
SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. We will take the roll call with the people in the AC room, except myself, who is just on the phone. I'm Sebastien Bachollet. Do we have any other participants who are just on the phone, please?

Okay. Not hearing anybody, I guess everybody's in the AC room. Good.

I have prepared a slide deck that you have received. I will go quickly through the first pages. We have two new members. You will see the list and we have the number of participants for each meeting and all the different day and time of our next meeting.

I wanted to give you some feedback of our preparatory meeting yesterday and to let you know that we will have a plenary tomorrow. I hope that tomorrow I will be able to come with a question we had since two or three weeks to the plenary. We didn't have the chance to prevent it last time. Hopefully this time we will be able to do it.

Avri's online. In terms of, I will say, difference of understanding about ATRT2, my understanding is that there were some questions of the Board, but after exchanging with the co-Chair, it seems that it's not that we have to do what it was sent to us by the staff about ATRT2 issue regarding the Ombudsman.

I know, Avri, that you [inaudible]. Anyhow, let's go and do it. Do you have any other information or expectation about this specific issue?

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.

AVRI DORIA:

I don't know what expectations I have. I certainly did not have an expectation of moving the talk to the Board. I believe that we need to look at the stuff. You've had the experts and the staff is giving them also, of the pending issues. That was enough. I'm not sure what needed to go to the Board on this.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, I understand, Avri. I was a little bit surprised because I had an exchange with the co-Chair today that, in the previous [preparatory] meeting, it was told to me not to talk about the question about ATRT2 to the plenary. That's why I was a little bit surprised.

But okay. To [mind], we will take that on Board completely and not wait for anybody to accept our participants to these items. Thank you, Avri.

The other question will be linked with PTI, but we already discussed at length this situation. During the last meeting, we had a good exchange about the Transparency Drafting Team linked with our group. I have included, just cut and paste the note of our last meeting to the document you have received by the same mail. I'm sorry for sending it so late.

In the general point of view, I would like to know what is your feeling now. I don't see how we can make the deadline for adding something complete by Hyderabad. It's now for Copenhagen. Have you any thought about that? Any inputs?

I was really willing to have something for Hyderabad, just to show that we, as a full group of Work Stream 2 – one group is [going ahead] – but we are not able to do it, I guess.

But if you have any comments [inaudible], please, I would like to have your inputs.

Okay. If nobody has some inputs –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sebastien, Cheryl here.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Mainly to break the silence, I suppose. I'm not sure, but it's not that we don't have anything for Hyderabad. The Hyderabad meeting, though, is not going to be for the silos. We will be bringing the attendees in Hyderabad up to date on the progress of the work so far and having the opportunity to look at any sort of review of some of the questions and challenges that may or may not have been met by our group or any of the others.

In the afternoon session, as far as I thought I understand, anyway, we also have the opportunity to look at some particular topics that we might need to identify as a work team now or in the near future to have as [agenda-wise] specific conversations for the afternoon session, but

also to look at some of the discussion points that [inaudible] to come out in the morning's deliberations for deeper discussions.

So I don't think we're going to be unable to show the progress. It's just that we won't be putting the fully-templated final draft report through, which obviously was the original intent. So it's not a terribly bad outcome, and it may be that we will still finalize a lot of our work before Copenhagen and have that interaction with public comment or whatever. It could just be that the final reporting will occur with a Copenhagen deadline. Just a comment from me.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. Any other comments?

Okay. Then my wish is to have something also for the larger group, not just for the Work Stream 2. But never mind. We will do as we can and the best we can.

Okay. I don't know if there is other things on the PowerPoint we need to discuss. If I remember well, I guess we have gone – yeah. Let's go to the full document, if possible. My point of view about where we are: I [inaudible] that some other people take part of the document to [inaudible] because I can't just do it myself. First of all, it's not good, and, second, it will be more interesting to have more people involved. But I can understand that, at the same time, you have another [inaudible] already have a commitment with other groups, and it's difficult to do different groups and different documents.

That's one of the points we discussed and we will discuss during the meeting; that we need more involvement of participants. I'm not sure that the ones here today are the ones that can offer more time to discuss the document.

I don't know how you want and what you want to do now, but I don't think that it will be very useful to read it again together during this call. I have put every item we discussed and just without really organizing it. For example, I just took the notes from the last meeting just on the transparency part of the document.

Can I expect that we can [speed] the document and some of us take part of it? Or do I still need to work on and to propose you amend the document for next week?

Okay. I don't hear anybody. But I guess maybe we don't need to prolong this call if we don't have specific inputs about the document. But I would like very much that you take some time during the week to go through and to give me your feedback on what is missing. Or do we need to add other questions in other parts? It will be very useful to amend the document and to have something better for Hyderabad.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry. I was on mute, Sebastien. Cheryl here. Farzaneh asked in chat, "What's the mandate of our group, Sebastien?"

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: The major piece was to compare the current definition of the work of the Ombudsman and what is on the best practice. It's one of the

charters, the one with the different columns. It's the one with the first more important work to be done. I just cut and pasted to documents but nobody gets into detail of what is missing in one part or the other.

The second is that we are taking on board the ATRT2 recommendation, and we need to do a review the Ombudsman's office. I don't know if you agree with me, but I hope that what we will have done at the end of our work can be considered another review and that we will not to go outside [inaudible] for another review [inaudible].

I don't feel that it is must be our group's responsibility. It must be transferred to somebody else, but not us. It's why I consider that our group will do a review, maybe not the review that was intended in ATRT2, but one we can do.

[Folks in here who] are listed in the current – once again, as I am driving, I don't have all the elements by heart, but the main point is that I think we need to go through during our work. I hope it's just [inaudible]. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's Cheryl again, Sebastien. I'm going to check with Farzaneh. Farzi, is that everything you wanted?

FARZANEH BADI: Yes. Hi. Yes, that is fine. Thank you. I just want to know: what's the scope? I kind of understood, but I think it's also important to have it in the document. I can't find it here – I just [clicked the] beginning – so that we know when you are going out of scope if we are discussing

something that we shouldn't be discussing. For example, [costings] are set or are in [daylight]. What sorts of disputes does the Ombudsman solve? And questions like that. If it's not within this group's mandate to go to get details of that, I think. So the current role of the Ombudsman stays the same if there might be some additions to the role.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Cheryl again, Sebastien. Thanks, Farzi, for that. I also wanted to point out, Sebastien, that Chris in the chat has also put the following: "Herb made a useful suggestion about getting Andre Marin to do their review. They are assuming it is the major review of the Ombudsman, but it could actually be the review that you were referring to for our work. So I'll ask him to clarify that in a moment.

Is this still an option? I think someone with his standing would be most useful. Chris, did you want to speak to that before I get back to Seb?

[CHRIS LAHATTE]:

Hi. I think Herb made the case for in the past week. I think it's always useful to have an outsider's view of what we're doing. Andre Marin, of course, has got great standing in the Ombudsman community. So Herb, I guess, would say he agrees. There's a cost, of course, but I think we can probably find the budget for that somewhere. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Cheryl, do you think it's something that we have to take back to the plenary tomorrow and discuss about that? Or do we, I will say, leave that in the hand of the co-Chair and the Leadership Team you are participating in? I am [inaudible] that the discussions we're having tomorrow at the plenary, but I would like your advice on that.

CHERYL LANDGON-ORR: Sebastien, I think it's probably a little bit early to take it to the plenary, but I do think it's something that, as a team, we could support or otherwise. I'll come and say that I think it's an excellent idea. Thanks to Chris for clarification, although the audio wasn't terribly clear to me. I gathered from what you said, Chris, that it would be wise for us in our work to use Andre. I wholeheartedly support that.

We have always had the option to ask for support of whatever funding may or not be associated with such support of outside expertise. I think we can, because of the importance of the Ombud's office and its critical function to ICANN and so much of our ongoing accountability in our post-IANA transition world, make a very strong case that, particularly in the absence of, to my knowledge, any other Drafting Team requesting such outside expertise, such expertise to be pursued.

It's that's the case then, Sebastien, if your group does agree with that, perhaps in today's call, then it's something that we do need to quite quickly get to the co-Chairs and key staff, the reason being, as you remember, the staff were in the next week or so going to be looking at budget and expenditure for the whole of Work Stream 2 to see what they could release and shuffle and utilize and commit, not only in

human hour budget, but I assume in cost budgets as well for the work teams that want to have staff support for their writing of the final report.

If we were to – as I strongly suggest we should – look to having expenditure on the vital consultancy, as Herb [inaudible] has put forward to us, then we need to know about that very early so that that comes ahead of those budget deliberations in the next few days.

So I would suggest that, as an action item out of today’s meeting, assuming we all agree – and if you’d like, Sebastien, I will poll the room for you to see if that is the case – we pen a note out of this meeting to the co-Chairs and staff, alerting them of the fact that this may be the case. I’m assuming that Herb has the direct contacts that staff can call on him to reach out to Andre and get a quote or whatever’s required.

Sebastien, is it your wish that we poll that question then?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, please. Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Okay, if I could ask everyone who agrees that we should positively explore and request the co-Chairs to explore the very recommended option – or recommend the option that we have someone with the stature of Andre Marin do a review of the Ombud’s office? If you could put a green check in your Adobe Connect room. We will look for green checks. If you wholeheartedly and violently disagree with the concept, then feel free to put up a red cross.

I'm only seeing green. I'm not seeing green from everybody, but perhaps not everyone has the bandwidth to get the little green tick up in good [inaudible].

If you object to this and you'd like to let us know out of audio, do so now.

Herb, if you know where you can put your hand up. It is usually an agree or disagree button as well. But I will take the fact that you've made the proposal as your probable support of the proposal.

Sebastien, I'm not hearing or seeing any objections, so I think that's probably an action item that we need to take, and raise that suggestion with our co-Chairs for the wider plenary.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Very good. Thank you very much, everybody, and thank you, Cheryl. Okay. I don't know what to do now. I think if we take the document and go through it, I think we will lose our time. That's not using our time very efficiently.

I would like to know if you have any others items you want to discuss today. Please, feel free to tell now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay, Sebastien. It's Cheryl again. I'm just making sure I check the room for you. Is there anybody who has Any Other Business? Please raise your hand now. Or make your voice heard.

I'm not hearing or seeing anybody with Any Other Business, Sebastien, so it looks like you can probably give half-an-hour of our lives back to us.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, I guess it's better. Once again, sorry about this little bit of a disturbing from my side of the call and not very [inaudible]. But thank you very much for your cooperation, and thank you, Cheryl, for your very kind help.

Thank you, and let's talk next week. But I hope really that, during the week, we will have some exchange on mails. Work Stream 1 is behind us. It was gone. Thanks again for the participation of all the ones who have done it. [inaudible] we have the transition done, then it's time for us to deliver our Work Stream 2. I am sure we will do it as well as we have done it for Work Stream 1.

Thank you very much, everybody. Have a good day, good night, or good evening, wherever you are. You have half-an-hour back to your life, and that's, I hope, good for you.

Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANDGON-ORR: Thanks, Sebastien. Drive safe, and I do hope all goes well with your son. Bye for now.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]