

---

TERRI AGNEW:

We're going to begin now, one moment please.

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the At-Large ICANN Evolution call, taking place on Monday the 24<sup>th</sup> of October 2016 at 11:30 UTC.

On the call today we have Gordon Chillcott, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Glenn McKnight, Julie Hammer, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Harold Arcos, Alberto Soto, and Sebastien Bachollet. As well as Siva has joined us as well.

We have listed apologies from Maureen Hilyard, Tomohiro Fujisaki, and Tijani Ben Jemaa.

From staff we have myself, Terri Agnew.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. With this, I'll turn it back over to you Olivier. Please begin.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Terri. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And this is yet another call to catch-up on all of the work of work stream two activities. Today we are going to be focusing specifically on two things. The work stream subgroup on diversity and the work stream subgroup on the ombudsman. And we're also going to take some time on today's call to look at the part [inaudible] of the work stream two work, including the next steps for work stream two, and of course, the coordination that we are doing from an At-Large perspective.

---

*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.*

---

Is there anything else that we need to change on the agenda? Any amendments or additions?

I don't see anybody put their hand up, so it looks as though as the agenda is adopted, and we can quickly move to the next part of our agenda. Now, we had some, I don't even remember if we had some action items. I notice that we did not put any action items on, or any agenda thing for action items.

Let me just have a quick look at the action items page. There were no action items, apart from the [inaudible] to the next call, during our last call. So let's move directly to a quick update on the IANA stewardship transition, if there is any.

I have not seen anything happen since the working group is now closed. The cross community working group on IANA stewardship transition has been officially disbanded, so I would imagine that in our future calls, we can just put this aside. And if there is anything that is happening in the IANA world, we would have this as in any other business item.

I don't see anyone putting their hand up, or wishing to comment on this. So let's... Yeah, we have a green tick from Cheryl Langdon-Orr. So let's move then to the next part, which is the work stream two updates. And here, we have a lot of work that has taken place, another week of fantastic calls from many of the sub stream.

And today, we are going to be focusing on the diversity. We have 20 minutes on this. Perhaps I should let Cheryl lead on this, since she is the person that raised this with us during our last call. There are two links in your agenda. There is one to the original diversity strawman, which is

---

a PDF file, and then there is one... Is it a PDF or a Doc? No, it's a Doc I think. And there is another one to another diversity strawman. I'm not quite sure which is which, but is it?

Yeah, one is a Word Doc, that's right, and the other one is a Google Doc working document. Let's hand the floor to Cheryl Langdon-Orr and we'll see which of the two documents she wishes to work with. Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you Olivier. I'm surprised I'm running this, but there you go. I was going to try to be silent until we got to my section. All right. The full screen will be fine, they should be absolutely identical. We started in our last call, very briefly, to discuss how far we had come in the review of this version one document on the call on diversity before last.

Since then, we've had an additional call, which has taken us roughly through the document. We can all have scroll control, I think it will do. At this stage, we've looked through the document and have had reasonable discussion on some of the languages and the nuances in the first two pages, noting that the second two pages are really very much placeholders for the various types of diversity in the ACs and the SOs.

I'm just looking to see if Sebastien is on the call, because he also is one of the members of this group that is regularly attending and contributing to the diversity group. I'm not seeing him. Is he on audio only or is he not on this call?

Must be not on this call.

TERRI AGNEW: Hi Cheryl, this is Terri. I confirm Sebastien is on this, oh, he just got disconnected. We'll continue trying to dial out to him. [CROSSTALK]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let me jump in, it's Olivier. If I can jump in. Sebastien has had to, he's on a train at the moment. So he has asked that his section, which will be next down, the ombudsman, would be pushed to the end until he is in a sort of more stable location for his mobile reception.

Now, if you do require his help, or his input on this diversity discussion, perhaps we could then go through all of the other sections have the total discussion on diversity and on the ombudsman at the end, later on in the call.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm happy to do that Olivier. I just wanted to recognize that he is very active and involved participate of this. So, I would certainly like to see, his input on some of these things as well. But suffice it to say, that we have managed to have, I'd really call it a first reading, because we haven't got very far into this document, and called in [inaudible].

So, if you want to move through the other reports and then come back to this, I think it would be very valuable if we could almost go through paragraph by paragraph to see how we feel about this terminology. And as I think I've mentioned in the last call, I have some reservations about some of the language in the call, at least in this version one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay Cheryl, thanks very much for this. Let's then move on, and let's just skip 3B as well, and let's move to guidelines for good faith. That's 3C. For a quick update on this, if there has been anything since our last call.

I think that the last time we did ask for someone, let's see. Let's try someone different. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You just want me to keep coming off of mute all the time, do you? We haven't had any on good faith since our last meeting. The last meeting, which I reported on, was the [inaudible] record for meetings, I think I mentioned. We managed to agree on our text for the interim reporting in Hyderabad, in I think it was under, five minutes.

And so we haven't had another meeting since then. So there is actually nothing to update. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl. Next is human rights, 3D. And I believe there would be a lot more to discuss on this. On the human rights discussion, last week we had Tatiana [inaudible] who managed to provide us with a good update.

I note that she is not on the call at present. Does anybody else have the ability to provide us with an update on this please? I understand that there was a group of four that was supposed to come together and

---

break a deadlock to the discussion that was there between two main sides, those that wanted to expand some of the mandates, and those that wanted to restrict it to a specific set.

And, I mean, that's very quickly summarized. I don't know if anything was, came out of this, and what the latest developments are. Is anybody able to provide an update on this. I note that Seun, you're on the call. Did you manage...? Were you on the recent call of the human rights?

Silent. He may be unable to speak at the moment. I'm looking at the list of people we have on this, with most people not on the call at the moment, apart from Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you Olivier. It's not just a pattern in this call, now is it? Okay. There has been good progress. The small work stream had done some things they've been drafting in between the call before last and our last call. And [inaudible] it is part of that group. And I think we need to, again, note the significant input she is making on that.

Of particular note, I believe the deadlock has been smooth-ish, and the working text is certainly one that I think is being better reflective of keeping human rights in the ICANN context, and not moving beyond what, I think, most of us in this group would believe was the intent.

The other thing was, refreshing attention to look at the framework of interpretation as the particular piece of work, which is of course, primary work that our mandate outlines. It's too early to perhaps look

---

at the gory details of the draft text there, but in our meeting after Hyderabad, I would strongly recommend, that just as we're focusing on diversity in today's call, that perhaps we focus on the state of play of the draft text with the layers of, sorry.

Getting my meetings mixed up. With the particular aspects of human rights in terms of its core mission and values for ICANN as a primary piece of our meeting agenda. One of the main things is, however, we have had an interim report prepared by [inaudible] as rapporteur, or co-rapporteurs, and there has also been some edits and some tweaks, mainly to ensure that there is no intention in that, in the reading of that interim report, which will be presented in Hyderabad....

...agree on any of the [inaudible] principles. I think the majority of us have moved well to past those as other than a useful reference to think about how we can find, how we can frame interpretation of how human rights can be managed within an ICANN context. I think if we look, and I don't think we have...

I'm not noticing [inaudible] agenda, actually, Olivier, is that my inability to read fine print at this time of life?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, inability to have a link to the human rights page.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The interim report. It would have been distributed to the list. May not be up on the Wiki yet.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It is not. Well, I have not put it on the Wiki. No, I did not update it on here, but if you click on the human rights thing, then you would get the interim report, which I believe, the 11<sup>th</sup> of October. [CROSSTALK] because it's not there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I didn't think I saw it. That's something that I think probably should be in our records, in fact, the interim reports from all of the work team topics, the work stream two, as they've been managed. And most of those, if that hasn't already been distributed to the list, will be distributed by the end of Monday, today. I'm assuming that's [inaudible] will be the cut-off for that.

So that's probably something worthwhile adding. So, beyond general agreement on that text, I don't know if there is much more to report on that either.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Cheryl. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. So of course, you are speaking of the different reports that are being sent to the accountability working group. So CCWG accountability, is that correct?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Correct. It's the intention of all of the groups to have an interim report that will be presented in our face to face day in Hyderabad.

---



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you for this Cheryl. I'm not sure how we're going to be linking to those, because the one that you mentioned, of course you alluded to this under the human rights page, and there is an entry for the 11<sup>th</sup> of October 2016, but it's a blank entry.

So that report was not added by the staff in charge of the human rights Wiki page.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And I am hardly surprised at that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Or is that the, no. Because the one from the 6<sup>th</sup> of September is not. Okay. Let's have an action item, please, that we trace this. I guess we have to get someone, or if staff can have a look at the CCWG accountability mailing list, and pick those reports up, and then link them to the agendas for the post-Hyderabad, then we will be able to touch on each one of these in our next call.

I've also put another action item on the, in the chat, which is the next ICANN evolution call post-Hyderabad conference, to have a focus on human rights. And that has been recorded. And both action items have been recorded. Thank you for this update, Cheryl.

Are there any questions or comments on this topic?

---

I don't see any hands up. Let's continue down our list. And Sebastien, we are going... I know that you've rejoined the call, we are going through all of the rest of the topics. Please let us know, then, when you are in a position where you can speak, when you have a more stable connectivity, and then we will revert back to the first two subtopics, diversity and the ombudsman.

The next topic for us at the moment is jurisdiction. That's 3A. Another very large topic. And for this, we have quite a few people involved in that working group. I do not know who wishes to provide an update. I'm looking again at the people that we have listed in our agenda, and who are on the call.

I don't think that Christopher Wilkinson is on the call. I know that he had drafted something onto the mailing list. But we have Christopher, no, no, no. Well, okay, let's go for someone else then. Let's go for Cheryl Langdon-Orr please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm really sorry Cheryl, but I'm looking at the list of each person, and I'm saying no they're not there, no they're not there, no they're not there. So, it's back to you.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Again, we... And I'd like to recognize people like Tijani, and Tatianna, and Jean-Jacques Subrenat were in the last call. So we are being more represented in the actual topics, we're just not necessarily getting people to these calls as well for reporting.

Jurisdiction has continued to focus in the first meeting, on the multi-layer approach, which is a [inaudible]. We took a while to get through that. I don't believe there has been a final, if it has, it has been out in the few hours, I haven't checked my email, the final interim report from jurisdiction distributed yet.

So again, that would be another one that we could perhaps get in some amount of time in a post-Hyderabad meeting, or we're through having a good look at because that will be the jurisdiction topic in my view, is starting to come together, I want to say, [inaudible] consensus yet. But certainly to focus more effectively meeting its mandate, and that's been particularly enabled by focusing on the multi-layer of jurisdiction discussion.

We still have, and I guess we probably always will, have one or two voices which may in turn [inaudible] shall I say, about not being able to look at moving everything, blocked off [inaudible] out of California law. It seems that they are a minority set of voices at this stage, and the multi-layers of jurisdiction approach is a levelling of two at least otherwise, analyze more effectively, are there any gaps, a bit of a gap analysis, in what we've worked for in work stream one, and what was [inaudible] in transition work.

---

And whether or not, within Californian law, any of who particular empowered community capabilities are [inaudible]. We also have maintained, I think that's a very good [inaudible], maintained the knowledge in the jurisdiction group. That of course, local law influencers will always hold a particular importance, where ICANN operates [inaudible] and outreach, etc. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this update Cheryl. Let's open the floor for any questions or comments on the topic of jurisdiction.

Seeing no one putting their hand up. Alan did mention, Alan Greenberg, did mention in the chat, by the way, that there will not be an ICANN Evolution meeting in Hyderabad, but there will be a full At-Large leadership call on this same subject, to which the work group is invited.

Did you mean call or meeting?

ALAN GREENBERG: I meant meeting, of course.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Meeting, thanks. Just making sure. Okay, thank you. Let's then move on. And we can go to reviewing the cooperative engagement process. Alan, Avri, Cheryl, let's go for Alan this time. Alan Greenberg, have you kept track of what's going on there?

---

I note, by the way, that there doesn't seem to have been much movement since the 19<sup>th</sup> of December.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was off-line all last week. So if there was a meeting since our last meeting, I certainly didn't participate in it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this Alan. I think there probably was not. It looked as though as it were kept to the side for the time being. Cheryl, is this correct? Was there no meeting of the [inaudible] in the past week? No calls. Okay, thanks. Correct.

Let's then move on swiftly. SO AC accountability. Now, Cheryl Langdon-Orr is a co-rapporteur. I wonder who should we ask about this? Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Olivier. That's one I'm very willing to report upon. And what I can report upon is going backwards and no progress. And inordinate amount of time and energy was expended, I didn't say that, a participant expended an inordinate amount of time and energy in one, bringing back the clocks of time, I suppose [inaudible], in terms of what we're relatively partially agreed, picks, and terminology, and even approaches to the questions of the community.

The manner of that [inaudible] of those concerns and deliberations was such that we have had a formal complaint made [inaudible], should I

---

say, he was, in a courteous way, made to staff and the leadership of the CCWG. And one of the few pieces of progress that [inaudible] have put forward, an increase in peer support between the co-rapporteurs, and the leadership of the CCWG, is that the interim report, the one that I referred to in other groups, the one that will be handed onto the CCWG and [inaudible] just accept some of the last edits and changes that have come through from our membership.

It has been completed, and happy to talk in greater detail about that, in a post-Hyderabad meeting, but it really is just a, this is our mandate, this is how far we've got, this is where we have [inaudible] divergence in view, and these are the ways in which we are trying to go forward. And we describe our work in a four trap.

At the next leadership call for the CCWG and the topics, [inaudible], Steve, and I will formally respond and propose a way forward in response to the formal complaint from some of our membership on appropriate behavior from the work team. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Cheryl. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. If I understand correctly, are you close to agreeing to the set of questions to be sent to the SOs and ACs? I mean, what I'm saying is, will that happen in Hyderabad, or are we likely to see this drag on until after Hyderabad, in which case, we could look at this document and others, in the aftermath of Hyderabad afterwards?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, it was the intention of, I believe, a high probability that the questions should have gone out after our last work stream call. It was intended to be a final reading on those questions before they distributed. The turning back the hands of time in the absence of using the safety of the Tardis to travel, basically means that I couldn't possibly predict whether the same minority views will be as obstructive in our call this week as they were in last week, but we shall see.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. You effectively asked the question I was going to ask in slightly different words. I was going to point out that at the last meeting I had attended, I had made an impassioned plea that we send out relatively generic questions, and not agonize over the definitions which vary from group to group, but let each group self-define and proceed with some sort of answers.

And I gather that has been unwound at this point. And I will make an attempt to be at this meeting and try not to, perhaps we can get forward somewhat on it. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Alan.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: By the way, Olivier, I really like the word After-a-bad. I'm not sure what it means, but I really like it. [LAUGHTER]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. It's obviously a slip of some sort. I probably wish it to be already After-a-bad, but [LAUGHTER]. But, no, I was just going to say, Alan, I told you, you go on holiday and you come back, and you can see that many people have managed to make things fun for everyone.

ALAN GREENBERG: In that group, it is not surprising.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So we will be touching on this, I guess, after Hyderabad, and maybe we can also put that in our agenda as something specifically to look out for, since there appears to be conflict in that group, from what I've heard. So we also have... I guess we are really building our call for after Hyderabad.

So Terri, if you could also mark down this. AC SO accountability will also be focused on. Let's move on. I don't see anybody having put their hands up, so I gather that we can move to the next topic, and the next topic in our agenda is staff accountability. Alan, Cheryl, and Seun, are involved in this. Alan? Well or Cheryl. I don't know.

I'm not seeing any other more recent documents than during the last call. The last document appears to be dated 29<sup>th</sup> of September. So has there been any update?



---

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll take that one. It's Alan. There has, I don't believe there has been an update, although there is one due immediately. The last call, the document that was presented was discussed in some detail, some very significant changes were discussed. Essentially, the original report written by the rapporteurs in the group, the group itself had some significant problems with, and the rapporteurs took it under advisement, and I suppose, are redrafting of version to be presented, with the caveat that that document has not been seen by the wider leadership, by the wider group, but presumably does take into account the views that were expressed on the call at that point.

So we will see a document which, in my mind, significantly changes the tone of the discussion, and again, in my mind, to a far more appropriate version than was listed at that time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Olivier. I thought I saw a [inaudible] come out in today's emails.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have not looked at emails since I arose 45 minutes ago.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: There may be that document you circulated, at least distributed to the work group, is fine. But yes, what you said is absolutely true, that I think it may be that the to be presented document has been distributed.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. It was due to be presented today, so I'm not surprised if it's there. I certainly haven't seen it, and I haven't seen it, and certainly I haven't looked at it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. It's Olivier speaking. Guess what? I'm currently looking for it and I just found it. And I've put a link over into the chat. The snapshot of the Hyderabad report for Hyderabad. Well that's what happens when you speak and write at the same time. When you speak, say one thing, and write something else. Great. Hyderabad report for Hyderabad, now you know for what it is for, but there is a snapshot, and you will be able to assess that document.

ALAN GREENBERG: You've done it again, Olivier. Hydro-bad this time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Hydro-bad. All right. I don't see any other hands. This is starting to become a bit of a tongue twister for me. Let's move to transparency, if I can spell that one out. Alan, Avri, Cheryl, Jean-Jacques. Who is willing to provide us with some information on this?

---

I'm looking, again, at the Wiki page that each one of our agenda topics points to. And I'm, again, no. There I am seeing something that is recent, a trans report.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Did you want to take that Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: No. I'm having a complete blank. I think I was at the last meeting, and I am a complete blank on what happened.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You've transparent it out, basically.

ALAN GREENBERG: Apparently.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl Langdon-Orr, let's bring something a bit more opaque.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I can be very opaque. The transparency, the report you referred to, and it's a somewhat lengthier report than usual, that, the last call which I think may be some time... I can't even remember when it was, it's all a blur, between my Friday night and Saturday morning.

---

It actually progressed quite well, going through I think up to section three of that report. So that report will be presented with very little modification to it, that came out of the meeting, noting that it is draft and that we are still reading through, from I think section three on if my blurry memory serves.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much for this, Cheryl. It's Olivier speaking. I'm reading that report quickly, and noticing that the ICANN CCWG transparency work stream two summary and report, or current report, is marked with an ombudsman letterhead. Is this coming out of the ombudsman's office? Or, I'm not quite sure how that come into it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I have no idea. I have to look at the link you're looking at, and the equipment I use doesn't allow live link in the AC room.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Unfortunately. Okay. I mean, who...? Was it staff that drafted this report? Or how is that usually put together?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Staff or the rapporteur. [Inaudible]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. It's Olivier speaking. Are there any questions or comments on this? I see Alan Greenberg has put his hand up. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. It's coming back to me slightly now. The general tone of the discussion is that we need to hold ICANN to a very high standard of virtually everything being transparent, and available. This is essentially document availability. And with very few limitations. There was even a discussion, and I say even, because I thought it was a little bit ridiculous about to what extent ICANN can use clauses in contract saying specific things are confidential, to not distribute them.

And there were even some comments saying those kinds of clauses should be forbidden in contracts. And clearly, we sign commercial contracts all of the time, which will have confidentiality clauses in them. It's part of the software agreements in many cases. So, but clearly, we don't want ICANN hiding, deliberately putting confidentiality agreements, or statements in contracts to hide behind that, when there is no other commercial rationale for it.

So, certainly the overall tone is pretty much everything that does not have to be confidential for really valid legal reasons, should be something that is available. And of course, the implementation of that becomes really, really difficult, and we're looking for outside bodies to be able to make a judgment on that, and perhaps including the ombudsman, although I'm not sure why that is in the heading of the paper. Thank you.

That's as much as I can remember at this point.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. It's Olivier speaking. And indeed, the paper has this logo. I'm just quoting, in the chat, an extract from the background on transparency. It seems to have been drafted by someone, I would say, a fairly decent philosophical skills. And it will make for an interesting reading, from what I have just read.

ALAN GREENBERG: I did notice, it is an 18 page document, which...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yup, it's 18 pages, and we've got as far as the [inaudible]...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. Okay. Are there any questions or comments from anyone here?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Actually, it's Cheryl again. One of the points that was beginning to be discussed with the whistleblower, I thought was important, and perhaps the opinion of this group may be brought back to the discussion, Alan, and myself, and the others who attended this particular topic.

And it was just the beginning of the conversation. Alan, as you'll remember, there was a view, not one that I support, certainly, that there should be some form of limitations on who can access an effective whistleblower regime. And I'm of the opinion, and I would like to know whether this group is of the opinion, if not here in our relatively low

---

number of people attending, but perhaps in the next call, I'm certainly of the opinion that there is no harm in access to whistleblower practices being as wide as possible. And should, indeed, some people utilizing a whistleblower mechanism also be able to take it through an ombudsman's office in [inaudible].

They'll have one pathway or the other, [inaudible]. But that's my view, and I would like to know whether my view should be [inaudible] as a more strong group view. I notice Alan's hand up, I think I've tweaked his memory.

ALAN GREENBERG:

You've tweaked it slightly, although I may have had to leave that call a little bit early. There was some discussion about whether even under the current regime, one could go to both paths. And I don't believe there is any prohibition in the current one, and I would not want to see any prohibition.

What I don't recall, however, again, maybe I left, was why did some people feel there should be a limitation on who could use the whistleblower policy? And I'll point out, even though we're using the term, the current policy was not designed to be a whistleblower policy, as such, and is not a particularly good one for that. So I'm not sure that's the terminology we should be using.

But ignoring terminology, why was there some feeling that access should be limited?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, Cheryl here. In fact, we were discussing in [inaudible] the hypothetical new recommendations for [inaudible] policy. Not the, as you rightly outlined, lack there of in the current situation. But for example, there was a limited view, not a particularly significant number of people, but certainly the view was expressed that [inaudible] for example, anyone who can be deemed in a contract relationship, should not be able to exercise any sort of access to an effective whistleblower policy.

And again, that's something I think, well, why the hell not? If you think, you know, from even a [inaudible] perspective, so many of our valued staffed, Gisella for example, they're contractors. And for them not to see, or to be prohibited from utilizing an effective whistle blower policy, I think is absolutely wrong.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I don't recall that conversation, so I must have missed that part for one reason or another. I do have a comment on it though, and that is, there are probably, and I haven't thought it through, there are probably aspects of the contract they signed, which should not be subject to the whistleblower act as such.

In other words, you can't gripe about the contract terms you signed, presumably there is no coercion or something like that, but that doesn't mean you can't say, I've noted something which I think is foul and needs to be addressed. So, I would agree with you that although there could be some limitations in what you complain to, complain about on such a



---

whistleblower occurrence, you cannot, and must not, prohibit access for those people.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Alan. I'm comfortable to continue pushing what I certainly expects my personal view in that sense.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I will push for that also, if and when I'm conscious on the call.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I also suggest the same [CROSSTALK]... Some view [inaudible] expressed, if under normal circumstances, an individual had access to the ombudsman as a mechanism for complaint...

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, that's an interesting aspect. Staff right now do not have access to the ombudsman, I believe, under the current ombudsman rule. I'm not sure contractors are limited, though.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking. From what I understand, indeed, yes. Staff are prohibited. But let's just continue this discussion after Hyderabad. In the meantime, Cheryl, may I please ask that you send your question to the mailing list? And then we will get a lot more responses and feedback, can continue the discussion after the Hyderabad face to face meeting. Sebastien Bachollet.

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you Olivier. Can you hear me? I am in a very noisy room, and if it's too difficult...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We can hear you very well.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, thank you very much. The end of the conversation, it was the one that I wanted to allude to. We are still in the ombudsman group, working on the question, do the ombudsman can take into account staff activity? They are two subject who are coming from the ATRT 2. [Inaudible] the plenary, but as we didn't have a plenary last week, it may be discussed after [inaudible], yeah, something like that, [inaudible].

And tomorrow. And then I think it's important to note what is the decision about, is the ombudsman open to staff also? Or just, into brackets, just the participants? And we need to have the discussion in the plenary group. And one of the question, the way we need to move forward, is maybe to have a joint meeting between the two groups to discuss [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sebastien. It's Olivier speaking. You mean a joint meeting in Hyderabad then? Or, I guess it's not really something for us to push for, or to arrange. It really would be...

---

SEBASTEIN BACHOLLET: No, not [CROSSTALK]. No, no, it's not for us to [inaudible] at all, it's for either. But, it's marginal points where we can have some influence, those are the group and by any participant, do we need to have some cross meeting on the specific topic? And I have a list of four or five, we can join to discuss one specific issue. Is it a good idea? Or will it wait at the end to put together all the inputs from each of the subgroups?

We don't need to discuss that now, but it's something that we need to have in mind to decide where we want to go. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sebastien. It's Olivier speaking. Are there any other comments on transparency? Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have a comment on Sebastien's last comment. And by the way, you're clear enough so you should try to get to that noisy environment all of the time when you're speaking. Your sound quality was really excellent. The concept of when do you deal with things that cross over between the groups is a really interesting one.

You don't want to do it so early that your ideas are not formed. On the other hand, waiting too long, may make it very hard to change what may be irreconcilable recommendations among the two groups. So I think it is critical that we meet where appropriate, but the timing is really not something that I have a good grasp on.

---

So it's something that perhaps should be talked about during the plenary in Hyderabad. Because I think it's going to be a critical area. It only applies in a few cases, but where it applies, it's going to be really important. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. I see a green tick from Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Sebastien, your hand is still up.

And now we cannot hear Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No Olivier, so [inaudible] my phone, but I have no access to internet anymore, then I can't change my hand, and if somebody can put it down, it would be great. Sorry about that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No worries. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Your hand is down now. And I'm noticing that there are no other questions on the topic of transparency, although Glenn McKnight has put a number of things in the chat as to things that are going to happen in the presentation and things. So thank you for filling those details.

Since we have Sebastien on the call, we can move back to ombudsman. Sebastien Bachollet, you have 10 minutes.

Maybe I was a bit too hopeful that we had Sebastien on the call. We now lost Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can hear you. Go ahead Sebastien. We're now on ombudsman, and we've got, in case you're unable to see your screen, the visual summary of the work stream one second draft proposal for public comment.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, I don't if it's for the good, [inaudible]... I don't remember this one. But what I wanted to say is that within the ombudsman group, we are working and we will discuss tonight, meeting in seven hours, something like that, have the meeting to prepare what we will say during the plenary tomorrow and for the Hyderabad meeting.

And what I wanted to share with you is that there are some points that could be of interest to this group here. And we already discussed the one on relations. Maybe I need to send this [inaudible]... I don't know, I may have missed something here.

But we were trying to go through all of the topics from the ombudsman, and just to be as sure as possible, we need to, [inaudible] focus of the ICANN ombudsman office, it's a preparation of the [inaudible] of the ICANN ombudsman's office. We are still waiting for knowing if we will have the budget, as it is not in work stream two budget for the moment.

But it's not either in the ATRT 2 budget or supposed to be, and staff is working to solve that. But I hope that it will be a good way to move forward to help people finalize the review of the ICANN ombudsman's office. Then we will work, I don't [inaudible] will you [inaudible] and then follow [inaudible], and of course, the requirement of this work.

I am a little bit scared about that because suddenly the rapporteur becomes in charge of the review of one part of the organization, and maybe to tell you question that, and I have no problem. But I really think it's a big change in the, in my duty, and in the duty of the drafting team. We have just to be clear that it's what we want, and where we want to go, and how we want to go.

And we will have also to consider the impact of the new accountability for ICANN, including the new bylaw, and for our community with respect to the role and the oversight of the ICANN ombudsman office. [Inaudible] Board who are hiring the ombudsman, [inaudible] who are following the work done by the ombudsman, and discussing the budget and so on.

Then what we want for the future is only [inaudible] the Board, or we need to have some responsibility for the [inaudible] for our community. And the last point I would like to raise again, is the question of what could be the role of the ombudsman within regarding ICANN staff.

And that came to another point with the newly created position of the complaint officer within ICANN. And the reason the legal department of ICANN, what is the role of all of that, and the differences, the link of the

---

---

ombudsman office and the complaint officers, and the legal department.

I think I will stop here, but I am happy to answer questions. And I am sure that [inaudible] and [inaudible] may add some specific issue. Why I ask to have this, a little bit more longer presentation, I think as we are ready to make a report for Hyderabad, it's good to have the discussion with [everybody?]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this update Sebastien. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I'm not seeing hands up yet. I do have a question. You touched on the complaints officer. And traditionally, so far, it was the ombudsman that was the complaints person, except when it came down to domain name issues, where it came down to the compliance department.

And there was an automated system for making a compliance complaint. I mean, has your working group already been in touch with what exactly the complaints person is going to be about? And does that mean that the ombudsman will not be the right person to complain to?

It seems to be either double duty, or something is just not clear at the moment.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you Olivier for that question. Sebastien speaking. You are starting where we are. We have just, the only information we had, it's a [inaudible] from the [inaudible] thing that we are organizing the

---

leadership team within the ICANN staff, and you will be creating a new position of complaints officer.

From my understanding, and some discussion I had, it's still a lot in discussions. The complaint officer will be specifically there to complain about staff, and then it will be inside the ICANN staff remit, if I can say it like that. But the link between both is still to be discussed, and we need to have more information on what was the goal, or what is the goal, of the CEO about this.

And the other point, with human rights, that it's important for us. You remember we had this same discussion of the compliance office. Why it is linked with the legal team. Nothing against legal team, but it's something we need to be aware of, why it was there, and what other limits it will create. Because if we are complaining about some legal staff, we will go to legal for that, just to take one example.

And it's a question, I raised it [inaudible] ago, but I raise it with the [inaudible], and with the full CCWG, and we are waiting for [inaudible], maybe we will have opportunity to have some discussion during our meeting in Hyderabad with the CEO. And at this point, another. That's all I can say now. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sebastien. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And you've raised a point here which might mean a question to be raised directly with Göran Marby. The ALAC will be meeting with Göran, several of our people in our community will be meeting with him, both the SO, ACSG, and for us, the RALO chairs and the ALAC leadership team



---

will be meeting with Göran, I believe. So, let's have this action item, for the ALAC to raise the question of the vote to the complaint, of the complaints officer versus the ombudsman.

I see that this has been put in the action items as we speak. Alan, I gather, we have your blessing on this to ask this question, do we?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. I need to go back and look at that blog, because I don't remember it quite the way Sebastien is describing, but my memory is sufficiently fuzzy that we'll take it under advisement. And yes, it's a reasonable question.

But I think we need to phrase it properly, but... If indeed, that is what the blog says, and I recall something about reporting to legal, but there is another part reporting directly to him. And I want to go back and look at what it says.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Alan. Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Just to be sure, Olivier, Sebastien Bachollet speaking, that you are saying because the word you were using, ring my bell. You talk about ALAC leadership team, you were meaning the ALT or you were meaning all of the ALAC members? A meeting with Göran.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:                   Regardless of what he meant, he meant At-Large leadership, which is the whole group.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:           Thank you very much, Alan. Just to be sure that we don't meet those two. Okay, thank you. And I will try to send you the link to the specific sentence, as soon as I get my internet back. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:       Perfect. Thank you very much everyone. Now, this has been a good update. Now we can then go and continue moving backwards and go to the diversity strawman, now that Sebastien is online as well. Sebastien, you might have missed a little bit earlier, Cheryl provided us with some introduction as to, regarding the strawman, and started out on this, but felt that you needed to be on the call as well since you were quite invested in this too.

So, I supposedly can go back to the strawman. There are two versions of it. One is a Doc file, one is the Google Doc, and it's a working document. We have allocated 20 minutes for this. We are five minutes behind schedule, but it's okay. So, five-ish minutes behind schedule. It's okay. Cheryl Langdon-Orr suggested that we might wish to go paragraph by paragraph on this.

On the screen, we now have a copy of the annotated Google Doc. It's a PDF of the Google Doc with I guess some of the latest changes and amendments. I'm not sure how we want to do this since Sebastien, I do not know if you have good internet now, and you're able to see this

---

document, or whether we should have Cheryl take us through this document. Sebastien Bachollet, your hand is up, you have the floor.

And Sebastien's hand is now down, so he doesn't have the floor. Cheryl Langdon-Orr? Anybody ready to step forward?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think I heard Sebastien's voice, Olivier. Sebastien? [CROSSTALK]

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, sorry. It seems that I need to learn how to use different tools at the same time. And having my lunch at the same time. It's a little bit difficult. This document is the one we are working on, and if we want to go paragraph by paragraph. I don't know exactly for. Are we, do we know if everybody who is on the call get a chance to read? At least the one you send us about the community with no comments.

Because if we go, I would say, paragraph by paragraph, it's maybe [inaudible] but what I will say for this, the start of the discussion, is two points important I will say. And more important, even if we need to go together, is to look at the definition, what we want as a definition of diversity.

And what are the least of the elements that can be taken into account? Which ones do you think need to be taken into account of the one that's less important? Maybe we need to have a list of items, classified by all the importance in the future.

---

But let's start by, as the first element, and that's good that Christopher joined, because Christopher writes a comment on the document, and it may be useful to hear him. And the discussion it's about, I guess it's [inaudible], sometimes diversity within ICANN refers to ICANN's ability to facilitate [inaudible], and create, and [inaudible]... of secondary [inaudible] and engagement throughout all levels of the ICANN, staff, community [inaudible].

Just to comment a little bit. The question about, what [inaudible] ICANN? How we define ICANN? What are the sub-elements of ICANN? How we call, then? We were talking and it's not [inaudible] about ICANN organizations. Some participants were thinking that the ICANN were not is just the staff. I would review that ICANN organization was like ICANN [inaudible] all that envisions, including staff, community, and Board.

And that was the first ICANN discussion. And on the second, is that, do we just talk about representation also participation, engagement, and that's try to be reflected here, in this sentence. And the last, what we want diversity help ICANN to do. And I guess that, these three points are the ones we need to discuss.

I suggest to stop here, and to have a discussion on that specific subject. And if I didn't get back all the ideas, I am sure that the next speaker will help me with that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sebastien. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And in the queue is Alan Greenberg.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry. That was an old hand, or a new hand. I don't remember what it was for, one of those. So go ahead, and if I come back in, I will.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Cheryl for the record. I'm actually very comfortable with the suggested replacement text, which Sebastien just alluded to and read to the record. I think we do need to make sure a definition is one that talks about facilitating diversity and creating an inclusive environment. I like the terminology there, the inclusive environment, I think covers a multitude of opportunity for improving the diversity record, and aspirations of the organization.

And I think also that the specificity of talking about obviously, and including and not limited to, the various aspects of stakeholder representation and engagement throughout all levels of staff, community, and Board, is an appropriate type of definitional text.

To go higher in the text as well, I had previously raised concerns about some of the terminology talking to some extent about measurability, and so in the part of the document that talks about what do we mean by diversity, in the opening section, I'm also much happier with the way it's currently written with the red line text that talks about referring to the elements of geographic origin, language, gender, stakeholder groups, and openness to newcomers.

---

Again, it's picking up on the idealism which is obviously something I support, of inclusiveness. And I do think the more we can use the inclusiveness language in this document, in recommendations and outcomes, the better. That's pretty much what I wanted to say about this section anyway.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Cheryl. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Are there any other comments on this?

Okay. Shall we revert back to Sebastien and move to the next section on this? Christopher Wilkerson, yes welcome, you have the floor.

CHRISTOPHER WILKERSON: Hello everybody, and I apologize for joining late. I've been so busy with various things in the last two days. In the note that I sent, I think for present purposes there are basic points of. The first is that I strongly recommend, in policy and procedure, to disassociate separate gender balance from diversity.

I think over the years, we have seen too often that ICANN's entities, and particular the nominating committee I'm afraid to say, have tried to solve their problems through repeated double whammy's, okay. We get one candidate who is both female and from a distant region, and thus try and kill two birds with one stone. I think that won't do.

I think what we need is a serious policy of gender balance, and a serious policy of diversity. But to discourage ICANN's entities from trying to achieve both at once, the net results of which has both been to achieve

---

neither. The second point relates specifically to the powers and responsibilities and objectives of the nominating committee, of having, and they say so, been voting under the nominating committee years ago, and having watched the process over the years, I think it's quite clear by now that the nominating committee does not have sufficient balance, independence, and powers.

By powers I mean the numbers of people that they appoint. Far too many people in the ICANN environment are appointed [inaudible], and far too few are independent and are appointed by an independent nominating committee. This may not be very popular to the ears of the GNSO, but I want to go right back to the original purpose of the nominating committee, and its appointments of independent directors, which was to offer the community a credible and viable alternative to the direct election of Board members, which we may all recall, some people probably don't recall, was not a particular success.

Regarding the text, I must confess I read the discussion document in its earlier form, but I haven't had time to read the amendment which is on the screen at present. And we'll try to do so in the next day or two and comment if necessary, but I think my note passes those two messages.

I don't want to impose or complicate of the negotiation of the more detailed text that you are working on today. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Christopher. Sorry about this. Thank you very much for this. I'm thinking about several things here. The time is ticking quickly. We do have more to discuss on this. You've raised some

---

very interesting points, indeed. And I'm not sure we'll be able to reach consensus on this.

I don't know, do we have any time that is set in Hyderabad to be able to discuss those issues? That's an open question. I'll let Alan think about this and come back to us. In the meantime, are there any comments to what Christopher has said, or should we go through another point further down?

There is a note, of course, that with the staff that are located in Istanbul offices, and in the Singapore office, there certainly seems to have been a lot of movement towards diversity among ICANN staff. And Sebastien has put an ATRT 2 final report link, which has data about languages spoken by ICANN staff. I believe there has been even a lot more movement since then.

So the statistics are quite different. But then I do note also that although Göran was a Swede, or is still a Swede, actually, he has moved to the United States, I guess because the head office is over in Los Angeles. So there, I guess, you get diversity, but then diversity has its limits, I guess.

I'm not even sure whether this is relevant or not. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Two things. In terms of Hyderabad, we will be discussing all issues. Now, that being said, this is a one and a half hour call, and I'm not quite sure how much time we're going to have in Hyderabad, so we're not going to have the time for a two hour, an hour discussion on any



---

particular issue, but hopefully all of the issues will be discussed, and we can raise the issues where there are points of contention. That's number one.

Number two, on diversity and geographic diversity, I always thought that Fadi's intention, I don't know if he ever did it or not, but he said he and his whole family are going to move around the world every six months, from one office to the other, and I thought that was rather dumb.

Yes, the CEO must spend some reasonable amount of time in each office, so he's not completely unaware of it, but I think one has to be pragmatic about how one uses one's time and uproots one's family. Ultimately, I think the CEO needs to be whatever the head office is, because that's where certainly a substantial amount of key staff are going to be.

So, I think you have to be pragmatic at the same time as wanting diversity. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I do know that Fadi Chehadé did spend some time in the Singapore office. I'm not sure if he spent any time, any significant amount of time, in the office space in Istanbul.

ALAN GREENBERG: Or whether he actually moved, I'm not sure either.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Moved, yeah. I'm concerned with the time here. We've got 10 minutes until the end of this call. I don't think we're going to be able to reach any significant points on this diversity document, beyond what we've already discussed.

May I just ask Cheryl and Sebastien, if there is anything else specifically to point us to, right now, that the members of this working group and the people on this call, or listening to this call recording later on, can read, form an opinion on, and then answer when the meeting, the face to face meeting takes place in Hyderabad?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, Cheryl...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Anything else to highlight? Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, so [inaudible]. I think some of the important points for us to discuss is, whether or not, and a good proportion of the document in front of you, is talking about data acquisition and the ability to measure status on a number of the diversity aspects, you know, language, cultural, etc.

Whilst I think it's important and useful to have metrics on a number of these things, and obviously things like achieving a gender balance to be

---

able to ascertain that we've achieved a gender balance, one has to have some measures of gender in various levels. You know, not I would assume [inaudible]...

So we do need to metric driven aspects of this, but... And particularly with Christopher's point on double whammies, and of course you can get to triple and quadruple whammies, where you look for the wheelchair bound woman from a far flung part of the continent with a rare and unusual cultural heritage so you can tick off more boxes when you appoint them somewhere, and how utterly useless that is for actual benefits of what one can get in a diverse environment, which is why I'm very comfortable moving towards making sure we have an openness to inclusiveness in where there aren't barriers caught up as part of these outcomes.

I think we also want to consider the risk of having almost hierarchal nature in some of these classifications of diversity. Certainly there may be some parts of ICANN, and the ICANN community, where some types of diversity are far easier to ascertain and to maintain. And where are some aspects of, some measurable aspects of diversity would almost be irrelevant, and I think we will have, for example, something I haven't read in great detail yet, but I quickly send some conversations happening in ALAC about diversity, and I know in Hyderabad, the ccNSO is going to be talking about aspects of diversity as well in its work stream two work.

So, I don't think it's necessarily going to be a one size fits all to all parts of ICANN, either. So we may need to look at, I don't [inaudible] hierarchal system, but a variable set of aspirations for some of these

---

---

visions. And while I use the term hierarchy, we need to consider our [first?] measurable within the diversity section more important, or more desirable to achieve earlier on, as we try to build a, make open an inclusive for engagement ICANN.

So I think that's where I would be focusing our attention. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl. Alan Greenberg to close off on this topic please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. And I'll make a controversial statement, maybe. In the long distant past, At-Large has on occasion, and I'm not talking about anyone who is around today, had people who were far less than appropriate doing their job. And if that were to happen again and we were told, sorry, we needed diversity there so that is the person you have to use, I would not be very happy.

And I think we're all in that situation. So although it is important to get diversity, we cannot let it rule, in my mind, we cannot let it rule the day. And skills... I found it very interesting that as one of the diversities SSAC thinks is important is knowledge and skill set and things like that.

There is a lot of aspects to this and it's complex. So I think we need to be very careful as we go forward, and still, not just tick off boxes, but make sure that we are really think with the right mindset. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Alan. Next is Sebastien Bachollet. Let's close the queue after Sebastien.

Have we lost Sebastien? It seems that we might have lost him. I'm still on the call.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Can you hear me now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, now we can hear you. Go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, sorry. Yeah, I was, I agree that the question raised by both Cheryl and Alan are important questions. We need to [inaudible] time to discuss only those questions. What I would like to ask people here, it's more, if any, what are the [inaudible] you would like to add to [inaudible] diversity within ICANN? And when I talk about diversity, even if I take into account what [inaudible] gender balance is also one part, and we can also discuss this issue [inaudible] aside in another [inaudible], but it will remain within this subgroup of diversity.

And I think also, we need to discuss what improvement we can do within our groups, within At-Large groups. We don't wait to do things that other decide, or that the full ICANN decide. We can maybe move things along. We are doing very interesting thing, then good. But how we can improve if an improvement is possible.

---

And that's something I will be happy to discuss. I am sure that we just, [inaudible] in a group, we will have a lot of different sensibility and point of view, and we can do the work of all of ICANN, but let's try to do it for our side. And thank you for putting this issue on the table today. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Sebastien. And we need to, we've spent a significant amount of time on diversity. We still have to discuss prioritization of work stream two work, with the next steps for work two stream and a coordination from the At-Large perspective.

We only have about five minutes left on this call, which is a little bit of a concern for me, and I have a back to back immediately afterwards. Let's see how we can go through this. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I also have another call right now. We will, with staff's help, be looking for volunteers to lead, to present and lead the discussion on each of the work stream two topics in Hyderabad. So anyone who would like to volunteer, please let yourself be known, and otherwise we will be fingering people. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan. It's Olivier speaking. And so on the prioritization of work, if we can just launch the discussion here, perhaps that would be, could be followed, both on the mailing list and, of course, in Hyderabad itself. Sebastien Bachollet, you had asked for this

---

topic. What are your concerns and how do you wish...? What do you suggest basically?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you Olivier. My suggestion is that we need to be, to know what, as a group, we want to do. For example, we have a participation in some of the subgroups very low, we have a participation, and then work not going fast very fast in groups. And do we want to say that we need to postpone some of the working group to concentrate on some issue where we have more participation, or where the work is already more advanced?

Just to concentrate forces of ICANN on this subgroup, because today we are really speaking 10 different groups. You have the champion of the participation with Cheryl, obviously. But except I don't see a lot of people able to follow all and to participate meaningfully in all of them. Maybe we need to decrease the number of the first step of work stream two.

But saying that, that means that we could decide that we will maybe postpone the end of work stream two, and we were supposed to do it prior to June, some people say prior to the end of the year, the calendar year. And it's something I would like very much to have an opinion of At-Large to decide where to go.

And the last point was about coordination. And we already talked about that, how we coordinate between two subgroups with a similar topic, [inaudible] for one, the diversity, maybe another point with the

---

ombudsman's office work, or obligation, or duty. But that was the point that I wanted to make here. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Sebastien. It's Olivier speaking. I think that these are very valid questions, indeed. Obviously these are questions which not only the ALAC would have to ask itself, but that's in coordination with everyone else. What I understand is you're trying to get a feel of how we feel about this. Could I perhaps ask you, since it is the top of the hour and several people have to run, could I ask you to do just a short email, send it to our mailing list, get the feedback from people on our mailing list on this?

Because I have a feeling that this kind of a discussion is exactly what the work streams are going to be discussing when meeting face to face in Hyderabad. We probably are not the only people who appear to be really, really stretched in between all of the different work streams. And obviously, the leadership of the CCWG would, will most definitely be working on this and looking at this.

So, could you share this with an email to the, to our own mailing list? And could I just ask everyone else to follow-up and provide their point of view, whether, what needs to happen first, what needs to happen next should things be rescheduled a little bit, or are things working all fine right now?

Is that okay?



---

And maybe we can have this as an action item. So Sebastien, we'll follow-up with the mailing list. I'm not hearing anything from him, but we'll follow-up with the mailing list on coordination of work streams from an At-Large perspective.

Okay. That's it. Thank you very much to everyone. Any other business?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up. We are two minutes past the top of the hour. I have another call. Many people are dropping off, they have other calls too. Thanks for all of the updates we had today. For those people that are travelling, see you in Hyderabad.

For those people that are not travelling, see you on the internet. And please, you can... ..follow-up on these, listen to them, contribute remotely as well. And you know, we'll move forward. And our next call will be after Hyderabad with all of the action items that we have here.

Thank you very much. This call is now adjourned. Goodbye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**