
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's the half-hour mark, but that's where we start. So let's getting going please, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Certainly. We'll go ahead the system. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the At-Large ICANN Evolution call, taking place on Monday, the 17th of October, 2016 at 18:20 UTC.

In the call today, we have Alfredo Calderon, Narine Khachatryan, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Maureen Hilyard, Remmy Nweke, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Yrjö Länsipuro, Louis Houle, Sébastien Bachollet, Eduardo Diaz, Gordon Chillott, Tatiana Tropina, Wale Bakare, and Narine Khachatryan. My apologies, Narine. I listed you twice there. We also have Alberto Soto on.

We have listed apologies from Vanda Scartezini, Alan Greenberg, Kaili Kan, Bastiaan Goslings, Seun Ojedeji, Tijani Ben Jemaa, and Glenn McKnight.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Terri Agnew.

Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and David.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your names before speaking, not only for transcription purposes but also for interpreters.

With that, I'll turn it back over to you, Olivier. Please begin.

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.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Terri. Welcome, everyone, to yet another call of the At-Large on what used to be IANA Stewardship and ICANN Accountability but it now called the ICANN Evolution Working Group.

We have, as per usual, a number of Work Stream updates, so we can coordinate what is going on and perhaps even discuss some of the points that are being made in the Work Streams.

So that's essentially today's call. I was going to ask if there was Any Other Business to add to the current agenda that is displayed on your screen.

Oh, yes. I see your hand up, Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I think we had talk of that last time, that, yes, let's go to each of the items or subgroups or drafting teams, but we need also to have some discussion at the global level. Tomorrow we will have a prep call, and after tomorrow, we will have a general meeting of all the members of Work Stream 2. I think it could be useful to add that in our list of topics and to take some time to discuss that.

Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Sébastien. Let's add in Any Other Business: discussing Work Stream 2 as a whole, if there are any discussions and points to deal with us.

Okay. I don't see any other hands up, so we can go to Agenda Item #2. That's the IANA update and the closing of the working groups in the IANA Stewardship Transition. There's the IANA Plan Working Group, I believe, and IETF is being now closed down, as it has completed its work. At the same time, there's also been a note by Jonathan Robinson and Lise Fuhr about the closing down of the CWG IANA, as all the work has been completed. Implementation, as far as I understand, has been effected, so no further work in that working group.

I just think that we perhaps should, by acclamation, thank both Jonathan and Lise for being able to steer us through this vital amount of work in what has been, on many occasions, very challenging. I know, having chaired some working groups in the past, that there's a lot of work that goes on behind the scene. I cannot imagine how much work has gone on behind the scene to get CWG IANA through to a successful end. So, well done. We can certainly put on the record our thanks from this IANA – well, now it's called the ICANN Evolution Working Group – Stewardship Transition Subteam.

That's really all. Are there any questions on the IANA updates? I noticed Cheryl Langdon-Orr with some virtual applause and virtual applause from Eduardo Diaz as well. I'm sure we're all applauding.

Sébastien Bachollet, you have the floor.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, Olivier. Thank you. You can add to your thanks five members from At-Large who participated in this working group. But as a member, I

think it's also good timing to thank them for the hard work and good work they've done. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sébastien. That's a very good point, too. Being one of the five members, I didn't quite want to pat myself on the back, but we can all pat each other. Thank you for this on behalf of all the people that have been involved in it. So I think, thanks to the amount of work that was done also by this working group here, it was pretty clear what the five members who were a part of the CWG IANA had to do and to say.

One of the big questions was, "Well, hang on. You are just five people. The At-Large community might have a different view." The very fact that we had the recording [and] all of the feedback on this working group was very helpful in pressing the point that needed to be pressed forward.

Looking now forward, we have Work Stream 2 activities. We'll go through our usual list, starting with Diversity. We have on this Cheryl, Sébastien, Seun, Tijani, and Beran. I know there's been a lot of calls in the Work Stream 2. I'm not sure about whether there's been any updates or any move forward on Diversity.

Does anybody wish to speak about this?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien, you [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh. Thank you. [inaudible] to respond, other than suggesting that, due to ridiculous technical difficulties – and I do mean possibly some of the worst I’ve ever experiences, as consistent and as long – in getting a lead into a group. Sébastien I think 15 to 18 minutes into the call offered and took over the chairing. So he’d be in perfect position to bring us up to date on Diversity. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Did you say Sébastien?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I did, indeed.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah. Sébastien Bachollet, you have the floor.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. As Cheryl just described the situation, we had an interesting meeting with one of the co-rapporteurs, who was not able

to participate. The other one was in trouble with a connection. At the same time, they had prepared a document, and it was a useful document that prepared a strawman.

We wanted to discuss the question of the definition of what diversity is and if we agree or disagree with the definition they suggested. Then we discussed what are the elements of diversity and what are the ones important for ICANN and how we can measure all that. They have now sent us an update on the strawman.

Maybe I will, if I find it somewhere in my – I will read just a short definition they suggest to take. I need to find the right one. I guess one is from the staff and [for the record]. Okay, I will leave all that to make comments, and if I find the just three lines, I or somebody else can read it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sébastien, there is a WorkStream2DiversityStrawmanVersion1.docx on the wiki page itself. I've sent that link to the chat. Is that the strawman you're looking for?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Okay. I guess first sentence gives a description of... The idea is: do we agree that diversity in ICANN refers to the ability of ICANN to facilitate [inaudible] in different aspects of stakeholder representation at various levels within the organization? The idea is to have a comprehensive, short definition. We can [inaudible] all the different aspects that we will discuss and then have it defined later it.

I guess that's the point that we need to make in this group, but Cheryl and others may wish in to jump in with pleasure. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Sébastien. Any other comments on the topic of Diversity? Cheryl, did you wish to say a couple of words on this, adding to this?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think one point is, if it is a document that is going to need a second reading – and we've asked if doing this certainly at least second reading – during this coming week, some online analysis can happen.

That said, with an analysis line by line, there is a fair amount of work we're going to have to do on this. For example, in that first paragraph, it ends with listing 80 examples of criteria for measurement of diversity. The last one ends up [using] the term "openness," and that's one, for example, I personally have enormous difficulties working out how one could even start having some further benchmark for something called "openness." Anyway, I'm not terribly sure that that's not an enabler rather than a diversity measure, anyway.

So it's early days. I think this document that Sébastien wrote the introduction for is a good start, and possibly one, Olivier, that might be worthwhile to, rather than just linking here – not all of the work [team] topics are progressing at an equal rate. I wonder if, towards the end of the call, we might come back to this. We might, where there's significant [inaudible] of work like this piece of strawman, pay some

particular, specific attention at some of our meetings to some of these things to discuss. Just a thought. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Cheryl. That's a very good point. Let's put this on the side. We do have time. We'll come back to the strawman. If I could please ask in the meantime that staff make a copy of this strawman so they could be displayed on the Adobe Connect, that would be really helpful.

Let's, in the meantime, move on while this takes place. Let's go the guidelines for good faith. I've always looked at this as being interesting. I'm not quite sure what a guideline for good faith would be, but it looks as though there has been some movement going on.

Who wishes to speak to this? We've got Cheryl, Avri, or Alan. At the moment, I only see Cheryl on the call. So, perhaps, Cheryl, you might have to say a few words on this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Yes, we in fact have had a, I thought, quite reasonable follow-up meeting since our last gathering in this work group. We're also at the point where we've got some of what I wouldn't call a strawman but more of a development book that is starting to be put together.

One of the things here that we need to remember is of course that this is the guidelines for what will be a set of benchmarks or behavioral expectations, the ability to show, if need be in a court of law, that you

have acted in good faith when, as a leader of the Empowered Community [inaudible] unusual and we hope hopefully rarer-than-hen's-teeth circumstance of removal of a Board member or Board members in enacted.

So there's the part of the equation where we can assure leaders of the Empowered Community that they will be not so much protected but supported through a situation where any form of claim of libel and reputational harm would perhaps happen in such a circumstance.

So providing that the leader in the Empowered Community has gone through a sort of agreed upon good faith action and not such [inaudible] in legal terms the average person would expect as good faith behavior.

Notice I'm not using the word "truth" here. The truth of it doesn't really matter that much at all, actually, in some courts of law. But the cost of such legal arguments, should it ever be made, [inaudible] covered by ICANN.

So this is a really important point. It's a point that Alan was quite passionate about during our work in Work Stream 1. He certainly got the support of, I think, all five of this in this matter. It is essential because, if the leadership of the Empowered Community – the people who would actually be taking action, for want of a better word, in bringing the case – were at risk themselves financially, obviously that would have a chilling effect. This is something that, should we need to use it, needs to be used professionally and effectively.

Now, the good news is – I'll stop after this – that where we are in the process of developing this right now has a clear demarcation line, where

we are looking at high-level principles which I think you'll find are socially acceptable norms across most if not all the cultures that we are familiar with within ICANN and more globally. But it leaves the specifics of such details, as in the matter of whether the individual Board member has the right to respond, the right to be heard – all those sorts of things – up to the appointing body; in other words, the NomCom, the Advisory Committee or the Support Organization. So it's going to be high-level principles and then leave the details up to the AC/SO or appointing body. I think that's a very smart way of doing it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Cheryl. Are there any questions on this topic from anyone?

I don't see any hands up. Cheryl, just one point on the actual membership of this group. It's a small membership, and I did notice one strange thing. Rinalia is quoted twice on this. She's listed both as a participant – Rinalia Abdul Rahim number 10 – and as the Board liaison.

Is there a difference between those two? It might just be an error.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not sure whether it's an error that she's listed as a participant, but certainly we see her as a Board liaison as well. They listed as a participant – of course ensures that you're sent all the call details and it goes into your calendar and all those sorts of things. So we've had a number of situations where observers in any of the groups are not as

up-to-date with what's happening in the meetings because they're expected to just follow on the list, so to speak.

But I believe that most of the topics have been given, I would have thought in most cases, to Board liaisons – a liaison and a backup liaison. So to that – I'm trying to adjust my mic [inaudible]. Is that better? Am I still muffled?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You're quite fine as far as I'm concerned.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. [inaudible] probably representing Veronica and David. They may not be hearing me clearly. So hopefully I fixed it.

The Board liaison, I would have thought, would have always been included in early invitations, but whether or not the liaison and the backup liaison are, I couldn't answer. Terri, in fact, may be in a better position to answer that later on. She could ask Vanda, for example. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Since I don't see any other hands up, then I think we can move to the next part of our agenda. I'm trying to find the right window, if I can find it, and that's Human Rights. A lot more participants in that working group. In Human Rights, we have Avri, Bastiaan, [Eric], Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Leon, Seun, Tijani, and Cheryl –

a lot of people. I would imagine we don't need to resort to Cheryl on this occasion. We could have someone else giving us an update.

Tatiana Tropina is willing to give us an update on this. Tatiana, you have the floor.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Hi. Thanks, Olivier. Hello, everyone. I'm not listed somehow in the participants, maybe because I'm new to this Evolution Group. But I'm in the middle of this Human Rights Subteam work, so I can provide an update from the very [inaudible].

I didn't participate on the last call, so I don't know if it was discussed or not, that two weeks ago it was totally obvious that the group got completely stuck and couldn't agree on the Ruggie Principles. For those who don't know what this is, it's U.N.-guided principles on business and human rights. The debate was [inaudible] and revolved around general applicability to their ICANN missions and operations.

Well, the problem was that these principles were developed and kind of tailored for supply-chain businesses – large ones, mainly of third-party contracts, like, I don't know, Procter & Gamble – allowing these businesses to opt out of the contracts with a sales party when their partners or contractors are engaged in, let's say, severe human rights violations.

The problem is that ICANN is not [inaudible] Procter & Gamble, and the problem is that ICANN also can be considered a common carrier in relation to some of the third parties. Many group members also believe

that it is actually a policy development process, where ICANN has respect to human rights and has to implement human rights concerns and not actually the relationships with the third parties where ICANN doesn't have that much influence or has too much influence to fix something. ICANN is not a human rights watchdog.

Since it got stuck, there was a call for volunteers, and there was small group composed of four people. I'm a member of this group. We have been scheduled with a task to come up with some different vision, maybe in addition to Ruggie Principles. So even without taking into account the Ruggie Principles, just get this group out of being stuck.

The Human Rights Bylaw in this regard was split into different pieces, like: what does it mean within mission and core values to respect human rights? What does it mean: applicable law? Each piece requires interpretation.

Well, I can only share that this doesn't mean that this is most pleasant work that I have done in my life, to say the least, because we have only four people in this group. The disagreements we have are quite severe. For almost two weeks, the debate was too [inaudible] around human rights.

Now this small group is trying to get out of being stuck, but I do believe that, in all of these intense discussions, we are actually representing disagreements and we're selecting disagreements of the general group. We are now trying to make progress and work on the interpretation document to suggest something as a group call tomorrow – at least some food for thought, food for interpretation.

I can share the document link, if you want, on this chat. It has been cleaned up today because a week ago or even few days ago it was a big, massive document. The whole group was complaining about it because, of four people, with a have three lawyers, which means that we have five different opinions. We were commenting on different pieces of the document quite substantially and extensively, but now all the comments are cleaned up and the substance is summarized. They're going to work – well, basically, this evening, besides that it is 9:00 P.M. now – and comes up with something for tomorrow morning for the discussion on the Human Rights Subgroup call.

So if any members of the group would provide the external view on this, I would actually be grateful because, though I know how this work looks from the outside, maybe I'm missing something. Maybe there are some comments or suggestions. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tatiana. Who were the other three people in that very small working group or group that tried to get things unstuck?

TATIANA TROPINA: Thanks, Olivier. It's a very pleasant team composed of me, Matthew Shears from NCUC, Greg Shatan from the Intellectual Property Constituency, and Jorge Cancio from GAC-Switzerland. So, yeah, basically lots of disagreements, especially with regard to GAC-Switzerland support in the Ruggie Principles. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Tatiana. That's really helpful. You mentioned that you might be able to share a link for a snapshot of the document. If you may, that would be really helpful.

I see Cheryl Langdon-Orr is next in the queue.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Olivier. Hopefully my audio is clearer and crisper now. I'm practically eating the microphone. If it's too loud, let me know.

I just wanted to bring to the group's attention what I put in chat because I know not everybody's Adobe Connect is necessarily behaving very well at the moment. With the work Tatiana has been doing, whilst I'm not an outsider, I've certainly been highly impressed with what she and the other three compatriots have been doing on this.

To have the committee of the whole of us argue these points as passionately as many of the deeply held beliefs would head us would be highly unproductive. So the work that Tatiana and the others have done no doubt hasn't been the easiest nor the most relaxed environment to work in at times because they are deeply held views and beliefs. It has put the rest of the team on an extremely solid and safe footing, in my view, for us to continue our conversation.

So I just her to rest assure that her efforts and the efforts of the others, whilst we all recognize it would hardly have been the most relaxed conversation ever had, really has made a huge difference because we would be progressing nowhere if we were to have those discussions as a community as a whole. People's beliefs in things like the Ruggie

Principles is almost fanatical at some levels, as is the belief as to what the meaning of human rights within the ICANN context is.

So the foundational work she's done really should be appreciated by all of us. I for one have maintained that she certainly has been a very welcome voice of reason on a number of occasions. Thank you, Tatiana.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Cheryl. "Hear, hear" is what I could say. For those of you that might have clicked on the link that Tatiana has put on the chat, you will be amazed to see 27 pages of work there. Somehow I'm glad I'm not part of that group, but at the same time, I'm very grateful that we have some very good people who are working on this. So that's really excellent.

Just as a last thing on this topic, Tatiana, you will be listed in our next call. So, apologies for not being listed on the agenda this time. I don't know if everyone knows, but you are a valuable individual member of EURALO. It's great to see you here.

I don't see any other hands up at the moment, so we can probably move on then to the next thing. The next on the list is Jurisdiction, with an equally large group with equally strong views being held by an equally large number of people.

I'm not quite sure who wishes to provide us with an update on this one. It lists here Avri, Christopher Wilkinson, Erich Schweighofer, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Tijani, and Cheryl. I believe that either Jean-Jacques or Cheryl are on the call. I don't see – no, so Tijani is not on the call. He

has sent his apologies. So, perhaps, Jean-Jacques, would you be able to provide us with an update on Jurisdiction?

Jean-Jacques will defer to Cheryl. So, Cheryl-Langdon-Orr, you're back on the update stream for Jurisdiction discussion. What has gone on in the past week?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Well, in fact I'm going to stop at being "The CLO Show" as much as that is probably against my natural tendencies under normal circumstances. Tatiana, you're also part of jurisdiction, and I think we should at least expand our voices.

So, Tatiana, if you'd like to pick up on this one.

TATIANA TROPINKA:

Yes, sorry. Actually, the [concourse] didn't find any progression. I really think that Jean-Jacques has to be sad that he didn't attend the last call because finally, after weeks of [suckling] around the issues of jurisdiction of ICANN and incorporation and headquarters and whether the question of relocation of ICANN should be on the table and should be a part of this group, the group has decided to put it aside for a while and work on the document of multi-layer jurisdiction to see what kind of layers of jurisdiction of ICANN can affect the accountability where it's applicable to the [contrast].

So now the group is really into the call of the debate and I believe that the decision to put the issue of general jurisdiction aside was a very

good decision of the group and I'm really grateful to the members of the group who actually pushed it.

I do think that there is still a danger that this discussion will come back and will get us back to the [weeds] or to the research circle when the group is getting stuck again because I see some discussions on the maiden list launch initiated by some of the group members, again, are [revolving] about ICANN's immunity, ICANN's relocation. But I do believe that if these discussions are put aside, the general debate will allow to identify some problems in jurisdiction which are actually related to the relocation of ICANN. This topic could be brought back if there are any real dangers or any real threats. But right now, the group finally got out of stuck.

Well, as a side note, I wish Human Rights would [do] this as well. And it is progressing so I'm really very much looking forward to the next group calls. Basically, I encourage everyone to attend because it is a very interesting debate on the jurisdiction. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tatiana. And you mentioned a document, the multiple layers of jurisdiction and I can put a copy of it – there you go – I've done a copy and paste of the link to that document. It certainly opens the door to something a lot more structured than discussing about anything and everything at the same time.

So jurisdiction of incorporation, jurisdiction of head [inaudible] location, etc., etc., etc. That will hopefully be able to bring first more perspective

and more order to the discussions in that working group. So thanks again for following this.

Are there any questions or comments on this, anyone on the call? I don't see anyone putting their hand up so we can, therefore, move on to the next one and that's the Ombudsman, for the Ombudsman discussion. Sébastien Bachollet is actually the rapporteur, so I guess I should turn over to him to provide us with an update on the Work Stream Ombudsman.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, Olivier. We had our tenth call just a few hours ago and even if participation was quite low – maybe the lowest one since the beginning – we had good exchanges on the different matters.

The first one is relating to the role of the ICANN Ombudsman Office regarding the ICANN employee when we talk about public policy and also about ICANN anonymous outlying users and other whistleblowers. And it was linked with another question: what is the role of the ICANN Ombudsman Office regarding the new created ICANN Complaints Officer?

And I will put the link to the blog published by the CEO and President of ICANN and we discussed a lot around that, especially one part of the document and I will take this to read it to you, that the ICANN Complaints Officer will receive, investigate and respond to complaints about the ICANN organization effectiveness and will be responsible for all complaints, systems and mechanisms across the ICANN organization.

We will be appointing someone to this role, reporting directly to John. John is John Jeffrey, the actual ICANN General Counsel and Secretary. And they discuss and will work closely with Ombudsman Herb Waye. It's why we take that in Board and I guess that the other group who will discuss the question of staff accountability would have to take that into account.

Just a short notice from my side is that we were quite surprised with this announcement because we didn't hear before, but it's not our job – it's the job of the CEO to decide the staff – but there is some link with the work of Work Stream 2 and the other point is that the fact that it's connected and under the responsibility of Legal, I have trouble to imagine how staff will go to them or we will go to them. It's a little bit the same thing that when the Compliance Group was under Legal, I guess.

But coming back to our call today, another type of question is how do we enhance the independence of the ICANN Ombudsman Office?

And it was quite interesting to see that the current Ombudsman and Board member was quite positive about the independence and two other participants, we were questioning about this full independence, the fact that it's the Board who hires the Ombudsman, the fact that the Ombudsman needs to meet with the Board Governance Committee and with other committees of the Board. That gives us some questions and it's why we think that we need also to define what will be the role of the Empowered Community regarding the Ombuds.

Just, I would, it's a little bit long, sorry. The two other points is that we are discussing about how we will under the review was supposed to be done with ATRT2. Then as the rapporteur, I request to know what is the [inaudible], where is the [inaudible], who will be in charge and we are still waiting for an answer both from ICANN staff and CFO, particularly, and maybe the co-Chair. But we have a call tomorrow and I hope to have an answer. And I was asking for some support by staff and we will get the support to write, to finalize the document.

The last point is that we are discussing about some issue who are interconnected – for example, the Complaints Officer with the Staff Accountability – and I would suggest tomorrow that we organize one meeting with both groups who are dealing with one issue. Maybe it will be also interesting to have one with Diversity and the Ombuds to see what could be the role of Ombuds regarding that. That's just to do that in our silo, but together. Then that's one [inaudible] that will come to the plenary session we will have after tomorrow.

I will stop here. Thank you very much. And if you have any questions, and yes, Cheryl, I know that you weren't able to come but it was, we missed you and I know that you will be able to catch up with the recording and give us your feedback. They are very valuable, as usual, and we will be happy to have. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Sébastien. And you mentioned that the hiring of the Ombudsman. Are you saying that this working group could change the method by which an Ombudsperson would be selected in that so far, it

goes via the Board but it could actually be the community that could do this?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: From my point of view, all of that is open because we are supposed to discuss all of those issues and maybe it will still be the Board, but if want to announce the independence, maybe we will decide that the Composition Committee have no anymore role in that discussion. It's really open. It's in a different layer here also, as you have who hired him, who supervises him, who discusses with him what he's doing and results. And I guess – I am not sure – but I guess there is no discussion about composition as such because the Ombudsman is supposed to give a budget to ICANN and ICANN needs to follow that.

But you know, every little detail and those ones need to be looked at very seriously. And maybe the Enhanced Community or the community can have a specific role.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sébastien. Jean-Jacques Subrenat is next.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: We can't hear you, Jean-Jacques.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It seems that we have a problem.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. Hello. Thank you, Olivier. Hello. Can you hear me now? Hello.

Yes, thank you. Thank you, Olivier, and thank you, Sébastien, for the presentation.

I have [the matter] of this Ombudsman Group, but I [inaudible] say a few things based on my experience on the ICANN Board, and also. Yes?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jean-Jacques, can I stop you please? Can you speak slightly further from the microphone because it's a little bit loud so there is much distortion [inaudible].

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Okay. Is this better? Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's a lot better. Thank you.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello. Can you hear me? Is this better?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's a lot better, Jean-Jacques. Please [inaudible].

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello. Hello. Can you hear me? Is this better?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Evidently, Jean-Jacques cannot hear us. Can you hear us?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Okay, good. Yes. Right. Yes, I can hear you. Yes.

So, two or three things. The first is that the Compliance Officer will report to General Counsel. So that is not independent. It is, of course, entirely up to staff.

So the consequence of that is that we must make sure on two points, that the Ombudsman is independent. The first is the way he is appointed, meaning chosen. And I think that a discussion among the ACs and SOs, at least in the first stage before going to the Board decision, would be useful.

The second thing is about the way he is paid and Olivier, Sébastien mentioned that he is paid by the Board on a budget which has to be approved by the Board. I'd just like to add a small point. It's that the variations in his salary, for instance, an increase of salary, depends on the Board. So there, again, I think that we have to be careful that he is not too tightly bound to the organization.

The third point is that we should make sure that, of course, there must be corporation or at least exchange of information between staff, meaning Legal Counsel's office and the Ombudsman. But certainly, that is a way of dangerous confusion of roles. And on that point, especially, I think we should be careful that he retains complete independence.

In saying all of this, I refer to my experience in northern Europe.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Have we lost Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Where I had a study made in my embassy on the workings of the Ombudsman. And all –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. It looks as though we might have just lost Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

TERRI AGNEW: Olivier, I think his line was muted again.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Olivier, he just said that he finished his speech. You can go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Fine, then let's go through the list. Next is Alberto Soto. Alberto, you have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO: Hello. I am part of this group. I was not able to attend to the meeting today, but I wanted to point out this. When we were talking about the new figure, there were people that said that this was closely related to

the Ombudsman function. But you know, if we analyze this and if we take into account the Ombudsman function on one hand and other functions on the other hand, perhaps it might be a common point which might be confusing.

So I was going to mention this issue in the meeting, but I was not able to attend the meeting. However, I believe we can discuss this in our next meeting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Alberto. Next is Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much. First, Alberto, thank you, and yes, your input will be useful at the next meeting. Just take notes on what we discussed and I guess you'll get all of the information and we discussed the issue you are raising.

And second, thank you, Jean-Jacques, for your input. If I can ask you, if you have any link to some study about the Ombudsman in northern Europe, that will be welcome. If you want to write us a short summary of your point of view, it will be also useful even if you are not a participant of our group, we will take that input into account and I will appreciate it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Sébastien. Are there any other comments on the Ombudsman or Ombudsperson or Ombud depending on where you are in the world? I don't see any other hands up.

I can just add one slight tongue-in-the-cheek comment in that in a few weeks' time after the U.S. election, there might be one person who could be an excellent Complaints Officer for ICANN.

Anyway, let's just move on and go to – of course, I'm talking about the one who would not be, the person who would not be selected.

Next is reviewing the Corporate Engagement Process, the CEP. We have Alan, Avri, Siva, and Cheryl. The only person out of this quadrature is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Hopefully my audio is even better than it was last time. There has not been a CEP meeting that I have attended since our last call unless I missed it, which is possible, the 14th of October. Yes, I probably did miss it. I'm not sure why, but it's not in my memory bank so there must have been some reason for me not to have attended unless it was canceled. Some of them have been.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl, I'm looking at it and it says, "Meeting canceled." So you have not missed the meeting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Inaudible] for my lack of memory then, so I'm glad to see that's still intact.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And you still an intact attendance record as well, so that's really great. You have nil out of nil and that's fantastic. Thank you. So let's quickly move on to the next one. I don't think there should be any comments about this either so we can swiftly move on to the SO/AC accountability. I'm sure on that, there will be a lot of discussion.

And I know, Cheryl, as you are one of the co-rapporteurs, this wonderful working group Work Stream – I don't know whether you wish anybody else to speak to this first and then report. I note that Sébastien Bachollet also is on this group.

Anyway, Cheryl, back to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Olivier. I'm more than happy for Sébastien to start.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, go ahead, please, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's such an exciting group. Let's go back to Cheryl Langdon-Orr, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: What do you mean "exciting"? It is an exciting group, a very exciting group.

Well, we are simply continuing on in our work. We have had a second reading of our draft questions for community. Our aim is to get those questions modified and finalized if all the stars come into alignment for us this week because we would very much like to have the questions discussed and hopefully approved by the wider group when it meets later this week.

To that end, the idea would be that those questions to the community – and by that, I mean the leadership at least of the various ACs and SOs which is an analysis, a probing, of what the ACs and SOs believe are the accountability mechanisms published or otherwise and so that we can use that as some baseline material to review, compare and contrast, recognizing that there will be variability between, for example, the SOs and the ACs, as well as between the two ACs that will be probably expecting greater, for example, SSAC and RSAC, we don't expect to have terribly detailed published accountability mechanisms. It's probably quite strong internal peer accountability. But it's that type of case.

We can predict a few things here but we're never not going to predict without evidence, so I would like to think – and I believe as far as [inaudible], my co-rapporteurs would like to believe – that if we can at

least get these questions out pre-Hyderabad, that it might be possible for at least some of the groups that won't have much time other than, you know, face-to-face meeting to consider these questions. But some of those will be dealt with.

So for example, the GAC, if we could get, at least get it on there, any other business agenda, then they can assign some people in Hyderabad to, perhaps, respond more specifically to the question, that type of thing. So that's what we're up to and "watch this space" is pretty much where we are at this stage. There are a few things on our plate under our mandate that we will need to come back to, but they are unsurprisingly some of the more contentious magazines, some of the minds of some of their participant. And it's certainly going to be better that we start arguing and debating those points amongst us once this baseline criteria of self-reported accountability mechanisms has gone out and we're waiting for its return. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I note that in the chat, Jean-Jacques Subrenat has put a note about the Ombudsman which I shall be reading just after we finished the SO/AC accountability, so that it is on the record.

As the, what he wanted to say at the end when he was inadvertently interrupted, I put a link to the SO/AC Accountability Group Google Doc working document which, I believe, which you are working on at the moment.

I also noted a more cryptic link to Giovanni's suggestions, which is not his suggestions on the kind of food you should have for lunch, but more like the questions to be asked from the different ACs and SOs. So I believe, is there some kind of a survey that is coming up for SOs and ACs?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Olivier. Yes. That is exactly what we're formulating and, in fact, the formulation, so Giovanni had a different framing of some of the questions at our first reading and, indeed at our last meeting. The group agreed that the reframing from the original Google Doc style into the type of order of questions and approach to questions that Giovanni had proposed is the one we were going to develop. So it's different ways of asking the same information. So there will be some preamble work, some modifications, but basically, following the style of format of questioning in its order and methodology that Giovanni proposed, and very much so, cut and paste from what you'll see in the Google Doc to go into particular styles of survey questions.

We're yet to determine that we didn't want to take it too far into final polishing before the group as a whole gets to look at the question as to whether or not we wanted to have different styles of survey questions so the multiple choice sections, you know, on a sliding scale of 1 to 5 type things, how much you do or don't agree with the following statements, those types of standard survey tools. We can certainly use those in a final cut. But that's yet to be determined by the group. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Cheryl. And for the record, Giovanni is Giovanni Seppia, the country code top-level domain representative for .EU. Are there any other questions or comments? Now Cheryl, there is a question that I do have. I might have asked it again in the past, but one of the ATLAS II recommendations was to look at the balance of SO and AC stakeholder input throughout ICANN and for this to be studied.

Is this something which the SO/AC accountability could be inclined to do, to look at sort of the balance of input or the balance of – I wouldn't use the word "influence" – but sort of the dynamics of how input goes into ICANN?

CHERYL LANDON-ORR: And here, I'm going to answer you in two ways. First of all, to state that it is not part of a specific mandate if it's not an articulated requirement for us to do that. So that answers the question which I can assure you, you have not, as yet, asked as this is your first time asking this.

However, in terms of my experience going all the back from ATRT1 days, it's not hypothetical. It seems to be an observation that there is not equitable influence or waiting of input from all sectors of the community.

Then variable causes so that some of it is opportunity, some of its inclination, some of its misunderstanding about what the difference is between, for example, Advice of the ALAC – that's capital A, Advice of the ALAC – and an opinion piece via a leader from a stakeholder group

out of one of the parties of one of the GNSO six halves. So that is something that could be added as a recommendation for further review. And if you'd like me to take that as a possible action point, I wouldn't introduce it in these early stages that I'd be more than happy to introduce later on in our SO/AC accountability work.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Cheryl. Perhaps we should bank this. As you mentioned, you wouldn't introduce this right away but, perhaps, banking this for the right opportunity to, perhaps if the group has finished its work early engaged in this direction as well.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think that would be very valuable. Yes. Leave it in the notes as an action item so we don't lose track of it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this. I'm not sure who is taking the action items. It is Ariel or Terri?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, hi. It is. Could you please state?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: State the question and then state the action item and then, of course [inaudible].

HEIDI ULLRICH: [Inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [Inaudible] the action item. No, the action item is for, effectively for Cheryl to keep track of SO/AC accountability and, perhaps, ask the balance of stakeholder input across SO/AC stakeholders. Is that short enough, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm just typing what I think is a reasonable [inaudible] in the chat.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Cheryl. Right. Any other questions or comments? I don't see anybody else putting their hand up, so we can move on to the next thing. But in-between, I wanted to read to the record Jean-Jacques Subrenat's comment regarding the Ombudsman, and it's in several points.

One, while exchange of information is necessary between Ombudsman and Complaints Officer who reports to General Council, we need to make sure that Ombudsman does not depend – with an emphasis on does not depend – on staff for his resources of information.

Two, Ombudsman gets a budget from Board, so is somewhat independent. But for instance, his salary level is decided by the Board,

and more particularly by the Board Governance Committee. This should be changed so that his independence is enhanced.

Three, choice of Ombudsman should not be left to the Board Governance Committee, but by a multi-stakeholder group, something like the NomCom.

And four, Ombudsman report should be published for comment, say, once a year.

That's the point that Jean-Jacques Subrenat was making to the Work Stream Ombudsman.

All right, let's move on. Our next discussion – if I can find it, let's find the thread – Staff Accountability is the next thing.

And in the meantime, while we speak about Staff Accountability, I note that Heidi – so Cheryl will be writing her point in the chat, and hopefully... Oh, it is in the chat, excellent. So then if you could just cut and paste this then over to the action items, that would be helpful.

Staff Accountability, who wishes to speak about that and get in trouble? Or maybe not get in trouble, and praise our wonderful staff. We have Alan, Cheryl, and Seun. Cheryl, it's you again.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I might not turn up to the next meeting of this group and see how much reporting gets done.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We'll have a five-minute call if [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Very quick meeting. Dear me. This is going to be very simple: the call this week was canceled.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl, and let's swiftly move on to Transparency. And in Transparency, we have Avri, Alan, Cheryl, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, so either Jean-Jacques or Cheryl, you're welcome to take the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Definitely Jean-Jacques.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jean-Jacques Subrenat, you're able to take the floor now.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello, this is Jean-Jacques. My transparency is voiceless, so I'm afraid I'm not much use.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this voiceless transparency, Jean-Jacques. Perhaps we can find transparent voice in Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, thank you. As you'll note by the meetings, the last meeting was reported because it was 22nd of September, so we've already reported that, and our next meeting isn't until later this week. So other than asking any questions about the Transparency group – which, just to remind everybody, aren't up to date in particular keenness still, at least the 22nd it was the discussion on how the access to documents should or shouldn't be guaranteed. The thorny issue, which has been around for many years now as to why certain things are redacted from documents that are requested and made available, the [analysis] of proof on the fact that things are commercially in confidence is such a wide open barn gate that the belief is that things are being perhaps far too proactively classified that way, and the plea that's been going on since before the days of ATRT1 that the default should be open, and only in the rarest and justifiable circumstances should reductions or other claims of commercial in confidence be made on any documentation, as well as the publication of documents and materials in a timely manner, because there is an issue of too little, and there is an issue of too late when we deal with transparency. That's just a review of the major things. There you go.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Cheryl, and while you were speaking, I've also put a link to the thematical review for Work Stream 2 Transparency Subgroup kindly written in the link section of saying, "Summary of Transparency Challenges for Work Stream 2." I'm not quite sure why they changed the name to transparency challenges, but it obviously is – or sounds like fun.

So thanks for your update. Are there any questions or comments on this? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. I note some discussion on the Ombudsman's salary, but that's obviously not something to be too transparent in the future.

I don't see anybody wishing to speak to this, so we have gone through all of the different Work Streams. I know that Sébastien wanted to touch on the overall – all of the Work Streams together as everything is coming together, but there was some discussion perhaps to be had first on the strawman.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, if I may?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Cheryl-Langdon Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Not so much specific discussion now in this call, because we're over an hour into the call and I for one would like to have some of my life back occasionally, but – I know it's a 90 minute call, but – the matter is when we have a new and critical piece of work such as the strawman in the diversity topic as an example, I wonder if whilst these updates are very important, whether or not we could put on our next agenda a specific lump of time, 10 or 15 minutes discussion of a piece of material like that strawman document, where we pre-read it and we come to this meeting with opinion that then we, representatives on this group, can bring back into those deliberations in the topic.

It's certainly something that I found very valuable in the transition work, and I would like to think that not just having personal opinion, for example, coming in on diversity, but being able to say the At-Large community as represented by this group seems to be unified in a certain direction or not unified in a certain direction, or whatever, would be very valuable.

So just from my point of view to you, as Chair of this group, I'd like you to consider how that might be engineered in some way, shape or form. So not so much a discussion of, but a consideration of how to in the future. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Cheryl, and everyone else, you can see the kind of document that we're speaking about, the Subgroup Diversity Discussion document version 1. Thanks, Terri, for putting this together quickly in a PDF form.

The way that the agenda has been built so far is usually Alan and I have been working with staff, and as you all notice, the agenda hasn't really been changed much over the past few weeks. It really is down to reporting on things.

We might wish to evolve the way that we work, since we do have regular updates now, and regular people ready to provide updates, perhaps to be a bit more proactive, and that those people who wish to provide updates could point out documents in advance to either the working group or Alan or me, and then we could build the agenda based on this and make some time available than on these documents.

So we could say, “Oh, well, in the Diversity Subgroup, and let people know in advance, there is a document for everyone to look at.” Whilst there are three groups where nothing has happened at all, in which case we won’t even have it on the agenda or will spend 30 second on them. Is this maybe a way forward, Cheryl, that could be helpful?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: In my view, yes, absolutely.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this. I think we can – it’s not a case of completely changing our work practices, but certainly working more with you, who are – all the people who are in the Work Stream to let us know in advance about things that they wish to speak about. Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes , I think it’s important to do that. We need to be, as a community of – At-Large community, as much active and proactive as we can. I would like to add that, Olivier, you may wish to send also a reminder that we need a participation of, as much as possible, member of our work community who are in those working groups. First of all, because it will leave Cheryl not to talk during all the meeting, even if it’s always good and interesting summary of what is happening. I am really astonished how she can remember everything of all the meetings she’s attending. But we need more voice and that’s important that the others who came to this meeting give a summary of what’s happening.

And maybe, may I suggest that you could wish to have one specific name for each group? Of course, it's easy with the SO/AC Accountability and with the Ombudsman, you can take the rapporteur from At-Large, but for the other, it's less abuse, and it could be a good way to embark more people in this discussion. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Sébastien. I think we are seeing a pattern now on those people who are able to report on some of the groups, and I'm glad to see, for example, Tatiana having joined the calls and being able to report on the Human Rights, for example, or some of the great work that's gone on there.

For the next call, we'll do this, and I think what we can do also when staff asks and creates the page and we've got the time in which we have the call, I can certainly send out – or staff can send out – a call for the topics. Just to remind you all, you who are in those Work Streams, to respond and say, "Oh, I need to speak about this. I need to speak about that." And perhaps you could even point the working group on your e-mail to the document that you would like to read, or you'd like to discuss.

I note that there are a lot of – maybe not a lot, but quite a few – people on the call, so it's not that this call is poorly attended, but it's of course – we're a little bit early on, we probably need to get ourselves into a little better routine than what we currently have.

Any other comments? Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Olivier. If you want, I will be straight: it's better than [it is at] a lot of the groups we are running for the Work Stream 2. It's why I think this discussion and the proposal by Cheryl to take some of the documents and issues to be discussed here is so important. Because, for example, between 5, and I guess 12 was the maximum participants to the Ombudsman discussion. Of course, it will go to the plenary and that's okay. But this group is quite large, even if we can be more numerous, and that's why it's important to have this group going on. And thank you for the participations of the ones who are here, it's good for us also. It's useful. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sébastien. I note Remmy Nweke suggesting that we could perhaps have three persons at most reporting from each group. We'd be glad if we had three people reporting from each group. It looks like we often have less than that, so it's not a case of having too many people, it's sometimes a case of having not enough, and certainly, resorting a lot on Cheryl to provide us with updates.

As I said, it could be a very short call had she not been here. But I'm glad to see there are more people and there is certainly much interest in these subgroups. Of course, I remind you all that you can also listen to the recordings of these subgroups sometimes, though it's possible to provide an update to this working group without needing to be on the subgroup call whilst it takes place.

Okay, I note that we have gone through all of the different lists. We have some time to discuss the overall meeting. Did you say there's a call taking place tomorrow or the day after on the overall topics? So for this, we are in Any Other Business and Sébastien Bachollet is going to take us through a few points. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, thank you very much. Yes, tomorrow, we will have what they call Leadership Team. In fact, all the rapporteurs, plus the Leadership Team of the CCWG on Accountability. That means the ones who are leading the Work Stream 1, like Cheryl and the co-Chair, tomorrow. And we will have plenary of Work Stream 2, that means not just members, all of the participants and observers who want to participate, after tomorrow. It's why this group is interesting, because we have already got this overview of the situation.

One of the reasons I wanted to raise is issue it's because I think those meetings are important. If you can't come to the subgroup meetings, at least come to the plenary session, it's a useful one, and your input will be useful. One of my points is how we will deal with the new CEO regarding this decision of new [IRP] for complaints. We as an Ombudsman Subgroup, we want to have a discussion with him on that, but maybe other subgroups would have to – will wish to have a discussion also, then it's why as a plenary we'll need to discuss how we will handle that. Maybe it will be to invite him during the Work Stream 2 plenary in Hyderabad or a specific call, but it's important that we start some discussion with the CEO on those specific issues. Yes, that's why I

think I wanted to raise this issue of the plenary session in two days now.
Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Sébastien. When you say “we,” are you saying the Work Streams on Accountability, or are you saying the At-Large Committee should do that?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, sorry, yes, we is we. It’s always a bad word here using it. Thank you for the question. I was thinking about subgroups or multiple subgroups of, or the full CCWG on Accountability Work Stream 2. Because regarding the role of At-Large, we may have some questions, but I guess it’s already handled in the agenda for Hyderabad that we have a tentative meeting with the CEO. The only thing is we may have to remind us those type of question, but I was thinking about the CCWG on Accountability. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Sébastien. Are there any other comments, points or questions or anything else to add to what you said? I personally think it’s a very good point that you’re raising, and obviously, there’s so much going on now and the work is still I guess quite early on.

I do have a question for those of you who are taking part in the Work Stream 2 work: when it comes down to the work that you’re doing in your Work Stream, how far ahead are you? I’ve noticed that some Work Streams have had ten calls, some have not even started work, but we’re

looking overall at a time scale for the completion of Work Stream 2 work.

Are we looking at a time scale of months, years? Are we looking at a time scale for some of the Work Stream works being maybe finished by Hyderabad, or finished by the Copenhagen meeting? What's the sort of view here? Is already somebody looking at this? Or should I say that, is somebody looking at this already? That comes in a better way, [inaudible] better. Tatiana Tropina.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thanks, Olivier. That's a very good question, because I did ask the Human Rights co-rapporteurs about this, and I believe that the groups are on the different stages of progress. While some things are progressing well, like for example I think that Accountability Subgroup – Cheryl, Farzaneh, and Steve DelBianco – are progressing quite well and some of the groups are getting stuck, like Jurisdiction and Human Rights, but I believe that even for the most difficult topics, the general timeline is Copenhagen. So certainly, our Human Rights Working Group has a goal, a target to develop the framework of interpretation for the Human Rights Bylaw to Copenhagen and this is a hard deadline for us. I mean it's a hard stop, let's say, so we are aiming to do this. I believe that even with all the controversies, we are able to make it. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks, Tatiana. Next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Olivier. Cheryl for the record. Yes, Tijani has the right of it there. We were asked each of the topics we were asked early on, to see whether we could assess – whether we had a more or less complicated matter, and whether or not in the timeframe, [the] planning whether or not we felt we'd be able to have some recommendations or reports or even finalization by Hyderabad or by Copenhagen.

Copenhagen is the desirable end point, as Tatiana said. That does not mean, of course, that at Copenhagen some of these groups may be making final recommendations from their group that includes further work and further study.

So it doesn't mean that their group will be doing it, necessarily, but it may be that there are some matters which have a longevity or follow-up work, and that's okay, but we do need to have reporting for a bunch of reasons. Some of them unfortunate logistics about staffing and staff availability. A number of the groups had a later start or found themselves unable to get to the [inaudible] of their matters as early as we'd originally planned. So some of the less complex, for example, topics, or supposedly less complex and simpler topics where they would have been wrapping up in Hyderabad are starting later and therefore will be planned to wrap up in Copenhagen.

That said, the timeline is published. Our desired timeline is published, so we should have linked to that. I'm sure you already have from our pages somewhere, Olivier, but we wanted to make sure that we had opportunity where it was desirable for up to two public comment interactions, if that was going to be needed. Now, that may become a time compression issue towards Copenhagen, but we can only do what

we can do, and there's a bunch of papers that were to be delivered to each of the work teams on their topics which was background and reference material to be put together by staff and with changes in staff and staff availability. They were, unfortunately, delayed for a number of the topics. So it's one of those best efforts having to be made issues. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Cheryl. I don't see any other comments for this, so that's been a really helpful and very good call. We are t here minutes until the end of the call. I guess it's a good time to stop, but we need to just quickly think of the call next week. I note that work is going full steam ahead, which probably means we do need a call next week, although it is starting to get dangerously close to the face-to-face meeting in Hyderabad, but perhaps even more so important that we meet next week.

We have decided to go for a rotation on our calls now, and so it's always on a Monday, a wonderful day to have a call on. Unfortunately, the next week's call is supposed to be a 12:00 UTC. I have a conflict, because this is a 90-minute call, and I think that at 14:00 – no, I'm actually taken up by this. Help. Help, Terri, please. I'm making a mess of my UTC timings.

TERRI AGNEW: No problem. Yes, so if we stick with the rotation, it should be at 12:00 UTC, but you do have a conference on your calendar at 13:00 UTC, so our option is an hour meeting, or perhaps move the ICANN Evolution to start 30 minutes earlier at 11:30 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Terri. The 11:30 UTC, let's see if that's flyable. Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, and 13:00 UTC, once every three weeks, I have the Ombudsman group. I guess that next week will be – maybe next week, but it's 1:00 PM, you have the risk of being always something by the CCWG, then if you don't want to have this, you need to start at 11:30 to be sure to have 90 minutes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, Sébastien. So, did you say 11:30 UTC is fine with you?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, it is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, is it not working for anybody? 11:30 UTC next Monday. It seems to be okay for everyone, so let's set this then, Terri, please. Our next call will be 11:30 UTC next Monday, and that's, of course, Monday the 24th of October, just one week before a number of people will fly to Hyderabad.

TERRI AGNEW: And Olivier –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And before we end this call... Yes, Terri?

TERRI AGNEW: I apologize for the interruption. Our interpretation does stop on Friday the 21st, so unfortunately, we will not have Spanish interpretation for the call on the 24th.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, well, thanks for noting this.

TERRI AGNEW: So they can prepare for ICANN 57.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Terri. Well, I'm really sorry for our – the people following us on the interpreted lines. But next week, there will just be one call there will not be interpretation. So Alberto and others who are on the Spanish channel or even listening to the recording on the Spanish channel, my apologies for this.

Just one last thing, yes. I need to read a note from Jean-Jacques Subrenat to the record, and it's about the meeting the CEO. Jean-Jacques mentions on the chat, "To Sébastien, on meeting the CEO. One, not too early. It's better to be thoroughly prepared with proposals. Two, for effectiveness, why not prepare a letter from ALAC Chair to the CEO before Hyderabad and to prepare a possible meeting there?"

These are the points the Jean-Jacques has made. Sébastien, I gather you've taken note of this. With this, I'd like to thank you all for being on this call and for having all the people who have provided updates. It's been really helpful. Thanks to our interpreters, thanks to our staff, and speak to you next week.

In the meantime, of course, continue the great work in the Work Stream 2 activities. Thank you. This call is now adjourned. Goodbye.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

TERRI AGNEW: Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines, and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]