SOI as we call them, the EURALO board will be making a choice as to who to send to that meeting in [inaudible].

Just to let you know that I personally am already funded to be in [inaudible], as I'm a member of the [inaudible] board, on behalf of EURALO, since EURALO is a partner of [inaudible], and all partners pay money to [inaudible] apart from EURALO pay in kind, by sending their chair to do all sorts of work for free, but there you go. Wonderful stuff, but we've got our space and we've got 3 spaces for people to go. Of course, if you're now thinking, let me put my SOI through, I'm afraid that the time period for this is already closed, it closed last week.

OK. Now I guess, we can move, if I don't see anybody putting their hand up, we can move to agenda item number 7 and that's the ALAC and RALO election, selections, and appointments. Yes, we are reaching an

election time again, and for this I will hand the floor over to Silvia Vivanco.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Thank you Olivier. I would like to [inaudible] announce that the ALAC and RALO elections will be announced by staff next week, we have our selection timetable posted on the Wiki page. The announcement will be made on the 23rd April. The nomination period will be from the 23rd to the 4th May, the 11th May will be the deadline for nomination [inaudible] then the election will require from 14th to 18th May, and all the positions will be renewed at the end of the AGM, at the ALAC [inaudible] meeting in Barcelona. The positions open for EURALO are ALAC member, now currently the position is held by Sebastian [inaudible]. The next one is the ALAC member from the NomCom, it's [inaudible], and the ALAC delegate to the NomCom, currently by Sandra [inaudible]. Please stay tuned for an announcement and be ready to submit your nominations, or nominate yourself. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOND:

Thank you very much for this Silvia, that's really helpful. That's a good advance notice on this, and as you can see the page is completely prepared for this. Are there any questions or comments? I don't see anyone... yes, Sebastian Bachelette.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLETTE:

Sorry, Sebastian Bachelette speaking. Just one question, what is the deadline for the announcement? We have the deadline for the newly

elected people to be seated, what is the deadline for the announcement of the elected people? Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOND: Yeah, thank you Sebastian. Silvia? I think it shows on the screen, doesn't it? 23rd April 2018, announcement of call for nominations and nominee statements. From the 23rd April to the 4th May, nomination period. Is that what you were looking for Sebastian?

SEBASTIAN BACHOLETTE: No, that's the nomination period, it is when you nominate somebody to be candidate. What I am looking for, is when the result of the election... what is the deadline for the result of the election? Because, it needs to be done prior to the meeting in Panama I guess, and I want to be sure that this deadline is for all the duty that we have to be done with then. It is important to put that as one date, and I guess that maybe it's, I don't know, 31st May or 5th June, I don't know. I think it will be useful to have it. Thank you.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you very much Sebastian for your comments. I see that we have set the date, however, that deadline has been reset. Normally after the election finished are between... I am looking at the calendar, will be on 18th May, right after, a few days afterwards the results of the elections are announced, all the RALOs, so it's a few days after the elections are completed. So, everybody will know the results with sufficient time to prepare.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOND: OK, thanks for this Silvia. Are there any other comments or questions?
Yes, Heidi.

HEIDI: As Silvia noted, the results will be announced as soon as we have them. If there are no other people, if there is only one person running for any position they will be approved by acclamation, with no elections, which will announced then sooner. Immediately, again all those new positions will take their seats in Barcelona, in ICANN 63 at the AGM. The chair election will take... the schedule will be announced shortly and likely just during or after the end of the nomination period for the at-large election. Again, that position will be known by ICANN 62 as well. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOND: OK, thanks for this further information. I don't see anybody else with their hand up so I think that's the end of our call, except we have one more agenda item and that's any other business.

HEIDI: This is Heidi again. Perhaps I missed it, but I thought we we're going to talk about the COP person. Did I miss that?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOND: That didn't get added.

HEIDI: I think it is on the agenda.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOND: I didn't see it. OK. It's not on there, so thanks for pointing this out Heidi. It's Olivier Crepin-Lebond speaking for the transcript. The community onboarding program has yet again got a space for a mentee to go and basically be funded to go to the next meeting in Panama. The question was, how were we to select such a person. Were we going to do an open call for people who wish to go, or should we have a more direct process, by which the EURALO board could perhaps identify someone in the community that they have found to have contributed greatly recently to any work of EURALO and that would benefit from going over to the meeting in Panama. There is no set process at the moment for us to choose someone for the community onboarding program, the only problem that we have is that the request was made again, with a very short turnover time. I am not sure... Heidi, when is it that we need to send the details of that person through to the ALAC?

HEIDI: This is Heidi. Alan has requested no later than the 22nd. That is a Sunday, the AASC will be meeting either the 23rd or the 24th. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOND: The 22nd of April?

HEIDI: April, yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOND: Goodness. It is the end of this week.

HEIDI: It is.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOND: That's very late. Of course, if I might add, it probably isn't the best time... well not only do we have to supply a name to the ALAC for this, but we're not assured to actually get someone to go over to Panama, as I think that there's only one or two slots for all of the ALAC, or all of the at-large community, so all the regions. We could certainly select someone from our region who might be a good candidate. May I ask that, because I am not seeing anybody... I am seeing Sebastian with his hand up, perhaps Sebastian you have a suggestion.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLETTE: Thank you Olivier. Sebastian Bachelette speaking. I just wanted to [inaudible] that it's just one or two people to be sent to all the at-large, maybe not European one, and we not forced to propose a name, we can. I suggest that with those deadline, we handle that with your EURALO board meeting tomorrow, because if you open time to have candidate, it will take 3-4 days and to be ready for the end of this week

is almost impossible. I suggest that you go through the discussion with the board of EURALO.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOND: OK. Thanks for this Sebastian. Olivier Crepin-Lebond speaking. What I will also do is to then follow up and find out why we suddenly now being asked this question at such a short notice. I might have missed something in the ALAC, perhaps I have missed the announcement on the ALAC, but it doesn't really give us enough time to follow proper process. I would have preferred an open call for people... for candidates, but we'll be dealing with this with the EURALO board call tomorrow. The EURALO board call if I tell everyone, is open for everyone to attend, but when we will be discussing candidates, and this is where there are names being suggested etc, and the discussions being talked about the candidates, in order to protect the candidates personal information, then we have to go in camera and close it to non EURALO board people. At that point, we will ask you to leave if you're not part of the board. The rest of the board call is going to be open. I'm not quite sure how much of the board call will be dealing with other issues, I have a feeling that the majority will be discussing the candidates. I'm not sure if it's 100% great to attend, but like I said, if you wish to, you may. With this, I don't see any other businesses, and we're already 21 minutes past the top of the hour, so thanks everyone for this. It's been a little bit more difficult to run the meeting today due to the Webex, I hope we'll get used to it and we'll be able to be more efficient next time, but until then, have a very good month. I hope to see you tomorrow on that webinar, as that's really important for our region, we're at the heart, of where all these discussions are going. Perhaps,

should I ask staff as an action item also to remind our community greatly about this call tomorrow and perhaps might I even myself add a note on the EURALO mailing list, that this is a particularly hot topic. If hot at all, sizzling hot. With this, thanks everyone, thanks to our staff, and thanks to all of you. Have a very good evening everybody, and this call is now closed. Thank you. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]