

Wolf Ludwig: I think it's time now to start this - our today's meeting even if we have intended, some more people had promised to show up and sorry for being a bit behind our schedule but this is understandable if you have meetings all day and if you are running from one meeting to the next one. Let me start with our standing agenda items, roll call and apologizes.

We have already Christopher who was here at the last meeting but he had to go to another one. He is still on the call, I think but he has to leave us in a couple of minutes. EURALO members present, respectively Board members and elected members here we have Rudi, we have Sebastian, we have Adam, we have Patrick, EURALO member Franz, we have Olivier on the call, and we have Sandra representing one of our ALSs from-

Olivier Crepin-Lebond: Can I ask you to mute please? It's Olivier here, sorry. But I can hear you and I can't hear Bill.

Male: I'm going to ring off. No just do *6 and it will mute the line.

Wolf Ludwig: Next point is the summary minutes from our last call from May 18th, which is posted. Are there any comments? Or questions? If this is not the case I consider the minutes from our last call as approved. Point 3, review of action items of the previous meeting, staff sat out to - shortly after Brussels - to find the date for virtual General Assembly in Brussels in early September. This is still something to be done, and I think we have to decide which one of the agenda items, later, to start with some basic points on the planned General Assembly.

At last call we said it would be good to have it in autumn. Place an idea on the table to make it in conjunction probably with the next ITF, because there may be some EURALO representatives going to the next IGF, which will be somehow at our front door. And this could be some opportunity, but we will come back to this agenda item later. The fourth point on the standing agenda items is current open public consultations. This is always a question directed to our elect representatives. Sebastian, do you want to give a short summary on the priorities or the most essential ones?

Sebastian Bachollet: Not to comment on what others give us to comment, but first to make our work done within At-Large in ALAC and the situation with the improvements At-Large Iraq and the Director election may be our first and foremost concentration for the near future. There are a lot of things going on about vertical integration, about new GTLD and I don't know there is

one specific comment we need to do maybe. I have no - there is a lot and too much, obviously each time we come to a physical meeting it is time for everybody to finish their work and we have plenty of things to look at and to see how we will handle but I have no clue which one is more important than the other. For example the Area A will be discussed here and I guess it will be over because it is 9 of July, the draft, right, yes.

In fact, I think the most important for us to draft fiscal year '11 operating plans and budget, because it's something related with one of the discussions we had at the At-Large ALAC discussion prior. And that's the main, maybe we will wish to say something about the meeting for the next decade. That is stage one and then there will stage two and a stage three; maybe we want to say something on that. I guess that's, yes, new detail area, next decade for the meeting and fiscal year '11 are the four. But, I think the more important is money, sorry.

Wolf Ludwig:

Okay, thanks Sebastian. I agree with the last priority you mentioned because this is also the context of common frustration at EURALO, having the ICANN Conference in Brussels in our region and compared with the last ICANN Conference in our region which was in summer 2008 in Paris. Our ALSs were not - were invited of course, but being invited and being funded makes a big difference. And the most quite considerable frustration among many our ALSs is understood they invited but their stay over in Brussels during this week June's ICANN will not be funded and this is a question of credibility, as we think.

And we are, I think, we are on the EURALO Board are quite of the same opinions that this is of contrary of encouragement of our members this is of contrary of involvement, this is of contrary of inclusiveness, et cetera.. And we will do our best in the frame of this discussion with ICANN officials to make sure, set in future there will be one face to face General Assembly per year supported by ICANN and financed by ICANN, what I think is really essential is to include the end reach at our Regional At-Large Organization and participation of our members. Yes Sebastian?

Sebastian Bachollet: Yes, just little carry out on what you say and maybe we need to change at least change our by law. I think if we request one General Assembly a year, we will have trouble. If we will request that each time ICANN meeting comes to Europe we have a General Assembly face to face organized/sponsored by ICANN, I think it is more feasible. But we still need to - I think it is less we can ask. But, we have also to think - it is one

of the reason in the discussion, even if I was disagree and pushy with Evan's proposal, I think we can't just say we rely on the budget of someone else within ICANN, we need to rely on our budget for our activities. And if they give us, because at the end of the day we come, we need to decide what we want to do with, now if somebody tell us, "Okay come and take our money," it will be great, but its never happened since years was in ICANN.

I say rely. I say not use. We can use. But the prime example is that really at the end of the day, there is one ICANN budget. Now it is split into pieces, but we see that as soon as one part is taking to much, all the other have to give back budget money, not real money, but budget money, budgeted money. And we also have to think about, do we want a summit coming and when and how and we know it will be not - ICANN will not subsidize us and the General Assembly for some period of time.

A prime example it seems we are in the place here, this year and it seems it will long last. I think we really have to think and make proposals sensible proposals about the budget for the next few years and not just for one year.

Wolf Ludwig:

Thanks Sebastian. I think there is general approval on your remarks and on your suggestions here regarding the next ICANN budget and there must be some clear signals toward user communities that ICANN is not always just talking about multi-stakeholder bottom up, but they're really meaning what they're saying. And therefore they need to invest, Olivier used this term investment in one of his recent postings, if they want to be credible they need to invest more funds and support in the improvement of users representation. Are there any questions regarding this agenda item?

Otherwise I will continue on with our agenda with agenda items for our today's meeting. I posted a draft agenda, I think last week, via our mailing list asking for comments, asking for suggestions for any additional points, and I think there was no feedback until today. Therefore, we accepted the draft agenda as circulated. Point four is the situation of the EURALO Secretariat position.

Maybe some or most of you remember that Dessi, who was elected into EURALO's Secretariat position at our General Assembly in Mexico in March last year. She was scheduled chair-elected for two years term. Dessi announced in early spring this year that for family reasons she, if

fact she is awaiting a baby, actually she is awaiting twins, and for this very personal and understandable family reason, she asked to resign from her Secretariat's function. On the Board we were discussing about that we are thinking that she will just take a kind of maternity leave, which what would have been my favorite, and I think the favorite solutions of the majority of the Board members, but finally Dessi decided to step down and we had to find, let me say, a replacement for the resting of the period of her term.

Another solution would have been at the next General Assembly would be to re-elect, but I think there are some good reasons for having now having now an interim solution, and next year when EURALO has to re-elect the chair and re-elect a new Secretariat we will consider as a new situation. In the mean time, in spring it was Olivier who offered to step in and take over the Secretariat's function,. As many of you have realized Olivier was elected to the EURALO Board in Mexico as well. He was as a Board member extremely active over the last year and to me it's, honestly speaking, a very good solution. I'm pleased about Olivier's offer to step in and taking over this function.

At this opportunity I think we have to thank Dessi, who did a great job over the last year and who was very active in her function and in her participation. And I think we have to give a great thanks to Dessi for all the work she did. And, at last step, they have prepared a certificate for Dessi and it will be sent to Dessi soon. Sebastian?

Sebastian Bachollet: The position that you expressed that I would have preferred that she stay away from the Secretariat position for some months, but I said she come back. But I hope that one day we will have her coming back at least as a ALS representative and maybe Board member. For the moment, it's not personal. I tried to have her on-line, but she is not on-line.

As you, just, just she's at the hospital and that's complicated to be connected. But I think she do a very good job and we need to thank her for that. Now but Olivier, I'm sure he will do a good job and it's a pity he is not physically with us today. But, as he is on-line I am sure everything will be okay. And, thanks Olivier for accepting this task. From my point of view it is very good for EURALO. Thank you.

Wolf Ludwig: I see that Olivier has raised his hand.

Olivier Crepin-Lebond: Thank you both. Can you hear me?

Wolf Ludwig: Yes, if you speak a little bit more then I think we can understand perfectly.

Olivier Crepin-Lebond: Okay, how about this. Is that better?

Wolf Ludwig: Go on.

Olivier Crepin-Lebond: Okay, no thank you very much for this and for considering me for the Secretariat position. I just wanted to add that because Dessi is in the hospital we wish her well. And, I wanted you to try and see if we all can wish her to come out soon and in as happy a way as possible, as happy as possible. Thank you.

Wolf Ludwig: Okay, thank you Olivier. And I think what is part of our today's agenda is now to formally adopt what I, what we agreed, what we suggested, and I think we should take some kind of a formal approval here. I know that the better opportunity would have been a General Assembly here in the context of the Brussels, ICANN meeting what for reasons I explained was not possible. I would be pleased if we had bigger participation from Board members today, but I think we let's take a formal decision on the, so for I ask you, yes? I understand that it this was this here approved that you, Olivier, will take over the Secretariat function until such General Assembly in 2011 and I can only tell you welcome.

Olivier Crepin-Lebond: Thank you very much Wolf and thank you everyone who had confidence in me, thank you.

Wolf Ludwig: Then I would like to start agenda Item 6, review of the ALS Survey 2010 and the results. This was a presentation which was already made on Sunday at ALAC meeting. But I think there are participants here today who have not seen the slides of the results of the European survey part and we, in this context, can try to analyze your current EURALO membership participation. It was not the first survey we conducted over the last years.

Actually we had a survey in 2008 and we had a survey - just help me Sebastian, I think we had two surveys earlier. And one very important survey was just before summit to find out what are the main concerns. And the main issues for the summit planning and for the summit agenda setting of our members. And at that time we had a very high response from our members in Europe and also from members from other RALO's,

but this was not so much surprising because there was a high incentive at that time because filling in the questionnaire of the summit was the entry ticket for participation in Mexico.

And this time we didn't have such an excellent incentive combined with launching this survey, but we had over 50% of returns, which is a very good with size compared with any other surveys. Normally if you have 20% you are already well off. So at 50% it figures 17 out of our 27 ALSs participated, and I'm quite satisfied with the returns. I think Matthias can now. Yes, show the presentation. I won't go through it in details but, I will concentrate what are the most important or the most interesting results from this survey, in my opinion.

The first questions of the survey have more technical or of administrative nature. The first questions referred to contact information. Once an, At-Large structure is certified normally you have a contact person. Who is our contact point? And is whom we are calling up? This works with a lot of our ALS's practice.

With some of our ALSs, they are rather silent; they do not participate in a way we would like, say as would do. And sometimes it may happens that a representative who lost their application and certification period for professional or other reasons who was a contact person is not available any more, and they simply forgot to tell us the person who will take over or who will be in charge.

So we are asking for a secondary contact and if possible even a third one. I was surprised that 73% of the participants mentioned a second contact, but most of them couldn't tell us a third one. And I think this was simply for capacity reasons that many of our members orgs are not big organizations are not institutions and, you always have to take into consideration again, they are all volunteer organizations and they are doing the best already. And volunteer organizations we know from our day to day business, you arrive very quick at your time limits and you arrive very quick at your limits regarding personnel and work investments.

Another question was the level of representation of our ALSs versus our representatives on the national level, on the regional level or on the local level. And the vast majority of our members say our representatives have preference on the national level with two exceptions. Only one exception was a regional level or impact was Isapalonia, here in Belgium and

another exception was made in Madenstradt (inaudible 00:27:07) Stockholm here in Germany. Stockholm the title already is a city of and stay focused on the local level even if Walftglinecline, Victor and Sancroft who present (inaudible 00:27:35) at EURALO as we all know are not at all limited in their work on the local level.

They participate here in here in ICANN quite regularly. They participate in the European dialogue on internet governance. It's a European version of the IGF. They are very active in the summer school on internet governance which is taking place every summer in Micsen. They are among the most active ones but, formally speaking and according to their bylaws I think your focus is rather on the local level as far I understood in the response that compared with others on the national level.

Question 4 was composition of the respective ALSs, how many individual members do you have and how many organizational members do you have? And amongst the responses, I always have to do this and bring this in the relation of the response only represents 17 and not the 27. Only 4 have individual and organizational members, prevailing majority of our ALSs consist of individual members only.

Question 5 and 6 was in regard of communication tools and to meetings in terms of our ALSs, and the answers showed that a vast majority of our members use rather conventional methods of communications like mailing list, almost 90%, some use Skype up to 37% and blocks half of them And some means of communication like Facebook, Twitter, RSS and other means that are not common are used by our ALSs.

As I said already in my personal interpretation on Sunday, this might also be due to the age structure of representatives of our ALSs. I would assume that the majority of our ALS group presentation is around 50. And this compared to other regions is much higher, where you, according to the survey results at this point, find the younger people are the more the (inaudible 00:31:13) represented in an ALS, the more they may use the newer communications like Twitter and Facebook, etc.

Meeting intervals is again a question of capacity. Networks normally do not meet regularly or often. They communicate on line by a mailing list and they meet perhaps exceptionally and I think the vast majorities, they meet twice a year or once a year, but not on a monthly level. This is in; this doesn't need to be explained in Europe or at the EURALO level

which is not surprising that we have cultural diversity, language diversity. We find out at the EURALO level we use around twelve languages or twelve languages are presented among our ALSs and for programmatic reasons we use English as the spoken language.

This was to me one of the interesting questions because I could not pre-image or pre-assume the result, the result of the question, what are the issues your ALSs members are interested in? I was not surprised about the high result for new GTLD's, 63 %, by the end I knew the results, 1.6. What was completely surprising to me was the high results for security matters.

For domain name security, but according to my interpretation again, as we have two well known experts on this issue, Patrick Vande Walle and Louis Stonehagger, who are, I think are seen, are very well reputed and well known and we had several discussions on this issue. And therefore security issues are not isolated are not perceived as isolated or an issue of technicians, but have very high priority. Patrick please.

Patrick Vande Walle: Just one remark. When you asked what issues are your ALSs members interested in, that means all ALS members and not the ALS representatives. So even if Louis and myself are interested personally in this thing, it does not necessarily mean my ALS is. As it stands, we have three Board members who are interested DNS SEC for example. So, I responded this is an interest for our ALS, but if I was the only one interested in the question, I would not have mentioned that, just clarification.

Wolf Ludwig: Rudi?

Rudi Vansnick: Well, I would like to add a comment in the sense that is not only about the security in the sense of DNS second zone, but also the abuse of domain names, is also an aspect of security. As we know that and it has been mentioned this morning during the session of the CCNSL meeting that the (inaudible 00:35:31) , for instance, is among the five worst domains in the antifishing list. That means we have to keep attention of this happening. Seems that .de has some issues .uk, that's also a criteria where we see more that people in ALS are interested in because understanding DNS SEC is technical and specialists work.

Wolf Ludwig: I entirely agree with you, that security, therefore I said security matters. It's a much broader term. Spam is for many people considered under security. Child protection is understood by many people under security, therefore it is not just a mere technical aspect, it's security in a broader sense, I think and therefore it's not surprising that half of our members are interested in this the kind of issue.

The next one is, Whois. This was not surprising to me again, because I know that several of our term ALSs are focused on data protection and privacy. They are very specialized on it and in this context, let me take one of our term members, they are known since the beginning for not being very proactive. They hardly participated so far in EURALO activities.

They could not, unfortunately, send a representative to the user summit in Mexico, but on the national level in Germany, are very active favorite. They are the organization who launched the Big Brother Award in Germany and it's organized on a yearly basis, they do it every year. And from Germany it was taken over to Australia and from Australia and Germany it was taken over to Switzerland. So Big Brother Award is a big thing ever year in the three Germany speaking, party German speaking countries.

It is the media and (inaudible 00:38:12) is mainly run by two people, and therefore I am always surprised how they can manage do this year by year again. This is a perfect example if you don't have capacities being very active on the EURALO levels, it doesn't mean you are inactive in your daily business. Many of our ALSs are very business in their daily work. And especially data protection and privacy became a main political issue on the agenda in Germany and, I think in Austria as well.

It is increasing in Switzerland it doesn't have the political ranking. It's a question of sensitivity and many Swiss people are still just in good face that there is not too much abuse of personal data. But, in Germany we had a lot of scandals over the last years and therefore data protection and privacy issues are high on the political agenda.

Next point is issues of ALSs are interested in is IPV4 and IPV 6, 42%, and here again Olivier is not yet representing an ALS, but Olivier is known as one of the real experts on this subject. And, what I think is the strengths of EURALO set on many ICANN related subjects, we have a variety of

good or best experts in our reach. Internet related engagement and outreach is interesting for 2/3 of our members and again among option any other issues people mentioned privacy or public interest, half of our ALSs. This was to me one of the interesting parts of the survey and of the results.

What type of working group activities on the ICANN levels do you prefer? We normally have standing working groups or a talk working groups, depending on the topic or required commitment, and again for simple reasons of the capacity, majority couldn't follow or contribute to standing working group over a longer period of time but, interested or open or willing to participate in talk working groups.

One of the very difficult questions I can guess for our members was Question 11. On a scale from 1 to 5, consider how well is At-Large integrated in overall ICANN policy structure. This may be easy to be answered by ALSs who do regularly participate in our activities. But this is rather difficult to be responded from members who participate on a case to case level or not so proactive. And, it's a question of perception; and a question of perception is necessarily more or less subjective.

And here the results shows a different perception among our members of our ALSs integrated feel 26.3 %, in the middle 42%, not integrated 15.8 %, isolated 10%. This shows a rather favorable, I would say, perception among of our membership. How far is ALAC and EURALO as part of ALAC integrated in ICANN policy structure? Question 12, was similar one but concentrating on how well is your ALS integrated in the overall ALAC, EURALO or ALS policy structure?

This was the narrow question, and a question regarding a narrow environment, and there are basically two blocks saying integrated 36.8% and not integrated 36.8%. This is very balanced in perception also some where in the middle assumed 15.8%. What are the important limitations to ALS participations? This to me was very important, a very relevant question because when we discuss about end reach, when we discuss about participation of our membership, we always have to take into consideration the circumstances.

We have volunteer organizations; they are engaged on different levels. I guess the ICANN level is not the easiest one. It's seen by many people as rather abstract from other people to technical that too many abbreviations used. You need a long time to understand or you always have walk

around the glossary to know what ESCAP means and SACT mean. And the answers are not really surprising. Only 5.2% believe there is no important limitation, on tiny thinks there is no important limitation. Two-thirds said other time commitments, 36.8% say policy documents are too technical, which was a very big problem years ago when I stepped in this was redicussed and rediccussed at ALAC.

And we always said we need to have documents which are understandable to ordinary people. And this is not always the case, but I think there has been certain improvement into the right direction. I don't say that it's good; I don't say that it's perfect today. But I think the problem was more and more understood and there were some efforts made to use a better language, and there were also efforts made last years thanks to repeated initiatives from representatives from us like Sebastian to have documents translated, that you cannot expect all people in such a complex terminology can read reports in English.

And to always give a big advantage to native speakers, and if you want a high scope of participation, if you except the people to understand the material, then you need a better understood language, even in English. And then you need translations, of key documents at least, into other languages. 31.6% consider not enough know how in our ALS. Yes of course a lot the current ICANN issues are not on the agenda necessarily of all our ALSs.

And so maybe periods there are members what it might say in it, what are these guys discussing about, this is always, I think this may be the ups and downs in the membership when you sometimes have the impression now this in my main concern and then as they get better involved in the current discussion and sometimes there is a point on the agenda where they feel less concerns. And, regarding the whole variety of ICANN issues, this is not surprising. Again, these are small members orgs they have the focus and they cannot cover the variety of all subjects that is you have to take into consideration. Sixty-three percent refer to other obstacles like language problems and especially again and again capacity and funding problems.

The last questions, I don't want to go into details in the context of an ALAC review. After long standing discussions we came up with certain recommendations; very pin-pointed recommendations. This is important for people who were closely involved in this discussion and they could

understand this question, but even when we outlined them it's the questionnaire. I think this is a question too complex for people who are not regularly involved. And it's not surprising that many people didn't answer this question and simply pointed to the answers.

I think this as basic results of this last survey, and it was important for At-Large staff, I think, for some of the findings were interesting for us to better know our membership. For me, a lasting problem is still the inreach. Having twenty seven certified member organizations of the stragic level we set, last year I think, one of our aims is having one ALS per country in Europe to be somehow representative as Regional At-Large Organization.

You shouldn't have too many wide spots on your European map where you are not present. Wide spots still are Northern Europe, wide spots are still is Eastern Europe, just to say at the moment we only have one member in Bulgaria and we have one in Romania. I hope to have in Moldavia soon, a new member. I wish to have new members in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungaria and the countries of the former Chugoslavia, and this for me a must. But, this is very dialectical in my eyes. It cannot be the only goals recruiting new members and not taking care that the existing members actively participate. And this is a question of inreach, how can we assure that our 27 members participate in our work in a regular way?

According all this to their own priorities, but this is important and we have to think about this issues and I think one of the easiest responses, the better our discussions correspond to the daily issues, the better they will participate, feel integrated, maybe this kind of correlation. But this is a challenge for us and this is something we have to discuss in detail on our next monthly calls and this will be, I think, an issue again for the agenda planning for our next general assembly. Yes, Rudi?

Rudi Vansnick:

Maybe just one comment, when we say we have 27 ALSs in Europe, if we compared to the number of members states, it's okay, we have 27 members that's represented. But, that's wrong. I think we have to clarify also that the majority are coming from Germany. If I'm not wrong, eight or nine are coming from Germany, which is 1/3 of the 27. So we need definitely others to be representative for Europe. And, aside from Olivier, I can mention that there probably come one from Portugal as soon as Portugal is going to be recognized and starting up, there will be another

one. But we need more from East Europe, also. Belgium could probably be the next one, too.

Wolf Ludwig: Sebastian?

Sebastian Bachollet: We need to try to fulfill a goal to as you say of one ALS in each European country. And we have try to find and I hope will be able to find maybe as a chapter, but I hope we will be able to find other organization. We need to control diversity within our member. We need really to increase consumer organization participation, woman organization from all the country and let's try to from most European country, at least one in each country, whatever organization it will be. Thank you.

Wolf Ludwig: Patrick?

Patrick Vande Walle: Yes, obviously we need to - or let me restate that, ICANN needs new ALSs to add to the different RALO's, and I do insist on ICANN needs new ALSs. We as RALO members and ALSs can help ICANN to get new ALSs, but I don't like the general attitude of ICANN to outsource its public relationships thing to volunteers paid pro bono, and then ask as I said earlier today in the ALAC meeting, and just say because you are doing that we will penalize you financially on your ALAC budget.

So what I think we need is the we tell though different means be it to comments on the budget or whatever, you, ICANN, needs all these new ALSs to be able to claim that you have wide representativity an wide advice from all the community and in this aspect we, EURALO, can maybe help you. But it's not like ICANN should blame us because we don't do the necessary outreach. We have enough work on our plate. And I'm thinking of all these documents we get less than three weeks before the meetings with all the comments periods that expire within one week after the meeting.

And this is enough work for us volunteers to do, and if we are asked above that to also do out reach, in an non-professional manner because we are not PR people, we can tell our friends, look it would be nice if you would join us in ALS, that's one thing. But, there is another part which is convincing these ALSs that they will have a return on their part of their time investment into ICANN. And, I'm not sure that we have the best tools to do that. Thank you.

Wolf Ludwig:

Thanks, Patrick. Well, it's clear to me that outreach meets two unique capacity forces. If we would have travel funding to our disposal we could make sure that Board members or other members will be present at current events in their country where you may be find other organizations, you can discuss with them and try to get them involved. We tried at different levels, already the yearly domain ports in Germany, Austria, or Switzerland.

This is just one of many opportunities that you may find new people. I think the only chance we have is to use existing for us European dialogue on internet governance, is to me again, another very important opportunities. The next international outreach will be in (inaudible 01:00:00). I think there will be a lot of European representatives over there. This is a must for me to do outreach for EURALO.

Talking about Eastern Europe, the Dipple Foundation has excellent network in Southeastern and Eastern European countries because they did a lot of European capacity building programs in these countries and the majority of participants are from these countries. And, I think we have to improve our networking with likeminded organizations. And we have to use all programs, conferences and events as possible and being present and talking with people. This is the way I think you slowly by slowly can find, identify new interested organizations.

We won't be overrun in the near future I'm sure, but we have to first identify where we can act in the direction, also interest them organization, internet use organizations, consumer organizations, civil rights organizations is still very important even if the majority of our existing ALSs are from the civil rights movement into digital age and as our most recent certified member we had Wikimedia Chapter Switzerland. And Wikimedia Chapter's is also very interesting network, worldwide network with many chapters in European countries and I will most probably participate in the next Wikimedia at the beginning in July in Poland.

And of course, I'm there in another context, but of course I will have some EURALO flyers with me and of course I will try to attract some more Wikipedia Chapters and I hope I can convince them to apply for membership. This is also, I think, the very interesting people, they are mostly standing for the open access movement, but many of them are very literate in ICANN issues and also interested. And I was quite pleased when we had this recent application from Switzerland. And this is opening

another spectrum where we can identify potential new members. Any other questions regarding Point 6, yes, Sebastian?

Sebastian Bachollet: I don't know if it is point 6 or one later but, what is coming from this survey is very interesting, but at the same time it gives us the no answer of some ALSs must ask, request us to know if it's why? If it's too complicated, is it because they are out of work, it's because they don't care anymore about At-Large, ICANN, EURALO, whatever you want to mean. I think when we will get to the point of who you one day the ALSs member of EURALO will have to vote in an orderly manner for the Director position we will be request to show evidence of existence. And I think the survey is one way to show existence for the ones that answer. For the ones that no answer we need to find out if they still exist, and it will give us more information. And I don't know if it is point 6 or a later one, but I wanted to make this remark now. Thank you.

Wolf Ludwig: Thanks Sebastian. Well, I think I agree with you the next opportunity is what we agreed already months ago on our monthly call, that we will do a consultation in the context of the At-Large Director selection process and this is something to be done soon. I think will not be so complicated because we won't ask them 10, 15 questions, with a variety of sub-questions.

We, in this context, will ask for nominations, suggestions, and then if we have nominations, we do consultations on the candidates and the preference of the candidates. So the outcome is open, but I think this is to be quite clear that consulting our membership about preferences for having a next At-Large voting director on the ICANN Board is for me we had this discussion, partly contervisal discussion, during some monthly calls and we simply have to do it.

The process, as Christopher explained just in the meeting before, was delayed by several reasons, but I think in the next couple of weeks, I wouldn't suggest you do this during the summer break, but we have to do this communication consultation soon. And this is the next opportunity to find out to what extent we can count on some mobilization. And mobilization is always difficult as you know. But, we have to do it.

Sebastian Bachollet: One part of my question it's, I don't know the bylaw at all, even by heart, but do we have number of person, participation and then we need to be sure that the fact that maybe some will not answer, the out of work, will

not jeopardize the overall process. It's just something we have to be sure about. Is there no problem with the number, with the number of voters and so on and no problem? But I know that in other region it is a concern and I want to be sure in our region it is not a problem.

Wolf Ludwig: Rudi?

Rudi Vansnick: I wanted to jump on probably the next point of the agenda, the membership.

Wolf Ludwig: We are not yet at - go on.

Rudi Vansnick: The question I have is - it's related, we may be delayed because there is thirty minutes left and we have 6 other points to handle on the agenda which is quite a lot. In the sense of membership I have a big question about how are we validating or revalidating the certification of membership if they are not responding on several requests. That is one of the questions I have because, as you know, we are all around the table, we are almost 4 years, 5 years, 6 years, working and working, on being present in ICANN meetings doing what trying to do we are expected to do.

But at the other side, if they are just taking advantage to be there and be a member and take advantage of being a member and not doing anything, I have a bad feeling. And I really want to know if we are going to do something in the sense that we are going to classify dormant members and active members? Because this could influence a lot of decisions, and as I have done the surveys relations between CCTLD's and ALSs as I expressed an hour two hours ago, it's difficult to make a statement on a percentage if the number of participants in your survey is not representative on the whole of your membership.

And that makes really dangerous to express statements if only 50% have responded. So I really like to have an idea why in Europe we have not enough responding to our survey?

Wolf Ludwig: This is a number for us difficult, complicated issues at the same time. Let me first respond to Sebastian's question. What is in our bylaws? Bylaws to my memory clearly states change of bylaws you need 2/3's and you hardly ever have the quorum for making substantial bylaw changes.

Normally, we need the majority and the majority is bound to quorum to the number of ALSs we have and representation.

In Mexico, for example, or at Paris at the last two General Assemblies we always had good majorities, so we were in a position. In a consultation procedure you do not need a formal majority. A consultation procedure, according to what I learned in Switzerland, is a consultative thing and even if the participation is rather low, what is normally in the referendums and in Switzerland almost never reaching 50%, so in Switzerland effectually, this has an impact because the referendum is a symbol of majority.

In a referendum you can stop the law or you drop something, but a consultation doesn't necessarily need even if you have a low return shows as a picture of preferences and this does need to be 100% in line with the regulations with our bylaws. The second question, what you, Rudi, mentioned, this is something we have to discuss more. We will bring to the Secretariat's Meeting because it's only a problem of EURALO, what we do about the members who never response, what we call in term (catalie).

And we can say, okay we converse them in our mailing list, but I agree it is not a good solution. We have to discuss about it. We have to try to re-contact them and as a consequence have to think about we have to discuss different levels of memberships, depending on activity, depending on participation, but this is a scenario. We will start this discussion tomorrow at the Secretariat's Meeting, and I would like to continue this discuss at the next General Assembly be a continued discussion. Rudi again.

Male: I've got to go. I want to say a couple of things very quickly because otherwise, you won't hear them. Discussing individual memberships, I fully support it and introducing individual members and I suggest we follow as close as possible in our, in the North American RALO, because that makes sense. General Assembly – will miss, please. That's about it, I'm sorry for running away.

Wolf Ludwig: This is noted. Rudi?

Rudi Vansnick: Just to follow up on what you were mentioning, it is also related to what Sebastian has mentioned. Having the election of a Director coming up soon, soon, we don't know, is it weeks, months? Depends on the

acceptation of the - nullification of bylaws. If that is not done it makes no sense to elect a Director. So we first have to go through the approval, if I'm not wrong, of that bylaw. On the other side, if we want to be enforced to elect a European member, we need enough voting capacity and that's why I'm urging our association, if I may say, to go forward and find out how many are really going to vote, because this can influence the position of our candidate in Europe.

Wolf Ludwig:

Be careful Rudi. No confusion in terms. We didn't - we have not decided that we do the voting. We do a consultation. This is a different issue. There are voices who said if you do the consultation why you don't let them vote. The voting option would be more risky because if you couldn't organization enough participation voting is useless. Therefore, I think the consultation option was a comprise and the consultation option is also based on our previous discussion we had yesterday when we said.

Because according to the scenario which is on the table so far, it is said EURALO needs participate in the voting. If I will have this function one day, I would like to have my vote based on at least a consultation of all members because it make no sense in this context if I follow my personal opinion my personal preference. EURALO Chair is a political mandate and must reflect the will of the community.

And therefore, for me if I one day have to contribute to the Board's selection of candidate I would like to have my vote, my part, based on result from our Region, just as simple as that. Any other comments to? Because time is running short, I would like to now start with Point 7. This is discuss the EURALO's membership discussion of your EURALO membership for new members. This is an issue we know from the very beginning before EURALO was created in March 2007, in Lisbon.

Even before ALAC, it was a repeated discussion at the two prep meetings at Frankfurt at May 2006 and at Berlin in September 2006. We had almost clashes of interests over this question and at our first draft of the bylaws, as far as I remember, individuals were included already and this version 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10; I don't remember how many bylaw versions, draft versions we had. It became more and more excluded. One strong argument for excluding them was the balance among individuals and organizations to have when it comes to voting in General Assemblies individuals have the same voting power weight as organizations.

And many of the organizational representatives say no way. And for these reasons we didn't, at the start of EURALO, we didn't include them. According to the bylaws practically we included them. I just want to refer to the first ICANN Board, EURALO Board, after the creation, Charley Hoffman was individual membership. She was Co-Chair the first year she was an individual member.

We have Bill Drake being an individual member. We have Olivier being an individual member. So, we never excluded individuals from the working level, but there are so far restrictions for encouragement. And including them in an active way to say, "Listen people, you are welcome if you are interested, and if you do not represent, or if you do not delegated, mandated by a organization you can join us in your individual capacity."

And in the mean time we have I think its clear voting we vote, individuals being regularly included at EURALO. I think over this question there is no dissent any more, the question is how? Therefore I asked Evan, because in a North America they are already part, even with the bylaws, and we would need to modify our bylaws in the way of the NARALO solution or find our own way, but now we are now discussing about how not if we will include them. And now I would like to give the floor to Evan just describe how you found your solution.

Evan Leibovitch: The way that NARALO implemented this, which was by the way, from day one our creation, which was in San Juan when we signed the Memorandum of Understanding with ICANN for the first time. We've always had in our operating principals the concept of individual members alongside ALSs. The current way that we handle this is that we have effectively a virtual ALS that is comprised of all our individual members.

So come voting time, if there is a vote that is one vote per ALS, our individual unaffiliated members collectively have the same vote as one ALS. Previously when we've had to have formal votes such as for elected ALAC representatives or things like that, what we've done is we've appointed one of the non-affiliated people to do a vote within the unaffiliated members and then to themselves vote as if they were the ALS rep when it came time to do the vote.

Since then we have found from the Big Pulse that it is actually possible to do this automatically. That the individual people will be able to cast a vote in one pool and the ALSs will vote in another pool, Big Pulse its' self

will collect the votes from the unaffiliated people and then register the preferences from that as a single vote alongside the ALSs. So we've actually found out from Big Pulse this can be automated to which us allows to keep it totally a closed secret vote, which we technically haven't been able to do until now. But now we have the wherewithal to do that.

Our main challenge right now is auditing the individual members. As of right now, things had been very casual. We have maintained a mailing list. Merely by joining the mailing list people have been able to assert themselves as individual members. As we go forward to the process for electing a Board representative we know that we have to get the details of this down significantly. So, we will be going through audit members in advance to that, which means that subscribing to a mailing list as we move forward will not likely be sufficient.

Wolf Ludwig: Thank you Evan for your explanations. Patrick now, and then Sebastian and then Rudi.

Patrick Vande Walle: Thank you Evan it was indeed quite interesting how you managed that. I just hope that you don't have Jim Fleming on your mailing list. And, it is being said regardless if you have ten individual members or one hundred individual members it just results to one vote, as I understand it.

Evan Leibovitch: Exactly. Simply in much the same ways we have ALSs with ten members and ALSs with hundreds of members and even at that level they each have one vote, so that argument has essentially been dealt with that way because our ALSs have all various sizes anyway.

Patrick Vande Walle: First, because we discussed this when we formed EURALO we ended up with a proposal for a system with a weighted voting where according to the number of members in ALSs and individuals and so on, and this was one of the reasons why, because we didn't see how really we could implement that in everyday life, this was one of the reasons why we didn't do it. But as you now explain that it's possible to do such a thing through Big Pulse, it will be much easier to do.

Wolf Ludwig: Sebastian, okay.

Sebastian Bachollet: I have another question. How to handle conflicts of interest in the sense that when you have a hundred individuals how can you be sure that they have the same interest? If one is interested in having more activity in

regards to security, while another group has some other opinions on what which should be done by the RALO, how are you going to weigh that? Just aside the fact of voting, you are coming back to the question we had from the beginning of the EURALO.

Evan Leibovitch: I can't answer it theoretically, but I can answer it practically, in the sense that we've actually found this method and the simplicity, the relative simplicity of this method with no waiting between ALSs of different sizes and no virtual ALSs for unaffiliated members. We found the simplicity of this has actually worked out to our benefit. In fact when we have our monthly meetings, we find that we able to accomplish most of what we need by consensus; even though we have some very, very diverse view points.

We are able to find in most matters - in most decisions we can find common ground enough to put forward significant policies, significant work. I'm certainly not ashamed of the work that NARALO has done over the last couple of past years and most of it has been done by consensus. I can't guarantee that would itself transfer to every other region, but I can only say as a matter of practicality that we have not had to deal with issues like this.

We're aware of people who are representative of RALO's usually when they do have a conflict we know when we have a lawyer within our group who has represented people on IPC issues. We're aware of people who have, or in some cases, do work for registrars, but, still identify themselves with At-Large when they are part of our group. I guess we've gone out of our way not to worry about motivation and to worry about result. And we just, I don't know whether it's luck or skill or just the determination by people to try and get something done but this hasn't been a problem for us.

Wolf Ludwig: Rudi, again.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, thank you Evan for the clarification, the only concern I have is that if one ALS wants to have a stronger position how are we going to accept the fact that from that ALS several individuals could step in as an individual member just to enforce position? That's a question which I don't have an answer, yet. But happens if from one ALS you have individuals saying, "Okay I'm becoming an individual member" while they are still a member of an ALS. How are you going to identify that difference? That's a question I have. I know you have probably already encountered this but I

think it's a concern we have to consider. If at a certain moment this pops up at another level, this could harm the At-Large.

Wolf Ludwig: May I make a short comment before I give the floor? This reminds me of the climate of the discussion we had at the beginning. The whole discussion before the creation of EURALO was dominated by the abuse perception. No one was concentrating on potential event situations, etc. Everybody was worst case, if one cow in Switzerland would meet a goat and what would they do together, these kinds of rather absurd scenarios.

Exactly this would be the worst or worst cases therefore we said, Rudi, we don't care whether an ALS applicant is a small organization a bigger one a bigger one a bigger one. We never had to North American case a consumer union which was representing nine million of members, which could have said – be nine members be counted at least nineteen ALSs compared with other small groups in your membership? I think you will never come to an end.

Evan Leibovitch: Again, to me this is a matter separating the theory from the practicality. You've already heard my ideas before of how we deal with large consumer groups by giving them a home within ALAC in which they can rub corners with other large organizations, so there's a way of accommodating that. But Rudi, an actually fact, our worst case situation was having people wanted to get involved in At-Large, but could not. That was our worst case scenario, so we were coming at it from the other side of things.

As a volunteer organization and this is not just ICANN, this is any where you have volunteerism getting people interested and willing to help is challenge number one. So heaven forbid if we get four people from one ALS who want to work, who want to get involved in working groups, who want to contribute time. We should have such problems, right? So to be honest with you, that has not been a concern so much. The capture issue, I understand what you're saying, but generally speaking our issue has been that people who are not affiliated with ALSs don't believe they should have to join a ALS with which they may not agree or which they may not identify simply to get involved in ICANN At-Large. So that was the primary thing we were trying to solve.

We have not yet run into a situation where we have an ALS with multiple people and they are looking to all capture us. Could that conceivably

happen? Our situation is that we are not going to try and regulate against every possible wrong that could happen, right now that hasn't been an issue. Our challenge has been getting enough people to help, to show up and to participate in votes and be active. And so, like I say, if multiple people show up from an ALS in order to do that, I would welcome them rather than shoo them away.

Wolf Ludwig: Thanks a lot, Evan. We are running out of time. I think I really have now to - let me do according to our agenda make a formal suggestion. We have to prepare something for the General Assembly. I just suggest we take the model case of NARALO, I will do with staff a comparison of bylaws, or whether it's written in your memo. Okay so we will take this and put this as a suggestion. I offer Rudi - if you want to develop an alternative option for the General Assembly you can do it.

So we can go into the General Assembly saying in principal we want it, yes. There is concerns about we want it. Now, let's discuss again, and unfortunately here today we don't have time left to discuss it, it can be an exciting discussion, so if we have an Option 2 and an Option 3, the better to me. Then we present it to General Assembly and then find out what is the preference of the majority for which Option 2 makes the bylaw modifications it comes true at EURALO s well. Is this acceptable?

Patrick Vande Walle: Just one second. In regards this, what I'm pointing to and what is important, in the survey we have been requesting who is the second and who is the third contact, and we are literally blaming ALSs that they don't give a second or third contact, in that sense it is in contradiction. We are saying that individual's cannot have a second and third contact. So already we have to be careful when we do surveys that the future we not ask such questions anymore. Otherwise we are bringing ourselves not respectful for what others cannot deliver. You see what I mean?

Wolf Ludwig: Let me ask Olivier, you had your hands up. Do you still want to contribute?

Olivier Crepin-Lebond: Thanks Wolf for looking at my hands up. I was going to comment on the previous thing individual membership, but I think we have now moved on to the EURALO G.A. and I don't want to delay the whole process.

Wolf Ludwig: No, formally we are still on the previous point, so if you have a comment on that, please go ahead.

Olivier Crepin-Lebond: Thank you Wolf. I just think, I agree with what NARALO is working on, I think it is interesting. There's one thing with which we do need to remember the dock needs at At-Large to place. In the early 2000's when the At-Large was somehow captured through certain votes. Of course, we were dealing with a completely different ICANN structure, different At-Large structure. At the time we didn't have RALO's, we didn't have ALSs, and all that and I think that was one of the reasons why the whole structure was put together like this.

With regards to having one vote per ALS, I think I fully support it, it's something which has always been in place. And perhaps as we said, we could have a virtual ALS and that's also an excellent idea. So being one of those individuals without an ALS there, I think that it's probably important for something like that to happen very soon.

I regularly get people coming to me when I'm do outreach and saying, "Oh but I'm not part of an ALS, how can we join, how can we do work, how can we take part?" And I think doing something about this ASAP will certainly expand At-Large. Thank you very much.

Wolf Ludwig: Thanks Olivier. I think you summarized several aspects we have to discuss at the General Assembly, again. As still a lot of aspects involved. My question now is regarding the time, how can we organize this process at the General Assembly in autumn? I think these are the key issues for our next monthly call to discuss these details again to solidly prepare our General Assembly.

To shorten this procedure a little bit down and now coming to the next agenda item, a preparation of next EURALO General Assembly in autumn, may I make a suggestion? That this will be in the time of the next IGF which is the 14th until the 17th of September, the place is Venues, is there any object against this proposal?

Rudi Vansnick: Just a question. If there are doing this outside ICANN Meetings, will there be coverage for participation? It's on own cost, just clarification.

Wolf Ludwig: Yes, I think I have to be between honest or pessimist by saying we can try it. I think there is no way we can get it. My assumption was that several of our members will go to the IGF any how. And yes?

Rudi Vansnick: I guess what you are saying that we will have an online General Assembly and some of the same participants will be in the same room, because they will be in Venues, which is good. And therefore it is the reason why you suggest to take this date during the Venues meeting.

Wolf Ludwig: No, it was rather more pragmatic. My thinking was there will be several members, Board members traveling to Venues to the IGF and then we would organize the room and I would ask ICANN to care for remote participation. That we get these technical things supported by ICANN. Otherwise - well, when we said in our bylaws, that exceptionally, at the General Assembly, with a Virtual General Assembly is possible, what we find out, okay then we will do it, but do we have to organize it completely on our own?

Evan Leibovitch: Unfortunately I cannot give you an answer at this point. I would suggest I take this up with my boss, and her boss and perhaps also, more coming from IGF, because I assume it would ultimately be the IGF Secretariat who organizes the remote participation.

Wolf Ludwig: Okay this would be the points which will need further clarification. Do you find - let me ask you this way, do you find it a good suggestion, doing it in the context in the frame of the IGF in Venues, I'm asking myself as we should we perhaps we should do or could do a General Assembly, now we have to find out with staff what would be the conditions if it's feasible, if it makes sense and does the feasible circumstances and let's decide when we decide out more, whether we will have a set date and set place.

And since we have to decide, I think, in July at our next call, do I have enough time to prepare it incase we go for the stated option of during the IGF in Venues? Then I think the agenda items will be rather clear. We will have to discuss what we started discussing today as a conclusion from the survey, how could we improve end reach? How could we improve outreach? And we would re-discuss the individual memberships and hopefully having three, one, two, three options on the table to work from. Is this scenario works for you? Okay any objections?

Sebastian Bachollet: To the one point we need not to miss, my term end at the end of this year and then we have to be sure that we under my replacement on time to be seated at the end of the AGM At-Large meeting. Yes, it is in this year.

Wolf Ludwig: I think it will be autumn who will be the Non-Com appointed ALAC Representative for Europe. And we have to discuss these issues, keep in mind we have to put this point on the agenda of the General Assembly. Whatever date, wherever it will happen? I regret we are not in a position to continue much longer, as the update ICANN Brussels Meeting was considered in the case you have would have broader participation remote, et cetera, from at least 3, 4, 5 people who would not have to had the chance being here, et cetera.

And I think it's only Olivier who is still, and Fidel on the call, sorry Manuel I over saw you, would you be - would you agree if I reduce this literally - we will meet Manuel or we be having a phone call and we will brief Olivier. And I now can cut down on the agenda items as much as possible because I think as far as I was told we don't have much grace period here left over.

Next point would be recent and up-coming activities of ALAC, this is something we discussed, already under Point 4 of the standing agenda items. Announcements and up coming events, recent upcoming activities of EURALO members, let's combine Point 11 and 12, any announcements? As I said before I will most probably go to Wiki Mania and I would probably take some flyers. I think this would be a good opportunity for to do something. But, whether we find out if the IGF is feasible for the General Assembly, there will be members in the IGF and we will of course use this for outreach.

Male: Just a question. Do we know how many people will attend the IGF from EURALO or do you have an estimation?

Wolf Ludwig: This is a good question. As far as I was I was informally, I think at least five. Five is not much, therefore participation is so low, and then it makes of course no sense to organize a General Assembly over there. This would be again somehow, symbolic and I would like to discuss at the next opportunity also the option what we discussed before.

We don't know what will be the funding situation in 2011, for the subsequent General Assembly. My idea would be to organize it

conjunction with the next EURODECK which will be in Belgrade, we have five members from EURALO at ERODEK in Madrid, at least. It would be a consideration and for this I would follow, and that's stretchy, for this I would also try to identify sponsors and sponsoring opportunity in the conjunction of EURODECK. Sorry Rudi?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, thank you Wolf. I think it is important that we wait until we have the information coming back from ICANN. And, I'm just picking up on what Patrick has mentioned earlier, ICANN should help us to do our job. And this fits perfectly in that request. They want us to be operational at Regional Level. It's up to ICANN to bring up the money to make it possible to organize a General Assembly that is representative and not just a few calls to appoint in Europe.

And that's why I would like to have first some reflections from ICANN if there is any way to combine this in another meeting aside ICANN official meetings. If that's not possible then we have to consider that we have only General Assemblies during ICANN Meetings and it solves the question immediately.

Patrick Vande Walle: I'm not sure I understood the question. Are you asking whether there will be funding from ICANN for people to attend meetings outside ICANN meetings to hold General Assemblies?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, in the sense that we know that a General Assembly is held by a limited number, those who are recognized to being of the general part of the General Assembly, it is not two hundred, we are twenty-seven. And that is one of the reasons why I was asking to identify those who are active and those who are not active. Those who are active could have funding, those not active, no funding. That's the first step you can propose, and then maybe ICANN can easily give a clarification okay, those who have collaborated. Otherwise it is out of our pocket again. And, I have to repeat what Patrick says, it's ICANN's job to help us do it.

Patrick Vande Walle: Yes, well that's not exactly what I - yes, that's what I said, in the context of going out and recruit new ALSs. When it comes to General Assemblies, our bylaws are clear, they can be made face to face, by a teleconference or a combination of both. So there is absolutely no reason for ICANN, and this time I will defend ICANN if necessary, there is absolutely no relatively reason for ICANN to say okay we will give you money to go to Venue's to go to a three hour meeting and then fly you

back home. It seems to me that is really throwing money out of the window.

Wolf Ludwig: I'm not sure that I understood your point. To organize General Assembly somewhere in the (inaudible 01:52:46) for three hours makes no sense at all in my eyes. Therefore it would be better solution to contextualize it as an event that is happening this autumn somewhere in Europe. And it will be a question again next year, as to my knowledge there won't be an ICANN Meeting next year in Europe, therefore we have to think about when there is no ICANN Conference, ICANN Meeting 2011, where to have the General Assembly. That was the reason, what I discussed with Wolfgang Kleinwachter. It could make sense to have this in conjunction with EURODECK what will be in summer and not in spring in Belgrade. And -

Patrick Vande Walle: I hear you.

Female: We think it will be 31st and first of May and fist of June, so it's spring.

Wolf Ludwig: If we go to the - it won't be the calendar nightmare of this year, end of April and I think it is the worst time of the year and we didn't make critical reflection. I think the timing was a disaster this year. And I think so if it would, just in case, it will be in Belgrade in spring, I would not make the suggestion to organize it in conjunction - these are options, options here we are talking about, we cannot make any decisions on it.

We can only say we are in a dilemma, according to the bylaws we have to organize one. And it makes no sense now to try another couple of weeks because we will not have the funding we would have expected. We have to follow pragmatic considerations. If we organize something then if we try to upload it a little bit it makes sense (inaudible 01:55:01) IGF if people from us are going. If only two noses are going it makes no sense.

Male: Need, I agree. I agree that there could be several people who are by chance at the same place at the same time and could gather into a meeting room and that would make one phone call from their side rather than three or four different phone calls from all over Europe. But that doesn't change the fundamental that it would be mostly a GA by tela-conference, only for the fact that while you might have three people in the room other than one, but that's the only difference.

Wolf Ludwig: Okay, [Zimphra].

[Zimphra]: I would support this for EURODECK as well, because it would be also our possibility to pull in new members. Because there are various people, especially from the Eastern part of Europe, there and maybe this could be an easy platform not to do ICANN's work but to promote the EURALO platform and the technical structure like remote participation and all these things are there so you don't have to do the things twice if you organize in Europe on a place nowhere.

So you easily can use the common structure and of course ICANN should support those people to go to EURODECK it's only a two day meeting, it's not a week like Venue's, it's only two days. And so, it's maybe quite easy for ICANN for the EURALO members to go there and to also to promote EURALO's structure in the Eastern part of Europe.

Wolf Ludwig: Okay, I think we now know about what we have. We know the scenarios of the options and this is something we have to re-discuss in July call we have to do a lot of clarifications in between. But it's what we can expect, if at all, from ICANN's side. I don't expect an answer Matthias.

Matthias Langenegger: I'm not going to give an answer because I don't have one at the moment. But I just wanted to point out that the draft budget that just came out a couple of weeks ago mentions one regional GA in three years, so now making the case that there's a GA every year without any reference to the actual budget, I'm not sure if that's a very successful strategy.

Sebastian Bachollet: Sorry, I am using the mike, but I'm not so close. Just to say we are having a meeting with Keri Woodson the CFO and it would be one subject about the General Assembly. And I think what we request was a little bit change, but it's a progress to have something - to have one General Assembly face to face in three years, and there are - but we still need to request that. In my view to have one General Assembly face to face each time ICANN come to Europe, it's more than one each three years it's one each one and half or two years, it depends. We need to have the facility for the year where we don't have a European ICANN Meeting to organize smoothly one General Assembly. Not to say we will need travel support, but to at least have the technical support to have a meeting when and where we can.

Matthias Langenegger: Just to add to what Sebastian said, it's probably the better way to discuss this directly with Kevin. And also, it has been previously said that meetings can be held in other venues in those years when ICANN doesn't have a meeting in these regions because that would save a lot of travel cost. And I think approaching Kevin with this idea would be a better strategy to get him involved. There could be an option for future meetings. So perhaps next year if there is not meeting in Europe then, EURODECK could be a very good option because there are members within EURALO who are already going to that meeting anyways.

Wolf Ludwig: Thanks Matthias. I don't understand why suddenly, according to my perception, why there is more misunderstanding on the table as there is clarification, I think it was quite clear that nobody here expects from ICANN this year any support for the General Assembly.

Okay, and for next year we have to discuss and let me a bit cynical now, I think if ICANN is now suggesting one face-to-face meeting every three years, then we have to reconsider the Memorandum of Understanding with ICANN, because there are certain obligations in the Memorandum of Understanding with ICANN already and if ICANN is violating this then let's think about engaging a nice good lawyer who is doing us a good price a suit against ICANN.

I'm now in just a kind of cynical scenario. But it makes no sense to make signing Memorandums of Understanding and provoking expectations on At-Large structure afterwards, saying, "Sorry guys we have no money so you can do nothing." And you are always in a stage where you know what you could do, you know what you should do, but in the last minute working with emergency frame and stopping everything down, this is, don't take this personally, this is just assuming now the situation. And there is Olivier who raised his hand, at the last vote, the last word I give to Olivier now.

Olivier Crepin-Lebond: Thanks very much Wolf. I just want to lend my support to what Sebastian said; I think the idea of whenever ICANN has an Assembly taking place in Europe, there should be a EURALO General Assembly, as well. At the same time I also lend my support to Matthias, I believe it was Matthias who spoke about proposing to Kevin that we conduct General Assemblies when EURALO is taking place as well, in between those years when ICANN doesn't having something place in Europe. But I think those things should be taken over to Kevin Wilson, and I do hope,

unfortunately I won't be able to make it, I do hope whenever it is taking place the message will go over to Kevin. Thank you very much.

Wolf Ludwig: Thank you very much Olivier. We started, I think, 17, 18 minutes behind our schedule, now we are 23 minutes behind our schedule now. I think our time is over now. I think what was important for today was said, or has to be postponed to our July call, which is open to anybody for remote participation. We have this monthly call at a fixed date, at a fixed time and it is adigo. We just do telephone conference and everybody interested is welcome to participate.

I think I have to close down now our today's meeting. I thank you all for your active participation. Thanks to the remote participants Manuel and Olivier, at the beginning there was still Christopher who had to leave. And I also would like to thank our guests for being with us today. And I would just like my final sentence to say we are open to attract people for active participation. So if you are interested, please, you are welcome. Thank you all and wish you nice evening.

--End of recorded material--