

---

RECORDED VOICE: Recordings are now started.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you so much and welcome everyone to the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 call, on Wednesday the 30<sup>th</sup> of November at 19:00 UTC. As usual, we would like to remind you if you have a [inaudible] of interest by now, please do so at your earliest convenience. If you have problems with that feel free to approach any of our staff members who will be happy to assist you with that task.

We will have some important points to review today on our agenda. I expect this to be a rather short call, hopefully. It's scaled for two hours but I don't think we'll be using that much time. So, we have six points in our agenda, as you can see in your screen. And I'd like to remind you to say your name if you speak and mute your lines if you are not speaking, for transcription purposes, of course.

So, the next agenda item, we have some administration issues to take care of. Of course, we encourage you to have a look at the ICANN expected standards of behavior. We have a small graphic here that has been sent out to the whole group on the list and I'm not going to go through all of the expected standards of behavior, of course, at this point, as I don't think that's the best use of everyone's time. But they are available for you to go through them and if you have any questions, of course, you can always approach any of us.

So, if we could go to the next slide please. Our next agenda item is the public consultation on updated several matters and procedures for the

---

independent review from the IRC. This is open and it will close on January the 10<sup>th</sup> and the public staff report after the limitation overseeing team analysis will be on the 28<sup>th</sup> of February 2017. So, we invite you, of course, to post your comments, and this is called the comment period, and should there be a need for the CCWG to actually file some comments, well of course, we welcome any thoughts for the [inaudible] generally would like to actually file some comments on this public consultation, or should there be no need to do this.

So, at this point I would like to also invite all members to go back to their respective groups and remind them of this important public comment and encourage them to provide their feedback during this period that, as I said, closes on January the 10<sup>th</sup>. So, I don't know, is there any comments in regards to this public consultation? So, if there's anyone that wants to speak today I would open the floor now, and if there are no hands then I will go to the next slide.

Okay, so having no-one wanting to speak on this could we please turn to the next slide. So, here we have our timeline. We have gone through Item 57. We have established some dates already. You can see Track One encompasses Human Rights, the Jurisdictions of [inaudible] and Diversity subgroups. And the Track Two which encompasses Ombudsman and so on and clear accountabilities [inaudible], they're in the quotes and other groups that are not visible on this slide.

But you can see the different timelines here, we have planned for delivery of those groups [inaudible] by our meeting in Copenhagen. It's the Item 58 in March 2017 and so far, I believe, we are mostly in track

---

with each other's subgroups. We will go to the different subgroups to provide an update in our agenda later on the phone.

And, of course, Track One is for those groups that have stated that they need a little bit more time, that they will extend further from Copenhagen and this is how it looks now. And, of course, the expectation is that all subgroups could deliver by ICANN 59. And I see Sebastien Bachollet's hand is up, so can you please take the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Leon. Yeah, I will not talk about the other subgroup but regarding the Ombudsman Subgroup, as you know, we received the present from the ATRT2 and that means that we are on our way to start a review of the ICANN Ombuds Office and therefore I think that we need to ask you formally to move to Track One, and even maybe to a Track Zero, where I am not sure that we will be able to fit with the current Track One timeline. But it's still to be discussed and we will try our best to stay within Track One, but definitely not Track Two. Thank you very much.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much for this, Sebastien. I think we will need to update this slide accordingly and of course include, as you have requested, the Ombuds Group on Track One. And of course, you want assessment on the estimated time for the legal reports update. So, I see Kavouss' hand is up and Cheryl's hand is up so, Kavouss, could you take the floor?

---

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Thank you, Leon. I see a lot of people want to go from one track to the other. I don't like this sort of thing. This should be handled by CCWG Plenary. From one track to other track, I don't understand. When you have these two tracks you have some [inaudible], you have some argument to put that.

I don't think that every subgroup should decide that I don't want to be Track X, I want to be Track Y. This should be decided by the Plenary and I think we leave it to the Co-Charis to convince the people the way they put into these tracks and they would like to [inaudible] that, maintain the original one. Not shifting the people, unless the Plenary agrees. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Kavouss. I had some trouble hearing your audio. It seemed quite muffled. And if I understood well you are not in agreement of changing the Ombuds group to Track One and you are suggesting that this is something that the Plenary should leave to the side. And well, actually, what we're trying to do here is to update the slide considering the Ombuds group in Track One, but as I said, there will be an assessment in the subgroup to find out whether they will be able to deliver by Copenhagen or whether they require a more extensive timeline for their work to be delivered.

But since Sebastien which is the rapporteur from whose group has requested that given the different situations that they have been through it seems that they will need more time, then I don't see a

---

reason why not to, of course, take his suggestion and [inaudible] Track One and then still, of course, change it [inaudible].

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Excuse me, do you hear me now? It is okay? Hello?

LEON SANCHEZ: I do hear you, Kavouss, but it's quite muffled.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I am not against Ombudsman. Any group should not ask to be from one track to the other. CCWG should decide but not every group. Otherwise you won't have any more Track Two. Everyone will be Track One. There was a reasoning why to have different tracks and I don't understand why people want to be moved from one to the other. It is not an opposition of Ombudsman. Any changes should be approved by the CCWG. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Kavouss. I think that Mathieu wants to comment on this, so Mathieu, can you please take the floor.

MATHIEU WEILL: Yeah, thank you, Leon. Just a clarification. Of course, that's a topic for the Plenary to decide although if the group is not ready it's going to be difficult to force them to deliver something, if things are not working out.

---

And to give a couple of examples, the Ombuds point that Sebastien was raising is the consequence of the Hyderabad Plenary discussions that we've had regarding the external reviews. And we'll have in the second updates later in this call, a discussion regarding the ASO Accountability Group which is precisely on this topic, which is the choice of track. And so, we will certainly come back to this issue.

So, rest assured Kavouss, it's not something that is intended to be only staying in the subgroups and we keep closely in touch with the rapporteurs to update the Plenary on this. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Mathieu. I remember that Cheryl had her hand up but I don't see it up at this point so I don't know if Cheryl, would you like to comment on something?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

No.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Okay, thank you. So, can we please move to the next slide. Okay, so this slide refers to the public [inaudible] for ICANN58. As you know we have budget plans for supporting the different members and rapporteurs that require travel assistance. So, this next meeting will be held in Copenhagen, in Denmark, from March 11<sup>th</sup> to the 17<sup>th</sup>. And we will be having a face to face meeting one day before the official opening of the meeting. So, we will be having a face to face meeting on March 10.

---

And we will be applying the same rules performing that we apply for ICANN57. The only thing that we are having is to allow the subgroup rapporteurs to apply, if they need funding. I think that Bernie could expand a little bit more on this information and the process to apply for funding. So, Bernie, would you like to expand information on this?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Leon. Can you hear me?

LEON SANCHEZ: Yeah, we hear you well.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright, thank you. For those that remember the process, we'll be using the same forms in the same way and we'll be basically giving people a month to come on. Recapitulating from the experience of the Hyderabad funding, let me repeat very, very clearly. This is for appointed CCWG Accountability members, i.e., people who have been appointed by their S.O. or A.C. to be on the CCWG and, now, people who have been selected to be rapporteurs. And if you're not sure you're either one of those, you're probably not. But we'll provide all the information and all those people who are members or rapporteurs are clearly listed on the Wiki and the address is given here.

So, please, if you don't fall in one of those categories it's really not of any use to apply. Second, as Leon has mentioned, these are for people who do not have any other sources of funding. If you have another source of funding this is not meant as a replacement. We're trying to

---

get as many people there as possible to participate, and as such, we really try and encourage people to be as effective with their funding as possible. We follow the standard ICANN rules for travel funding.

And just as a reminder, we have 20 seats per face to face meeting, plus or minus a minor variation. And as the co-chairs, once the funding period is closed, that we'll go through all the applications and try to make the best decisions.

The other important point to remember from the old process, is it's not an all or nothing. If you have been funded to go to the ICANN meeting but not for the face to face meeting you can apply only for one or two extra hotel days, depending on your need and one or two extra per diems. We will gladly entertain those requests as it allows us to meet our objectives of getting as many people there as possible.

So, we'll be opening that up Monday next week. Everyone will be getting the email. But I repeat again, it's for appointed members and subgroup rapporteurs only. And the process will close Midnight UTC, Sunday 8 January. So, that's the information. If there are questions, we'll be glad to take them. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much for that information, Bernie. Are there any questions at this point that anyone would like to ask or any clarifications needed? Okay, there doesn't seem to be any. So, Bernie, is that an old hand or a new hand?



---

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

No, just one minor thing that I would like to add. Although it seems far away, March 11<sup>th</sup> is really about 12 weeks away and for anyone who will need a visa please have a look early if you're planning got attend and understand the requirements for you obtaining a visa to attend. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Bernie. So, this would conclude this agenda item and we can now move to our next agenda item which is an update on the Legal Committee activity so if you could please check your next slide. As you know, the Legal Committee has the task of taking care of the legal requests from the different subgroups and, of course, assigning them to the legal advisors that they consider prudent.

And we used to have [inaudible] as a member for the ASO and the Legal Committee but we have been informed that Michael Abejuela will be substituting [inaudible] in this task. So, I would like to, of course, thank [inaudible] for her service to the Legal Committee during portion one and welcome Michael to the Legal Committee for portion two.

And so far, we have received some requests from the Ombudsman group and the Human Rights group for questions to be answered in [inaudible] and that was, of course, tasked to this Plenary meeting. And we have requested from ICANN Legal a series of answers in regard to the Ombuds group and to the Human Rights group but we haven't had a reply yet.

I am aware that we have a major holiday between the day we sent the request and now so I guess that is why we haven't had a reply to our

---

request so far. But I guess that we will be able to have an answer to the questions on the Ombuds group today. I've been advised by Samantha Eisner that they are preparing this reply and hopefully we'll have those maybe today. So, when these come, of course, we will circulate them to the incumbent group.

And on the Human Rights requests we have not had any reply to the requests as this was sent out just today. And, well, of course, we will be following up with ICANN Legal to find out when we will be having these answers as soon as possible. I see Sebastien Bachollet has a hand up and I also see a question from Kavouss. So, Sebastien, could you please take the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLETT:

Thank you, Leon. I hope that you can hear me. Sorry for my voice. Yeah, I am a little bit surprised that, if I understood well, the requests go from a subgroup to the Legal Committee to be reviewed and sent to the right legal team. Does the answer first come back to the subgroup and then be discussed in the whole group?

I am a bit troubled if we get an answer today and then the subgroup then discusses it in two weeks and we have some magisterial questions or disagreement with what it said. It's really a question, I've not thought too much about that. But I was thinking and hoping that the answer will come to the committee who raised the issue. Thank you.

---

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Sebastien. So, the way we are envisioned to address this is that we would be receiving the input from ICANN Legal, then this input would be circulated both in the Legal Committee list and in the incumbent group, which in this case would be Ombuds group. And from there, of course, the Legal Committee members and incumbent group will be able to comment on the reply that they get from ICANN Legal.

And from there we will determine whether the reply is satisfactory or whether we need further input or maybe external opinion on the reply received by ICANN Legal. I don't know if that is a reasonable or acceptable way forward for the Ombuds group. Yes, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLETT:

Thank you, Leon. No trouble. You are the Co-Chair and you may decide. But I just want to question that the first answer is given to the whole group and then it's discussed by a sub-team and I hope that everything will not mix up. I know already I have feedback from some member of the subgroup and they are even asking why we asked the question and why we asked Legal, then I would be question with that.

My suggestion is that the answer be given to the subgroup and the Legal Committee, of course, and then discussed there, and if there's no disagreement or follow up, we can, together with the Legal Committee and legal staff, deliver the answer to the whole group. But, once again, it's your call, not mine, but that was my suggestion. Thank you very much.

---

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you, Sebastien. I think we are on the same line. I think that what I suggested is exactly the same that you suggested. And if it isn't, well of course, we can always take the discussions up line and [inaudible] and the procedure, but I think you and I are saying exactly the same thing.

Okay, so on the Human Rights request, as I said, this was sent just today and that is me to blame, of course, I just sent the request today. And we will be expecting some follow up from ICANN Legal on the matter and as soon as we have something else to report or any updates I will be glad to provide them to the group. So, this would conclude the update on the Legal Committee. I would now like to hand the floor to my Co-Chair, Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks very much, Leon. And hello everyone, this is Thomas Rickert. We're now going to take a look at the action items from the Hyderabad meeting, Item 57. Actually, there are only a couple of action items and we're going to go over them very quickly. First one is on ATRT3. As you know, we received a response from the ICANN board on our initial letter which we sent out back in August. Steve DelBianco was kind enough to draft a response to Steve Crocker and this response has been sent. So, that action item is complete.

With respect to the second action item ATRT3 versus CCWG Accountability, update on request toSO/AC's as per board response. You might remember that Steve Crocker in his response to our group

---

said that deciding the remit of ATRT3 is not for the board but he asked that the SO/AC's should actually comment on that.

And in line with that response we asked Steve to also draft a letter to the SO/AC Chairs, which he has produced. It's actually a great letter, in line with our thinking on the options for potential overlap and how to resolve the Work Stream 2 ATRT conflict or preventing any conflict from happening. And that letter is going to be sent in the next couple of days.

And we would like to ask the members, representing the chartering organization in particular, to ensure that this letter is being treated by your respective groups with a certain sense of urgency so that hopefully we're going to be able to collate a cohesive answer with feedback from SO/AC's to the ICANN board subsequently. And, not least, that we are clear on the situation between ATRT3 and our Work Stream 2 work.

So, let me just pause here for a second to see whether there are any questions from the group on these two points which are related. And for those who haven't noticed Steve was kind enough to publish our ATRT recommendation into the chat window of the AC room. I don't see any hands up so it looks like this information on those two action items was sufficiently complete.

Let's now take a look at the third action item on SO/AC Accountability and that is the update on responses from SO/AC's. As you know, there were requests from the SO/AC Accountability sub-team to SO/AC's for information. And I'm not sure which one of the rapporteurs from the SO/AC Accountability sub-team wants to speak to that but I'd like to invite you to take the mic and briefly speak to that action item.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I can do that if you like. It's Cheryl.

THOMAS RICKERT: It would be awesome. Cheryl, the floor is yours.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Thomas. At the moment, with the responses from the SO/AC, we've not formally received any completed questionnaires but we have been updated, and, thank you very much to the Co-Chairs and staff for continuously doing that, with progress within some of the SO's and AC's.

I'd also note that on 1<sup>st</sup> of December meeting of the GNSO Council it is an agenda item. So, it appears, from our at arm's length observation, that the SO's and the AC's are all intending to attend to this matter in a timely manner. We have had a request from the GNSO already to see whether or not an extension is possible.

Whilst we said, of course, we can only receive what we get when we get it, it would be appreciated if it could be as early as possible, close to the date we requested mid-December, specifically because of the holiday season that many cultures and offices do observe during December and we have, as Bernie pointed out earlier, a very short 12-week time to the Copenhagen meeting. Thank you.

---

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Cheryl. And just to add to this in line with your summary, only, like, six minutes ago, an info from Tom Dale from the GAC Secretariat came in that the GAC is currently considering its response and that they plan to submit no later than the end of next week. So, that's quite promising.

I'm mentioning this just because it came in during this very call but that's certainly not to discriminate any other feedback that we received from other groups in the ICANN communities. So, thanks very much to you, Cheryl, for providing this ad hoc summary of the state of play in the sub-team, or to be more precise, the responses from the various SO's and AC's.

Great. Any questions from the group on that action item? That doesn't seem to be the case. So, then let's move to the next item, Transparency Status of next version of recommendation. And I know that Michael has sent a note to us and staff to announce the publication of the circulation of the next version of the document. Maybe, Bernie or Karen, you can help me to specify that date? I think that Michael is not on this call, is he? If he is then certainly he can speak—

CHRIS WILSON: Thomas, this is Chris Wilson, Michael's co-rapporteur for Transparency. I'm on the call.

THOMAS RICKERT: Chris, welcome. So, if you want to speak, please do.

---

CHRIS WILSON: Yeah. So, I don't know if he provided an exact date, I know that the intention is to provide a revised draft of the recommendations by next week. I know Michael has been traveling for the last couple of weeks since India so he was delayed, I guess, about a week or so, in delivering the revised draft.

But the revised draft would incorporate suggestions and edits that were made in Hyderabad by the CCWG during our discussions then. So, I don't have an exact date next week when that will be delivered but I believe it will be next week at some point. So, look for that next week.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Chris. That's much appreciated and we're eagerly waiting for the next version of the document which we already started discussing in Hyderabad and you will remember that the group has asked for some revisions so we fully appreciate that there's some editing to the first draft needed and that this takes some time.

So, we're looking forward to the document and thanks to you and Michael, in particular, for taking care of this. That allows us to move to the last action item that was a follow up on the discussion with [inaudible].

And just to refresh everyone's memory, when we had our session with [inaudible] there were a couple of questions and concerns raised by our group, particularly surrounding the functions of the Complaints Officer. And we actually squeezed in a second discussion to basically debrief on the session we had with [inaudible], during our face to face meeting,



and during that second session we collected some feedback from the CCWG with respect to concerns and comments that they had.

So, this is around the word 'organization' and its use. There were a couple of concerns with the Complaints Officer reporting to ICANN Legal. There was a question about the function of the Complaints Officer and his relationship to the Ombudsman. And the main Complaints Officer in the first place.

So, there were a couple of alternative suggestions brought up by the group and we wanted to accept [inaudible] invitation to work with him and continue our conversation, not only at ICANN meetings but also in between. And we are now planning to follow up with [inaudible] to convey the group's views on these questions and maybe to help shed some light on the concerns that we raised and we will subsequently report to this group what [inaudible] response was.

The second action item stemming from our discussion with [inaudible] was his invitation to the five internal groups they are helped by ICANN staff on ICANN Organizational Culture and Ethics, Demand Driven Outreach, Sharing Best Practices, Internal Core Knowledge Training, and, Internal Communications, where [inaudible] said that we could send representatives from our group to join these staff groups so that we are aware of the efforts that are being undertaken inside ICANN and that we can potentially also inform the staff sub-teams work and their outcome.

So, I guess the appropriate way for our group to deal with this invitation from [inaudible] would be to launch a call for expressions of interest

---

---

from this team. I guess it's nothing that the Co-Chairs should do and nor should we just ask individuals to ask whether they are going to be invited to one of these sub-teams. But we should make this a process whereby everyone in the CCWG has the opportunity to express their interest and then, depending on the level of feedback that we receive, we would potentially have to prioritize or come up with some sort of selection process.

But my suggestion would be that we ask for expressions of interest first and maybe we only have five and then the solution would be easy. If not, we will get back to the group with some sort of selection process. So, you can express that call for expression of interest to be launched to the CCWG mailing list very shortly and we will likely give you maybe three or four working days to respond and let us know whether you're interested in participating in any of these groups.

So, Robin just says that she could not hear well and asks for what an expression of interest could be filed. Robin, you might remember that during our session with [inaudible] in Hyderabad he said that he had set up five staff working groups to deal with five different topics which are, one, ICANN Organization Culture and Ethics, two, Demand Driven Outreach, three, Sharing Best Practices, four, Internal Core Knowledge Training, five, Internal Communications.

And [inaudible] has invited us to attend these groups and I'm now announcing that we will launch a call for expressions of interest so that individuals from our CCWG teams can let us know if they're interested in joining any of these groups and we will then convey this request to [inaudible]. Only in case we get more expressions of interest than we

---

have groups, then we would need to come up with some sort of selection process.

Jordan is asking whether I could share any information on the level of commitment that is involved, and the straight answer to that is that I do not know. Maybe one of the support staff on this call does know how many meetings are being scheduled by this group? I don't know. Bernie? Karen? Do you know? If so, please do speak up. They're both typing. Bernie doesn't have any idea.

So, what we will do between today and launching the expression of interest, we will try to find out what the work schedule for this group is so that we can provide you with the little bit of information on the level of commitment required to attend these groups, before you file your expression of interest, if any. Okay, so, I guess that is it. I'm just pausing, that Kavouss has asked a question which I haven't yet responded to.

And that is, Thomas, were there substantial comments on [inaudible] report. I guess there weren't any more than the points that I summarized at the beginning of my report on this action item. But we can certainly send these points to the list so let me just copy them into the chat for everyone's benefit. So, these are the points that we extracted from the meeting minute. Certainly, this is not [inaudible] as our discussion was but I hope it helps you get the idea so that we can now continue the conversation with [inaudible].

And we will make sure to invite [inaudible] to the next face to face meeting in Helsinki so that we can continue our conversation with the

---

whole group. Okay, that's it for this slide. I don't see any further hands up, nor questions in the chat, so I hope to have answered everything sufficiently and now I'd like to hand over to Mathieu.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thank you very much, Thomas. This is Mathieu Weill speaking. Hello everyone. We have three groups' updates. I've noted in the chat that Kavouss wanted to raise in a topic on jurisdiction so we'll take that after the three other groups. I know that Ed Morris, the rapporteur of the CEP group just sent out a few slides because the CEP group is asking a question from the Plenary so in order to make sure these slides are received and uploaded by staff, my suggestion is we go for the other two items before turning to you, Ed, if you don't mind? On the AC/OC accountability, Cheryl, you requested a quick update including a discussion on the timeline I think. Would you like to speak to that please?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yes. You want me to do so now? Thank you, Mathieu. Yes, I was hoping that we would have displayed, during this very brief report, an updated dashboard slide. But if that's not available I'm sure all the dashboard slides will be distributed to the list very shortly. So, when you see the dashboard slide you will note that the Echo OC Accountability work team has done a number of important things since our Hyderabad meeting.

First of all, is we have progressed in two ways towards the 40% line. The first way is we've actually removed one of our four tracks that were

---

reported to the Plenary and wider community in Hyderabad down to three. By removing the effectiveness topic which was, in fact, a preamble effort and foundation effort for one of our mandated tasks which is, of course, to come up with a set of recommendations regarding SO/AC Accountability in the future. We decided that by modifying how we were going to approach the main pieces of our work, post Hyderabad, that we could remove that as a track per se and integrate it with some of the particular work that we've now tasked to some small sub sub-teams, which are drafting sub-teams.

And that's the second thing that's allowed us to progress for our October/November reporting. The two drafting sub-teams that we've formed to date are, first of all, one that is looking at the methodology and then the actual auctioning of what we're talking as a data capture exercise, with the material and information that comes back in response to the questionnaires.

And I'd like to punctuate this brief report by thanking all of the SO's and AC's, as referred to earlier in today's meeting. We are getting interaction from all and we certainly look forward to most, if not all, having their responses back in total, if not in part, by our requested date/time of mid-December.

The small team in this case is one where we've specifically asked that at least one person from each SO and AC who is familiar with the accountability question and response survey is part of it. And we also don't mind whether they are, in fact, the people who are partial or total authors of it. That's to make sure that we don't miss any or misinterpret any of the responses. So, that's underway and obviously

that work will come back to our group as a whole and then the Plenary as a whole in a timely fashion. The second part which is a much longer task I suppose, well, it depends on whether the Plenary approves of us changing our tracking. I'll come to that in a moment.

The second group is one that is reviewing and is already reframed our existing reporting material and starting to ensure that a framework is available to start plugging in information as we go on in our work plan now. So, that we can have our material prepared for Plenary consideration prior to anything going out to public comment. So, that's the two major events that have gone on. And when you look at the dashboard slide you'll be able to see all of that.

The other thing that we had specifically done, and that I would like to make very clear, perhaps I can refresh everybody's memory. If you'd all take your minds back to in the very beginning when we, in fact, looked at these timelines. The rapporteurs, and I might note please that Farzanah's apologies for today. She's in the midst of moving ten years of her life from one country to another so she's unable to join us today. And I know Steve has to leave in a few minutes for another call, if in fact he hasn't already left, so he has partial apologies as well.

Some of our rapporteurs, and there are three of us, thought that we were going to be able to do our work in relatively short order and that we would be able to stick to the proposed Track Two timeline. Others of us felt at the very beginning that there was a risk, that there was some complexities that may take us past the Track Two timeline. So, our work group has flagged from the very beginning that we would do

---

our very best to stick to Track Two but we may indeed have to move to Track One. Well, that has happened.

In our post-Hyderabad meeting the majority of our members all agreed that it was not practical for us, particularly with the survey going out only during Hyderabad to be in the Track Two timeline for completion of all our work. And that we would formally request the Plenary, and this is what's happening today, to move us to Track One. For the rest of your memory jog I suggest you read the chat. That's it. Thank you.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. And I think this update is giving us a clear insight that will change the planned time track for the AC/OC group following a Plenary conversation. Unless anyone has any objection or comment on the report by Cheryl, which was extremely clear, in my view, thank you very much. No? I'm seeing no comments so I think that's one of the conclusions we can grow from this.

A very, very brief summary from the Human Rights group. Niels, he apologized for this call because he's flying to the ITF but gave us a detailed report yesterday during the preparation meeting. So, what is important to note on the Human Rights group is that they've made great progress in Hyderabad through a drafting team.

They are now considered at a stage where the subgroup is reviewing, discussing a pretty advanced deliverable document which, when it's worked out within the subgroup, will come to the Plenary, so in the next few weeks hopefully. Maybe very early next year once they have really worked it out. So, work is progressing quite well on the Human Rights

---

track and anyone who wants to join the discussions can apply still for the subgroup and the more people participate to this important work the better and the more informed discussions we will have in the Plenary later in the work as the work is proceeding.

That's a very short and brief and concise update from the Human Rights group. And now I'm turning to Ed Morris. Ed, as the rapporteur of the CEP group, has some guidance to request from the Plenary. So, Ed, you have the floor, and thank you for sending in a few slides that will help guide us through this discussion. Ed.

EDWARD MORRIS:

Thanks, Mathieu, and apologies for the rather ugly nature of the slides, I'm not as talented as our staff members in creating them. Welcome to the world of the CEP and we need your help. We have two questions which have come up during our conversations of a fairly small group, we'd love more members. Alan Greenberg just joined and if that's an incentive we'd love to see more folks join because it's an important subgroup. It's the gateway to the IRP.

So, just for those who don't think and talk CEP every day, I want to remind folks, the purpose of the CEP and where it sits in our accountability plans. It's a pre-IRP filing. You don't have to do it but if you do it, at the end if you lose a case, there's an economic benefit, or there may be an economic benefit as the (00:54:06 – inaudible) are assigned. So, we like to encourage it. And the purpose of the CEP is try to either narrow the dispute so when we go into an IRP both parties



know what issues are at hand, or we resolve the dispute entirely and obviate the need for an IRP.

So, if we can go to the next slide, what our questions are. It goes to the base of what we're trying to do here and what we're doing in creating CEP rules which is the basic thing our subgroup is trying to do. Do we want the CEP to be either a negotiation or a mediation?

Let me explain the difference in where we're at now. The current CEP, you should envision it as a process of negotiation where we take both parties, generally ICANN Legal and a third party with a complaint, we pretty much lock them in a room, lock the doors, turn down the shades. We don't take transcripts, we don't have recordings, and you hope something good comes out of that. Lots of problems with that, particularly for an organization that is committed to accountability, openness and transparency.

So, during work stream one, we considered this during our subgroup, and I believe it was a working party of a working—it was very low in the totem pole where we considered the CEP and I looked at the transcripts today and I'm going to give credit to Greg Shatan who came up and said, "Hey, maybe we should consider throwing a mediator in the room so the parties going in are on more or less equal footing."

One of the accusations that came out during work stream one, for example, is that our friends in ICANN Legal sometimes use this for discovery rather than, in the opinion of some people who've been through it, as a valid means for trying to reach consensus. So, we're

---

---

here in the subgroup and, okay, we have mediation, we have negotiation.

So, we get to the next slide and get back to the conciliation issue, the only guidance we really have is from the new bylaws and it's almost a negative guidance. Either party may terminate the CEP if that party, and we'll go to B, request the inclusion of a mediator. So we're trying to evaluate, do we want a mediation, do we want a negotiation? Do we want to have the CEP, which is the gateway to the IRP, to be more of a formal mediation where you file, you have a mediator in the room and you try to work it out before an IRP?

In other words, it would almost be a mini IRP in some ways, though perhaps, less formal. Or do we want it to be like it is now with a negotiation but perhaps with more transparency and openness? Because we didn't as a small group we were competent to answer that question.

Our second question comes to the Plenary. I think I have almost an answer to this from a conversation I had with Dave McAuley. I'm sure David may be willing to speak to this later during this call. But we do have in the IRP something known as conciliation. Now, in the old bylaws conciliation was almost a mimic of the CEP. It had financial incentives and it was there to both resolve and narrow disputes. The new bylaws are not the same thing at all. No financial incentive to participate and it seems to be a little less formal.

What we're concerned about in the CEP group was we don't want to suddenly go to more of a formal mediation and then the first step of an

---

IRP when you file is another mediation. We're trying to avoid accountability paralysis. So, I'm sure if David speaks to that I think that's an issue we can resolve fairly rapidly, given what he's expressed to me his views are of the conciliation aspect of the IRP. But the bigger question is does this group want more of a formal mediation? Or do you want to keep it more as a negotiation? Or do you want it to be both an option of a party? How should we write the rules and what direction would you like us to go? Thank you.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thank you, Ed. Let's stick to that first question right now. So, the one that was, yes, either mediation or negotiation? Is there a tendency in your group, Ed, that would be, sort of, the starting point of the proposal?

EDWARD MORRIS:

Given the discussion, I can say we have seen Eisner on our first call. Didn't ask her this question but she emphasized the value of the informal nature of the current procedure. On the second call, from those who discussed it—and one of the board members, Chris Disspain actually brought up part of this and said, "Yeah, there should be a mediation between before you file."

And I don't know to what extent he meant—a formal mediation or more of an ad hoc type of mediation set up. I'll take my rapporteur hat off at somebody who's been involved in the CEP. I hated it. You go into a negotiation not knowing what to expect, the doors are closed, and you're up against some pretty formidable, I wouldn't call it opposition,

---

but the other party's been through this before. I wished personally, in my CEP, that we had a mediator there.

But I also understand Sam's perspective that once you throw a third party in perhaps it's less likely that you can all be pals and come out the other end in a kumbaya moment. I'm just not sure how likely that is. So, in terms of the group itself I think we looked at this question and said, "Hey, we're not competent. We're only five, six people. "And I'm the only one in the group at this point that's actually been through a CEP and I would love to have petitioners who have done this before step up and join or at least try to give us some guidance on this call.

But the answer Mathieu, is no, we're looking to the greater group for guidance here about what we want the CEP to be. Once we know what we want it to be, I'm fairly certain we can get the rules set up in short order. But we need to know the direction the group would like us to go in. Thanks.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thanks, Ed. Any inputs from the group on this question? Any strong feelings or not? David?

DAVID MCAULEY:

Mathieu, hi, it's David McAuley for the transcript, thank you. I put my hand up to speak just because, as Ed mentioned, he and I spoke about this on the phone and I've been thinking about it a little bit in the interim since he and I spoke. And I've actually changed my view a little bit. It seems to me that it might be good to call this a negotiation. The

---

new bylaws, the way the bylaws read to me is once you ask for the inclusion of a mediator that amounts to the termination of the CEP. And I think that those bylaws are, sort of, written now. They're, sort of, written in stone in a sense.

And so, it seems to me what we're talking about is a negotiation but what the CEP group might consider doing is putting some small sense of formality around that negotiation by having the IRP Secretariat—I think it's the International Centre for Dispute Resolution right now—sort of, convene the negotiation in a sense of saying, you know, send us your issues, we'll share them among the parties, and then you can negotiate. Put a little bit of formality around it but it seems to me, the way the bylaws are written, the CEP is not a mediation and the mediation would actually terminate it. Thank you.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thank you, David. So, negotiation with some formality. Next is Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Mathieu. It's in fact the question, I guess, David just answered. I was wondering why we will talk about mediation in the CEP, as the first, because the IRP, it's the IRP mediator and mediation and why we will do the same thing in two different venues for the same topic. Then what I imagined that the CEP need to be a first step to go before going, if going to the IRP mediator and then to the full IRP I guess. Thank you.

---

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you, Sebastien. Next is Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Alan Greenberg speaking. Ed mentioned I joined the group. In fact, I was accidentally put on the group by staff by mistake, I'm not quite sure how, and I decided to stay. Perhaps there's a learning experience, if nothing else. We're not designing process for the sake of designing process.

This step was added because clearly during the CCWG there was a belief that if we add this step we may either reduce the number of things that formally go to an IRP or we'll make the process easier or better or something. I almost think we need some case studies to look at past examples of IRP's, understanding that the rules have changed and what kind of process might have made it better? Because, you know, I understand what David said, saying the bylaws are written therefore we cannot do something in violation of them, or going against the intent.

On the other hand, if we made a mistake at that point and we need a mediation phase right now, and I'm not saying we do, but if we did, then so be it, we should make sure the bylaws are adjusted so it works properly. So, we're not building process for process sake. I think we should try to find some examples and see might we be able to design something now that would have helped in those cases? Otherwise I think we're just stabbing in the dark. Thank you.

---

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you, Alan. Greg? And then we'll move onto the next question. Greg.

GREG SHATAN: Greg Shatan for the record. I'll double down on my earlier suggestion which was cited by Ed Morris. And I do think the mediator is a good idea at this point. We would need to straighten out exactly what's happening overall, but I think that the bylaws are an iterative process so I think David McAuley's point recognizes that we're going to need to make some changes in the bylaws, not that we're, kind of, constrained by the bylaws.

And I think that the issue is, you know, as Ed cited both from personal experience and from what others have said, it's not a level playing field. And a mediator to, kind of, help put some form and shape to the negotiations and there's more than one way to [inaudible] and my thinking was that of a kind of structured negotiation rather than some of the more artificial or highly structured processes that mediators will engage in. Such as keeping the two parties in completely separate rooms and running suggestions back and forth and not allowing any actual face to face negotiation. That's not what I'm thinking of. That is one kind of mediation.

But what I was thinking of was basically, you know, a referee for the negotiations so something to save the petitioning party from getting whiplash and to level the playing field here a bit. The alternative is to basically have an advocate for the side that's coming in green and that raises a whole bunch of other questions and frankly be more extreme,

---

more interesting, more extreme suggestion than basically having a neutral in there trying to, you know, facilitate. Thanks.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thank you, Greg. So, Ed, I think you have some input from the Plenary. It's probably not as easy to manage as if it was a very clear cut answer but there's a range of options. Negotiation, negotiation with some formality, mediation, structured negotiation. I think Alan's suggestion is good, reaching out to ICANN Legal or other parties, to CEP's, to check what helps the process most is going to be useful for the group to come back to the Plenary with pros and cons or maybe just one of the options will appear as clearly better in another reading on this question.

And I hope you noted, Ed, as well, Berry Cobb's mention of similar conversations happening in the subsequent [inaudible] PDP. So maybe this [inaudible] liaison to establish here as well. So, I think this is a good initiation of the discussions in the group on the CEP and I hope it's also convinced others to join this group. Let's take the second question now. Ed?

EDWARD MORRIS:

Yes, thanks, Mathieu. And of course, a hybrid approach may be what we come up with taking into consideration all the input but, yeah, I like Alan's idea as well as an initial step forward. And further to what you just said, look, I've been getting private emails from petitioners who have been in CEP's telling me how hard it is.



---

And then when I come back to them and say, “Please show up to the group,” this isn’t heavy lifting, you don’t have to show up at every call, but if in your community, you have people that have pretty much bitched about the CEP, don’t like it, we need their input. So, I’d ask them to consider and I’d ask you to go to them and consider asking them to show up for a meeting or two, give an hour or two. Any input would be valuable in that regard.

And thanks, Mathieu, on to the next question and I will ask Dave McAuley to address this. You have in the new bylaws the conciliation procedure. After the claim is referred to an IRP panel the parties are urged to participate in conciliation discussions for the purpose of attempting to narrow the issues that are to be addressed by the IRP panel. While, obviously, we’re not trying to resolve the issue before the IRP because you’re already in the IRP, but otherwise the goal seems to be fairly similar to the CEP.

So, concern expressed by our group is that we could have the CEP—and I just noticed, we were talking about, well, if we do mediation, what if the conciliation is constructed as a mediation. But at the same token, even if we do negotiation, we could then have another negotiation that the parties could call on. So, what we want to do it and what comes from our group is that we don’t want to have duplicate procedures at the CEP and then the first stage of an IRP. And perhaps David could help us out on this question. Thanks.

MATHIEU WEILL:

David, do you want to follow up? I know Greg’s hand is up.

---

DAVID MCAULEY: Mathieu, yes, I would be happy to make some comments. Ed and I did discuss this. Do you want me to press on through that?

MATHIEU WEILL: Yes, please.

DAVID MCAULEY: I see this, the conciliation bit, as an important part of IRP that is separate from the CEP and what it is, is, in my younger days, very long ago, I used to do a little litigation, and as the trial got closer the judge would call the parties in and say, "I want you to toss aside all the extraneous claims that mean nothing to you, that you just threw in to be aggressive, and boil this case down to its essential contested issues."

And I think what this bylaw says is this case is definitely going to the IRP, it's not going to be settled, that recognition has already been made, there is a three-member panel in play. The judges, in a sense, have been selected out of the standing panel, it's ready to go. And this is, sort of, that narrowing moment, especially when the parties are getting a sense of how the costs are escalating. Where it's possible to, sort of, narrow the issues down to what is the [inaudible] of this case?

And that's really what this is about. Let's narrow the issues so that we're not wasting time and money. And this is going to IRP, everybody recognizes it, it not settle-able. And so, I think it's separate and I think this is an important part and I think, obviously, it's voluntary, the parties

---

are simply urged to do it, but I think it's an important part of the IRP process. Thank you.

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you, David. So, you would keep it separate from the CEP. So, that part would be within the remit of your group, the IOT, and not on the CEP's remit. Am I correct?

DAVID MCAULEY: Yes, Mathieu. In fact, the IRP IOT team met, I think, about a week ago, and we discussed some of the things that are on our plate and this was mentioned that, you know, we will come up with a letter of invitation, or whatever it is, that needs to put this in place. But this is, I think, a sensible bylaw and we will deal with it in our team. Thank you.

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you very much, David. Ed, I assume no objection on your side? I would like to check whether there's anyone else objecting to that approach on this second question? Okay, so at least we have clarified the second question, which is a 50% achievement on the questions. And I think we have a very good start of discussion on the first one and that's certainly going to be helpful for the CEP group as a whole.

So, thanks a lot, Ed, for raising these issues in the Plenary. I hope that was helpful to you and we've at least achieved some clarification on the second point and have some food for thought on the first one. We will now turn to the request from Kavouss to promptly and concisely a concern on Jurisdiction. Kavouss, could you explain your point shortly

---

to the Plenary? Kavouss? Please tell us your concern or the point you wanted to raise on the Jurisdiction group list.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. My concerns, if you do not interpret it shouting, my concern is that after the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting we are at the beginning of nowhere. First, we discussed whether we address the issue of the gap analysis, we abandoned. Second, we discuss whether we should address the issue location of ICANN, we just put it aside.

Then we discussed whether we should talk about the choice of law, we abandoned that. And now we put it on the [inaudible] and for the [inaudible] two very narrow questions have been adapted. People [inaudible] that, and other people did not want to extend the questions.

And, apart from all of these, one of the main important issues is the immunity. This immunity has a different meaning. One is immunity of the ICANN from public law, according to the US Act of Immunity, that we have serious difficulty. The second is that the immunity of the SO and AC, if they remove the board member they want to have the immunity. We don't know which immunity we're talking about. And the progress of the work is very, very little. And we have serious difficulty to continue with one jurisdiction. People discuss that they need to go to have these additional jurisdictions in order to have a choice.

And these are the very important things. Please, for some people jurisdiction is the most important and we need to be quite conscious of that. It seems that some distinguished colleagues, they push to limit the

jurisdiction and, finally, to be under the jurisdiction of one single country's law. That's that. So, the disappointment and we don't believe that we will get anything from these jurisdictions. Because we have heard formally from somebody, formally saying that, take the jurisdiction off of the table. So, we are turning around.

At the end, we reach July and then there is no [inaudible] important. If the issue of additional jurisdiction is not addressed, we are lost. If the issue of immunity of ICANN from the public law is not addressed, we are lost. If the problems of the sanctions of some countries that maybe have problems with the DNS, and so on, support, we will be at the mercy of one particular jurisdiction, we are lost. So, that is that. I'm sorry to say that. And please kindly do not interpret it as shouting. I hope that you have heard my voice clearly, if I have spoken loudly, I am sorry for that. Thank you.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thank you very much, Kavouss. That was very clearly articulated and I think you've made your point very clearly. I'm going to give maybe Greg an opportunity to respond briefly? And I'm sure we'll find a way forward after that. Greg?

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks, Greg Shatan for the record. Just briefly, I would disagree with the characterization of the work of the group. Although we have a difficult time because we have strongly divergent views in the group, even with regard to what the scope of the group is, and also with regard to whether we're sticking to the work plan that we have.

---

---

We indeed have a document that we are actively working on, although trying to get people to focus and actually work on the document has been frustrating. We're working on a document which seeks to answer the question, what is the influence of ICANN's existing jurisdiction relating to resolution of disputes, i.e. choice of law and venue, on the actual operation of ICANN's policy and accountability mechanisms. This was decided by the group as being a question that was clearly in scope and that was a core part and focus of our group, as is stated in the bylaws, as is stated in Annex 12.

And we have a document that, to some extent, has stalled out because people don't seem to want to work on that question. There are people come in with other thoughts about what the group should be looking at, and that has essentially taken away the focus from this that we're supposed to be working on.

We've also agreed on a working method of identifying issues and if issues are identified, looking for potential solutions to those issues. We've identified the question of immunity clearly falls under the remedies question. While we're still on the issues phase of our work, the immunity question was brought up on the list while we were, kind of, in Hyderabad and the group was essentially, kind of, not working. And now getting people to put that back in the queue for when it will be dealt with later has proven difficult because some people really, really want to discuss that question. Whether in fact that is something we're going to reach, whether there's an issue that requires that as a potential remedy is not yet decided by the group.

---

So, there are certainly challenges in the group, and if we focused on the work that we had agreed to do, I think we would make more progress and I'm hopeful for that, that we will be able to refocus and deal with some of the other issues. We had made a decision in one meeting to look for some additional recounting of experiences that people have had related to what ICANN's jurisdiction, but now that project has become more complicated as well.

It's still mid-stream, there's no reason to talk about sausage wallets being made and we'll see how that resolves. I just want to make sure that we air things fully but also that we keep an eye on the scope of the group. So, we'll continue to try to press forward and keep it from, kind of, running off in all directions simultaneously.

And as to what we did and put aside, I think it was a, kind of, elephant in the room question that we dealt with in terms of the question of when we would deal with ICANN's jurisdiction and location and we decided to put it aside. Again, looking at that as a, potentially, a remedies issue. Not to put aside looking at what those potential effects of it might be but whether there's something in the nature of a remedy relating to those things is, again, put aside for the remedies period so that's in itself progress.

And as far as what the gap analysis is, frankly we're stuck with a rather ambiguous Annex 12 in some ways and we are going to need to clarify some things with regard to exactly what Annex 12 instructs us to do. But the question of how to proceed, I don't think there's a serious question about how to proceed, we just need to continue to proceed

---

and to focus really on the open work and not to try to re-order the process that we've agreed to. Thanks.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thanks, Greg, and I know you're devoting a lot of time on this so I want to acknowledge the important work that you're doing on this as well. I have David on the list and then Kavouss and then we'll close the item for the moment. I think this big sense and way forward as possible and I'm sure David has some useful suggestions as usual. David?

DAVID MCAULEY:

Mathieu, thank you. I may disappoint this time. I just wanted to say that, like my friend, Kavouss, I experience frustrations in the Jurisdiction group from time to time but I think that's a result of the fact that it's just difficult work. I wish that everybody agreed with me, unfortunately they don't on the call, but that's understandable as well.

And I just want to say I'm glad the Jurisdiction sub-team is on Track One and not on Track Two. I think it's being well led. And I think one of the challenges we face is, compared to Work Stream One, the number of people that are active in this sub-team is just a low number. It's just happens. We're struggling. There are difficult issues but we're making progress and I just wanted to tip my hat to Greg and [inaudible] and we just have to soldier on. Thank you.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thank you, David. You stole my thunder somehow for the conclusion, but I'll come back to that. Kavouss?



KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, Mathieu, I think if you and the other Co-Chairs have time to read the notes you will see that now we are limited to two very narrow questions saying that does or did your business or your [inaudible] is affected by ICANN jurisdiction is too narrow. I'm very sorry and you see that when the people asking to have to broaden the questions and also have the additional questions [inaudible] opposed to that, you see in the chat, we can't agree, or we can't agree. So, even agree either to the two questions.

The two questions were answered by two people and these two people received some comments, and one of them posted, no, I don't agree to amend my questions. How is that? I think we should be open. I don't think that somebody could say that because I am adjusting the question I don't agree any other comments. It is not a proper course of action.

So, I'm sorry you have made very little progress. So, if you are very optimistic, okay, good luck, but I don't think that we have such a ample time. We are reaching June within six months and that's all. And we have to do it as well. And we are now limited to question of experience. This is not our problem of experience. The problem is that jurisdiction. This current jurisdiction does not work. What [inaudible]?

If this doesn't work the whole issue will [inaudible]. We need to continue to accept the multi-stakeholder may not accept that because they're no longer a multi-stakeholder. If it's single stakeholder [inaudible] any jurisdictions. So please kindly [inaudible]. Thank you.

---

MATHIEU WEILL: That was your point initially and I fully understand and recognize that this is your view and as you heard others maybe more optimistic, let's all be optimistic and that's usually what makes things happen, is when we think they will happen. Greg, a very short last word?

GREG SHATAN: Yeah, I just want to clarify, that was a mischaracterization of what's going on. Because the decision was made to ask a couple of questions to try to get some actual fact experiences into the group. That was not meant to limit the work of the group in any way. It was to give us some more information. It did not change the remit of the group or what we're working on.

All we wanted was facts but because nobody in the group is offering any actual facts about experiences and negotiating with ICANN or disputes with ICANN or any other things that have been affected in the past with ICANN's jurisdictions. So, we wanted to get some information from outside the group. Characterizing that as somehow limiting the work of the group is extremely frustrating and having to talk about that characterization repeatedly and from several members of the group is also extremely frustrating.

So, I'm not quite sure why it keeps coming up and being phrased that way but it's just not true. All we're trying to do is get some more information. Some facts, some experiences, in there. We're also debating whether another kind of question should be asked and we'll get through that too. But that was the point of those two questions. Just information. Thank you.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thank you, Greg. So, to answer and sum this up. And, Kavouss, rest assured, I am following the group very closely. The exchanges, the meeting notes, everything. And I'm also very much aware of the importance for many stakeholders of this issue. And so, we take this very seriously. I think there's progress being made, although it's sometimes slow.

There's some important [inaudible]. They are well structured. I think, looking for public input is useful but it needs to be worked out very carefully so that it can be useful in the next stage. And let's all remember, as David was saying, that we are trying to be a consensus. It can be lengthy, it can be messy, we are well aware of that. We've been through a pretty lengthy and messy Stream One work. And I think the trick is that we need to trust the process even in the middle of the storm and keep an open mind.

And another part which I think could be helpful in this case is let's focus on where we agree, on the areas of agreement, and not on the disagreements. And that will help us create a wider zone of consensus. So, there are agreements in the group, there are some interesting things and I think we can build upon this. Certainly, we'll try and have an update on the group on the next Plenary so we can share with everyone, even those that are not participating in the subgroup, where we're standing. And I am available to the rapporteurs to help as needed to progress just like the other Co-Chairs.

---

So, I hope this conversation is constructive and helps us move forward. I think everyone is willing to make progress in this group. And I'm confident that we can make it if we keep the spirit that has characterized our Work Stream One efforts. So, with that, we are closing the item on the subgroup updates and moving [inaudible] AOB. Anyone who has an AOB can raise their hand. I know Natalie wanted to give a short update on the dashboard. Natalie?

NATHALIE VERGNOLLE:

Yes, hello, thank you. Nathalie Vergnolle. Thank you, Mathieu. Just briefly wanting to give everyone an update on the publication of the November dashboard. We've been asking rapporteurs to provide input on progress of their subgroups and as of today, I have received five inputs out of nine subgroups and I'm still waiting inputs from Jurisdiction, from CEP, from the Ombudsman and from the Good Faith Conduct groups.

We will also be publishing today, the 30<sup>th</sup> of November, a draft version of the PCST report for review with the Co-Chairs. I'm sorry, not publishing, but just sending the report for review and approval to the Co-Chairs today. And the report will officially be published on the 5<sup>th</sup> of December and that will include the dollar amounts for the month of October.

And as for the actual dashboard itself, including the November activity reporting, we will be publishing this no later than ten business days after the 25<sup>th</sup>. So, that takes us, this month, to the 9<sup>th</sup> of December. So, that is our target date for publication of the dashboard.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thank you very much, Nathalie. Any questions or other AOB? I'm seeing, no, so I think we'll adjourn this call. Thank you very much everyone for your participations and contributions. And you have received a note that we have cancelled the call we had provisions for next week, because there will not be enough substance to discuss then. So, be aware that our next call is in two weeks' time. Thank you very much and talk to everyone soon. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**