

---

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. It's now two minutes after scheduled start time, with no additional parties that have joined, since you and I have checked in last time.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, let's get going, then, let's not waste any more time. Thanks for monitoring this.

TERRI AGNEW: Not a problem at all, just give me one moment, we'll go ahead and begin. Thank you, we'll begin now.

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the At-Large ICANN Evolution call on Thursday the 26th of January, 2017, at 13:00 UTC. On the call today we have Leon Sanchez, Sarata Omane, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Maureen Hilyard, Gordon Chillcott, Kaili Kan, Barrack Otieno, Alan Greenberg, Wafa Dahmani, Carlos Vera, Yrjö Länsipuro, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Shreedeeep Rayamajhi, Tatiana Tropina, and Sebastien Bachollet.

We have listed apologies from Seun Ojedeji, Bastiaan Goslings, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, and Alberto Soto. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdoğd, and myself, Terri Agnew. Our Spanish Interpreters today are Claudia and David. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking, not only for transcription purposes, but also for our interpreters. With this, 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 CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Terri. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Today we are going to be looking at primarily Workstream 2 updates with several subtopics that are undergoing either a first reading, second reading, or a public consultation. We're following up on our action items from our previous last call, which was actually quite a time ago in October 2016. Since then, we also had a face to face meeting at the Hyderabad meeting. So you've got the agenda on your page at the moment. Are there any additional points that we need to add to this? We will be taking most time on 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D. I don't see anyone with their hand up. I see Sebastien has put his hand up. Sebastien, you have the floor. That's Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Olivier. Yes, sorry, a little bit long to get connected. Just to add in any other business, how we can schedule calls not conflicting with one of the Workstream 2 item, because at the moment I may be on the other call, but I will stay here. But I saw that Christopher Wilkinson, Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr went to the other meeting, and that's quite normal, and how we can avoid this type of clash. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks so much, Sebastien. Yes, let's discuss this and any other business. It's Olivier speaking, and let's then go directly to our action items from our last call. The action items are as follows; there are a

---

few, actually, that need to be probably ticked, because I think they have all been done.

The next Evolution call post Hyderabad will have a focus on human rights, SO/AC accountability and transparency, that's done. Interim reports presented in the face to face Hyderabad, staff to look into the CCWG accountability mailing list and pick those reports up and then link them to the agendas for the post Hyderabad. Then we will be able to touch on each one of these in our next call. I'm a little confused about this one. I think I understand what it pertains to. I wonder whether we have an update on this, whether this was actually done, I can't quite remember this. Terri, do you have any information for us on this, please?

TERRI AGNEW:

Hi everyone, it's Terri. And I am so sorry, Olivier, can you just repeat that question very quickly?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

We're looking at the second action item which said, "Interim reports presented in the face to face in Hyderabad. Staff to look at the CCWG accountability mailing list and pick those reports up and then link them to the agendas for the post Hyderabad, then we will be able to touch on each one of these in our next call." And I'm wondering whether this is translated and whether this has been done. I see Sebastien has put his hand up. Maybe I can ask Sebastien Bachollet, he might have been the originator of that action item. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sebastien Bachollet speaking. No, Olivier, I don't, but I think that a call today will follow this path because I guess you have the link to all the documents currently discussed in the group for first reading, second reading, for the plenary, and then it's a good type of answer of this type of request or action item from last time. Last time it was in October, then long time ago. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, okay. Thanks! Alright, so this is done. ALAC to raise the question of the role of the complaints officer with regards to the Ombudsman with Yrjo during the ALAC wrap up session during ICANN57. I think that this has been done. Does anyone remember? This is all such a long time ago. Sebastien Bachollet again.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Olivier. Yes, it was done. I will say that it is still an open question, but I guess that Yrjo took back not just input from ALAC, but from other groups, and for the moment we did not have yet the full role of the compliance officers, and it's in the hand of Yrjo for the moment, not in ours anymore, I guess.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Sebastien. And as I go through the action items, the next one was, "ALAC to ask for volunteers for Workstream 2 issues in Hyderabad," and that was done. And finally the last action item was on you to send "ICANN Evolution an email of the workstreams from an

---

---

At-Large perspective. ICANN Evolution group to make comments back.”  
Do you have any feedback on this, Sebastien, please?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I'm not sure that I have done something, I don't remember either. Not done, but I hope that the call today will help to go in that direction, and I may have missed something here, but that's life. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Sebastien. We have two more action items which are listed on our agenda, and that's from the At-Large Leadership Working Session Part 8. The first one is for me and the ICANN Evolution working group to discuss SO/AC accountability at our next teleconference, and we will be having this in 3E, so that's done.

And finally, Heidi and Terri to compile the relevant Workstream 2 documents to be included in the ICANN Evolution working group Wiki page, including the Workstream 2 dashboard OCT, and it's got a file there, it's actually linked to it. If you click on it, you can see that dashboard, and indeed, the home page of this working group has been updated with all the relevant documents. If any of you sees documents missing, please let us know and we can definitely ask for more or add points which you think might be missing from that home page.

Now, let's move directly to the bulk of our call today, and that's the Workstream 2 update. Starting with the human rights, and Tatiana Tropina has been following this very closely, has been involved in the Workstream itself very closely. Just before I start with this, there is a

---

slide deck with the latest update which is available for all of you to have a look at, it effectively is a sort of copy with the different links to the different documents that we're working on—here we go, fantastic, Terri, thank you. And if we turn over to page 5, there we are, we've got the design teams with the different documents. Let's turn immediately to Tatiana Tropina.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thanks Olivier, hi everyone. Tatiana Tropina speaking for the record. Well, that date might be a bit long, because we did have significant progress since the last call which we had in October, as Olivier said. At times during the last call the human rights working team was discussing whether we have to adopt rigid principles, or how these human rights core values can be operation wide.

Right now, I can say that the good news is that the group drafted the framework of interpretation for the human rights by law for the human rights core value. I think the link to the framework is on the Wiki page, so anyone who is interested can go and see how this framework is designed. But basically the underlying notion behind this design was that the group decided to provide the interpretation of each piece of the human rights core value by law.

So what does it mean to respect human rights as a core value, what core value means in terms of human rights, what applicable law means, and so on, and so forth. So each piece of the bylaw got a particular interpretation which is agreed within the human rights drafting team. Now while the good news is that we are done, there are still some

---

problems, because once we see the framework for interpretation, the question was what do we do next? Because there are basically two annexes in the CCWG proposal which was adopted.

Annex 6 which lists what the group should do with regards to human rights by law, lists everything in bullet points, like a few separate tasks, while Annex 12, which also set tasks for the group and which basically has the same wording, lists everything like one single task. And while the group was drafting the framework of interpretation but are considering the interpretation of the text of the bylaw as a separate task, but there are still some questions which are unanswered, which are actually the task of this group, as well.

For example, to consider how the interpretation and implementation of human rights core value will affect existing and future ICANN policies and procedures, or will it, or will it not affect the government or advisory committee it supplies, and other issues. And some issues which came up in the process of drafting, for example, what to do with ccTLDs and governments who are accused of human rights violations. Are we opening the ICANN mission to different interpretations? And we have to provide the ccTLDs. So there are different questions which are not answered in this simple and nice framework of interpretation for the text of the bylaw.

So basically we are now a bit stuck, because we came to the CCWG plenary and the group is waiting for the answer from the co-chairs to the question, what do we have to do now? Are we done? The framework for interpretation is finished. Well, if the question is yes, we are done, I would be the first who will draft the public comment that this

---

framework does not operationalize the bylaw. With this framework the bylaw is not an operation, and human rights, core value, both vulnerable and open to different interpretations, and it will not do good either to ICANN or to human rights, themselves.

The second way is to say that we have to follow the Annex 12, as well, which leaves everything as a single thought, and we have to go back and revise the framework of interpretation to make it a document which will operationalize the bylaw completely. The drawback of this solution I see is that the framework will not go to public comment, and the group will continue to work, and it will delay some other things, because the document which will be finally issued for the public comment will probably be quite big.

The third way is, of course, to split these tasks to issue this framework of interpretation for public comment and to say that the other tasks can be addressed by the group by issuing additional documents and maybe recommendations for ICANN. So now we had a few human rights team meetings canceled because we are still meeting for the response, and I'm actually curious, I see Leon is on the call, I'm actually curious when this response will be issued.

I understand that the co-chairs might be busy because there are many groups who are going to put something out for public comments, like transparency, I believe, and I'm just wondering what the timeline is and whether the framework for interpretation will go back to the group or for additional amendments, or whether it will go to the public comment to be finished after ICANN meeting in Copenhagen. I'm really sorry if it was a bit complicated, but the suggestion is complicated itself.

---

Though, as I said already, if anyone wants to read the framework for interpretation, it's online and there is a link, and I believe the framework is really simple, really self explanatory, and I believe that it was a big achievement of the group, that we were able to agree of this. Thank you very much. I will be ready to answer any questions in the next 10 minutes, because then I will run to the meeting. Thanks a lot.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tatiana. Leon Sanchez is in the queue. Leon, you have the floor.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Olivier, this is Leon Sanchez, and I thank Tatiana for this excellent topic on the human rights subgroup. She is right, there was an answer pending from the cultures as to the scope of the mandate of the human rights subgroup in regards to the interpretation, and that answer has been just sent to the plenary of the CCWG on accountability, and I can follow up on that, of course.

That answer states that since all the subgroups have driven their work based on Annex 12, while we recognize that there might be some ambiguity between Annex 6 and Annex 12, we recommend, as cultures, of course, we recommend that the human rights subgroup confirm that they have completed developing the human rights framework of interpretation as per Annex 12 of the CCWG's accountability Workstream 1 recommendations, and also that this report goes to public comment.

---

And should the subgroup feel that it should develop suggestions for ICANN, implementing the human rights framework of interpretation based on the work done to date, the cultures would, of course, be amenable to this and would invite the human rights subgroup to submit any such suggestions to the plenary for consideration by early May 2017, and if there is no objection from the plenary to adopt these recommendations, then of course, we would be happy to endorse those recommendations approved by the plenary. So that is what I have to add to what Tatiana said, and I hope that discussion on this will follow on the public comment in the subgroups' further meetings. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Leon. Tatiana Tropina.

TATIANA TROPINA: Sorry, I lost the sounds. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We can hear you.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yes, thank you very much. Thanks, Leon. Well, this is a bit of unfortunate news, because though I was one of the penholders for the framework interpretation, we drafted the framework with the thought in mind that we have further tasks. So if the answer is that we have to follow the Annex 12, I will be the first who will raise the issue in the

---

group that we do have to revise the framework and include the missed bullet points from the Annex 12, so I don't know when it can go to the public comment.

I know, of course, it would be for the group to decide, but I think there is a bit of controversy, though I'm very happy that we have an answer, because I do believe that if the framework for interpretation for human rights core value, it should be a complete framework of interpretation and not only interpretation of the bylaw text. So yes, I think the group will need some more work to do. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Tatiana. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. So the floor is open for comments and questions on this topic of human rights. I know there are quite a few people that follow this. There was a webinar that took place last week, I think, that was very well attended with a lot of people, and I've noticed a lot of people from the At-Large community on that call, as well. It seems that we have had a very, very full update on this.

I certainly don't have any questions, I don't know if anybody else has. We do have enough time to discuss these topics. The reason why we are focusing on these four topics today is to give us more time to discuss things. It looks like there are no further comments or questions from anyone on the call, so thanks very much for this update, Tatiana, and let's see what happens next. No doubt we will be kept updated on this.

The next topic is about transparency. We have several people who are on this working group, on this Workstream. The problem we're faced with is we have a current conflict with another call. So Alan, Avri, Cheryl, Jean-Jacques, Jean-Jacques Subrenat has sent his apologies. Cheryl is on the other call just listening in at the moment. Alan is on the other call, and Avri, I believe, is not on this call, I can't see her in the list of participants. So we're not doing very well on that. What I suggest is we can move to the next thing. If anybody else wants to pick up the ball on this, perhaps, and give us some information on this, that would be great. I see that Sebastien Bachollet has put his hand up, so let's have Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. The transparency subgroup already published a document and it's on the board here. But there are still some issues to be discussed, and one of the items open is one between the Ombuds design team and the transparency design time, because there are some needs for the DIDP, the question about the publication of document by ICANN, and it was suggested by the transparency group that it could be the Ombuds to do that, and there was a discussion with the current Ombuds and with our group of Ombuds drafting team that it may not be the best solution. And we are asking, in discussing with the transparency team, to see what could be the role of the Ombuds, what could be the role of the new guy who will join legal by the decision of Yoran about—oh, what is it next?

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, [inaudible] then.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. And any other possibility, like somebody else within the staff, somebody else within the community. And it's still an open question. For the rest, I think, yes, it could be useful to read the full document and to have feedback, and I am not able to do that. I am very concentrated on filling between the two subgroups, the one where I am a rapporteur and this one, but it's something who is still open, and it's why we don't know when the document will go for public comment.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, because the first reading is done, we are waiting to solve this issue to allow the document to be agreed by the transparency group with the agreement for the part about the Ombudsman by the Ombuds group, and then it will go to the second reading, but it's not yet totally done. It's why we have this, in the Powerpoint on page 5, you showed us before, it was on the list after our first reading, and we are waiting for the second reading. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Sebastien. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond soaking. So that's correct, yes, the first reading is done, there is the report that's on the page. You have a link that is first reading

---

completed, you have a link on your agenda page, you can have a look at the draft comments and the whole report and its draft comment if you're interested in this topic. Are there any comments or questions on this second topic that we are dealing with today? Sebastien, you're putting your hand up and down, short of dancing of Macarena? Or are you wishing to speak, as well?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, it was a mistake from my side, sorry.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. I don't see anyone else wanting to discuss this any further. I guess it is one of these times when we have to wait and see what comes up. I would suggest that you all read that report and hopefully, I don't know whether Leon is still on the call, but is there a planning for this matter to be completely resolved and moving on by the Copenhagen meeting? My question, but Sebastien, perhaps you can answer that question, too. Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, the plenary was just consult, and we have one in two weeks. I hope this issue will be solved by the next plenary, and then the next plenary will go through a second reading, and then go to public comment before or around Copenhagen. But Leon will give you more good and right information than I can give you.

I just wanted to raise one issue, Olivier. Some of those questions we were supposed to discuss were raised by Christopher Wilkinson. The

---

fact that he is not here shortens the discussion. May I suggest that before going into those details, if we can do a short review of all the items, it will be the group of SO/AC accountability to finish the call and we can go to the last half an hour for those discussions with the people who carry some questions like Christopher, just a suggestion. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this suggest, Sebastien. It's Olivier speaking. That's a very good point. We won't take as long with the others, and then we will be able to hopefully have the missing people on the call in about 30 minutes time. Leon Sanchez, you're next.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Olivier. I am struggling here with a small crowd of children, trying to make them go to school, so I might not be as participating as other times, but I have little to add to what Sebastien just said, and what I can tell you is that our aim as cultures is to have at least two or three public comments going on as we head to Copenhagen and the transparency report is one of them.

And hopefully as Sebastien said, the pending issues that need to be sorted, are sorted out on our next call, and from there we can determine the dates for the public comments so that when we get to Copenhagen, some of them are near completion and we are able to advance to work in Copenhagen by analyzing the comments that might be already submitted by the committee. Thanks, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Leon, very helpful. Then let's go to the next, 3C, and that's Jurisdiction. Again, one of the topics that we needed to work on specifically today. Currently there is a public consultation on this topic. Again, most of the people who are involved in this topic are on the other call at the moment. So, it's going to be a little difficult to get an update. I don't know if anybody else wants to say anything or add anything to this. Leon, I noticed your hand is up, is this a new hand? It's probably not a new hand. Let's go over to Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, do you hear, Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: You are sounding loud and clear.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you very much. I am perhaps not the best one to report on this subgroup, even if I am a member of the subgroup, but I missed some calls lately. But I know exactly what is happening. This subgroup is the most controversial one. I told you at the beginning, our first calls, about this Workstream 2. We are stuck on the point that shall we discuss the jurisdiction of incorporation and location of ICANN. Even if it is one of the layers that are mentioned in the Annex 12, one of the topics that we have, but several in the working group said no, we don't have to address it.

---

And I was upset, because if we discussed it, I am sure we would come up to a decision very easy, because I am sure that there is a majority in the group that will go immediately—there is a lot of reasons why we can say we will not move from California, but those people didn't want to even to have it on the table. And we ended by letting this issue apart, and go and discuss the jurisdiction of contracts, et cetera, and we were more successful on those other issues.

But now, again, we are stuck on the same point, exactly the same point. We prepared a questionnaire, because it seems that there is no solution, no consensus, we prepared a questionnaire for the community to help us to advance. The problem was in the questions, we prepared four questions, the fourth one was a blocking point because it asked, "Do you know or have you the factual things during the work of ICANN that the American jurisdiction blocked or affected the work of ICANN, and this is the question that was asked now.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani, it's Olivier. We have that document for public consultation on the screen, I don't know whether you can see it. Are you speaking about 4A or 4B?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, we have only number 4, it is not 4A or 4B. This document is old. Now we have only one 4, which is -- what did you -- you cannot hear me, one moment please.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani, thanks for letting us know that this document is old. Let's have a quick action item to update this document and find the latest one to use. Then we will add this, obviously we need to be updated. Back to you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, let me tell you what was the conflict. The conflict was that some people from the call on the working group wanted to make Question 4 asking about what might affect the work of ICANN and the jurisdiction. They said we don't have experience in anything, so even if we have something that might affect, or something that people can give you a scenario where it might affect, and this was rejected by other people. So now we have only one Question 4, which is about factual things. And the questionnaire is not yet published.

There was also a discussion about how to publish it. Now there is another conflict, what is the time we have to give to this questionnaire. Some said that we need only 30 days, and this makes it finished just before Copenhagen. Others said, no we have to let it after Copenhagen, to let more time for people to answer our questions and to let us have the opportunity to speak to people in Copenhagen.

So this also is a conflict between two parts of the working group. I am really sad in this working group because we reached the point that people started to almost insult others, and this was very bad. Because it seems that the interest is very big for some to go to this level of friction, but I think that it was very easy to let people tell you, because it is almost a consensus among all people that we did everything according

---

to the California jurisdiction, so shall you find other people now, today, to tell you, no, we have to move from California? I don't think so.

It is only a problem of psychological, people feel that if you put it on the table, it will affect the American government, so it is not good. Perhaps this is the fear of some people, but I am sure that it was very easy to solve this problem if we from the beginning would put it on the table and discuss it. I am sure we will have an answer very clear. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this extensive explanation, Tijani, it has been very helpful for those people like me who have not kept a very close eye on those deliberations and discussions. Next is Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Olivier. Just to say that this is the last document on the page of the jurisdiction group. I am sure that Tijani is right, but it's not yet published on the Wiki page for the jurisdiction group. It's why you have this version, and I am trying to find the last one, but it seems that it is not yet published officially on the Wiki page. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, let me try to find it and perhaps I will give you immediately the other version. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I have a question on this document, too. You mentioned that this is a questionnaire, and it goes here, "Currently in public consultation," was the name of the document. I was looking at the ICANN wide public consultations, I can't see anything about this, so where is that currently under consultation? [CROSSTALK] Well, one of you has to start, so let me try with Sebastien, then. Go ahead, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Tijani is right. I was thinking that we will have presented the four points and as I wrote a part of these four points, it's my mistake. I didn't want to say that it is at the level, or it will be sent to have answer. I am not sure that it will go through public comment as the other type of public, as it's a question there, maybe yes, maybe no, I don't know. But it's my fault if it's returned like that, it's not because it was written somewhere else. The last version of the questionnaire will be sent out, so we have answer from the public, and that's why I put it in the public comment arena. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for the feedback, Sebastien. Tijani, did you wish to add anything to this on the progress for public comment?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, you didn't see it, Olivier, because it is not yet published, as I said, but there is also discussion about how to publish it, how to make the questionnaire go to the public. There are a lot of ideas, is it public

---

comment? It is not, it is clear. So it is a consultation. So how will it be done? There is a discussion on this, also. But it is not yet public, okay?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much for this update, Tijani, that's very helpful. It sounds like that workstream is having a lot of fun. But anyway, let's go through the queue. We have Wale Bakare. And Wale I can see that you're speaking, because your microphone seems to be working, but we can't hear you at the moment. There might be a problem with your microphone. In the meantime, anyone else have questions on this or comments on this topic?

I see from Wale, "There was disagreement with regard to the questions, but the jurisdiction subgroup has moved on to the next stage." And he's typing another line to add to this—in the meantime, Sebastien Bachollet?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Olivier. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. Yes, I think that everybody is right, that we agree now with the fourth question, and we don't know how it will go through. But we know that we will get those four questions, and I guess it will be useful to start to organize who is in At-Large who will answer those four questions, and how will we organize our own discussion within this group, but more globally within At-Large. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alright, thanks for this, Sebastien. And with this, I think we can probably move on, then, to our next topic of discussion. Certainly, we all have to look out for this questionnaire and see where that goes. I followed this discussion ever since Workstream I, and before, of course, as we were discussing this topic in the CCWG, Cross Committee Working Group on IANA Stewardship Transition, and Carlton quite right says in the chat, "Really there are two things which are particularly important in this, and it's the registry agreement and the registrar accreditation agreement, and of course the post transition IANA," which are public technical identifiers, as it is called, now. These are really the only two things that matter, particularly, but it certainly is a bit of a messy discussion, it appears to be.

Now, let's move on down our agenda to the next topic, and this is 3D, Guidelines For Good Faith. Yet again, the primary people who are involved in this are currently on the other call, which is to end in about 10 minutes. Might I suggest, perhaps, that we push this over to the side and wait for them to come on the call to ask questions on this, or does somebody else have something to add to this? I see Tijani Ben Jemaa has to comment on this topic. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, do you hear me?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We hear you very loudly, Tijani. You may speak less loud if you wish.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. I would like to apologize, because the questionnaire that was displayed was the right one. Question 4 is one question, but at the end they break it in two parts, but it is exactly the same question that was adopted, in that it does not speak about other things than fact. So it is the last one, and Sebastien was right. I apologize.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Tijani, thanks very much for this update. That's still to do with jurisdiction. I will ask Staff to remove the action item for Tijani to update the jurisdiction in public consultation, since this is the document we have in our hands is the latest one. So that's great, thank you.

Back to Guidelines For Good Faith, is there anyone who wishes to add to this at the moment? Okay, we'll wait for those people who are mostly involved with this topic to come to the call.

The next one is SO/AC Accountability, and Cheryl is the co-rapporteur for this. That's exactly the call that we're in conflict with, so let's move that down.

The next one is Diversity. And on the topic of diversity, we have Cheryl, Sebastien, Seun, Tijani, Beran. So these are now from the topics 3F, G, H, I, J and K. We were not going to focus on these, let's just do a quick update on these, please. So, the topic of Diversity—has any update happened since? And thanks for putting the Diversity page up, Terri. And so Sebastien Bachollet, you have the floor.

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Olivier. May I suggest that we put in the document, all the dashboard of December. Because with the dashboard we can go through where each group is and where the full Workstream II is. It was a link in page 4 in the PowerPoint.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks for this Sebastien, I noticed this. Do you have the dashboard, Terri?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Unfortunately, the dashboard was in PDF and I didn't have time to ask Staff to send me by PowerPoint. It would have been easier to put it within PowerPoint, but I was unable to do it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I've put a link to the dashboard in the chat, and you can all independently open this. It is indeed a PDF and it has Workstream II Overall Report. This is the first time I'm really closely looking at this dashboard. I had received it in my mail, but not so much further. On page 4 of the dashboard we have an update as of December and on the Jurisdiction subgroup, it still shows a lot of work. On the topic that we're dealing with now, which is the Diversity topic, it is showing 25%.

So update, "Second version of Strawman document is under discussion. Getting information about diversity data collection within ICANN from Staff. Preparing a questionnaire for SO and AC input. The current focus concerns and risks, move to drafting the initial report, request input from SO and AC and understanding the current state of diversity data

---

collection." That's the overall topic of Diversity. Terri, have you managed to find that document? Is it possible to display this on the screen, please? Back to you, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. The Diversity design team is currently working on different documents, also Strawman. Within the group we get some improvements from Staff, the last two meetings with Staff coming to explain what they are doing regarding collection of data, what they are trying to do to evolve the information system, to allow one single place for the same type of information. Because, for example, today, when you want to enter through different paths of the information system of ICANN, either the website, the Wiki, or other means, you have a different sign on and you have to repeat the same type of information. We had very good input from Staff on that.

We are still working on the questionnaire for SO/AC inputs about diversity, what are you doing regarding diversity, what is more important for you, and how it's done, that's the type of questions, I hope quickly to be worked out by SOs/ACs. Another point we are discussing in the Diversity group is the question of setting up a Diversity office and as the Ombuds group suggests that it could be taken into account when we reframe the ICANN Ombuds office, taking that as a new task for the ICANN Ombuds office. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Sebastien. Let's see if there are any comments or questions on this. I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so thank

---

you. Let's move to the next topic, and that is the topic of Ombudsman. Sebastien, again, you are the rapporteur. You have touched on this already in the past. How is progress doing—and we are on that page, the subgroup progress update. I do don't know whether there has been any update since, so please let us know, Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, Olivier. Two tracks I would say. We're following the external review and the request for proposal was sent out beginning of the month, and we are waiting for the number, and when we have that, ICANN Staff will work on which one will do the outside external review. And in the same time, we are trying very hard to coordinate with all the other subgroups, because we may be very late with this external review compared to the others, and we do not want to not delay the others.

Transparency is one, we already talked about the, Diversity is the second one, I already talked about that. We will have some work to do with Staff Accountability, with Human Rights, and with SO/AC Accountability. But it's not yet totally formalized compared to the other Transparency and Diversity, where we are clear with what we need to do with them. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this Sebastien. Are there any comments or questions on this topic? I do not see anyone putting their hand up. I'd like to thank Kaili and Carlton for being on this call, they have had to move on to the consumer trust review team, they are two representatives in that

---

group. I think we can then swiftly move on to the next topic, and that's Reviewing the Cooperative Engagement Process. Again, Alan, Avri, Siva, Cheryl, those people are still on the other call for a few more minutes.

Is there anything breathtaking that we need to speak about? I note that this is not even on the update, so I'm not sure—the update that we have on the screen at the moment, I'm not sure whether there is very much going on. I note that the page after that, first and second reading status is still blank for reviewing this PEP. Ah, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you have put your hand up. Welcome.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hardly welcome, I've been on the call with the exception of the introduction. I simply have given you my left ear and my right brain. Now you have an active mouth, as well as a microphone, so beware ladies and gentlemen, I have to contribute to the audio text. Thank you, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record and I do note that --

TERRI AGNEW: Cheryl, this is Terri, I apologize for interrupting you, are you able to speak a bit louder for our interpreters? [BACKGROUND AUDIO ADJUSTMENTS, CROSSTALK].

TERRI ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, it's Alan. Your voice is remarkably different than it was on the last call. I don't know if it's the voice bridge or something else. [AUDIO BREAK].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'm glad to hear that all of the participants in the other call appear to have made it to this call. As you might have missed the earlier parts, we went through most of the different Workstream subsections. We will focus back on the initial ones in a moment during the last half hour of this call. We still need to keep 5 minutes at the end of this call to discuss how to have a schedule that is not going to clash with the Workstream II calls, which is one of the reasons why we had a bit of a problem today.

Cheryl, do you wish to test your—and I know that you didn't miss anything, because you have two ears, and I sometimes wonder if you probably have more than two years, as you are able to follow more than two calls at any one time. But this whole limitation of a single mouth is difficult these days. And appears that we cannot hear you now, Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Okay, let's continue on the list of topics that we have. We have reached the Cooperative Engagement Process, the CEP, it appears that not very much has moved on that front. And the last three topics, Staff Accountability, Alan, Cheryl, and Seun are in that group. Has anybody got the ability to provide an update on this? And Alan was dropped. Okay, Cheryl would like to enter the room, so Cheryl appears to have been dropped, too. Oh, and now we are hearing an echo, Cheryl, we are hearing you twice. Try again.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is that any better?

---

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: You sound clear, but you are not very loud. You sound quite distant. I can hear you, but I'm not sure if the interpreters can. [BACKGROUND AUDIO ISSUES]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, I'll check again. I'm now actually almost [inaudible] in the microphone.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. This is Olivier speaking. And it's sounds as though -- certainly it sounds better from my end. The microphone -- it must be --

TERRI AGNEW: This is Terri. Confirming that the interpreters unfortunately are still having a very difficult time hearing Cheryl. Cheryl, can we dial up --

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The only difference, Terri, is you will now have to dial out to me, on my other call I was using dial out options for my audio, instead of the apparently useless Adobe Connect one, so if you would care to dial out to me, we may eventually get some of our intervention audible.

TERRI AGNEW: Absolutely, thank you.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Let's move on. Staff Accountability. Is Alan back on the call? Alan is back in a moment, okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alan is back on the call, but Avri is in a better position to do this one than I am.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's great, thank you Alan. I've noticed Avri Doria, co-rapporteur for Staff Accountability, could you please update us, Avri Doria?

AVRI DORIA: Sure, this is Avri speaking. Okay, the echo tells me I'm being heard, okay. So, we're working -- should I keep going? Ah yes, the echo stopped. Okay, so we had a fair amount of information that we needed to request from ICANN staff. We have received that information, we've been going through it. We also sent some follow up questions. Staff have sent us some questions to respond as well, asking us to discuss some of the concerns that we had mentioned in our earlier postings. We're working on three documents at the moment.

The first document is well along its way and it basically discusses the issues in a general way. And they're called Document A, Document B. The second one, Document B, which actually gets into the details of what is available in terms of various processes and procedures, is being defined. And that one we're actually including recommendations. That one is still in early stages. We have extremely light participation.

---

We have very few people, maybe three or four of us, that are actively working on the document. I put that partially down to the slow start that we had because we had to wait for information and everybody got themselves booked up in every other activity. At least, that's my optimistic interpretation of what has happened. But we continue to put forward.

And the third document we're working on is responses to the questions that were asked by staff. All three documents are available as drive documents which are open for anyone with the URL to comment on and to suggest new text to. And I believe we have our next meeting next week. We hope to have our first drafts of both A and B ready in time for Copenhagen time frame presentation to the plenary. I guess that's about it, without starting to go into some of the issues and I don't know if this is the time to do that. But that's pretty much where we're at.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Avri. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Are there any comments or questions on Staff Accountability? Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: (inaudible) so we can be heard, this is Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Loud and clear.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Terri, can you confirm for the interpreters? I'm going to assume that Terri can, in fact, confirm. I think Avri, noting how much time we looked at some of the other topics through today's call and we have covered off the vast majority of the Workstream II sub-team topics, I think doing a very brief drill down into a couple of the issues is exactly what I'd implore you to do.

And yes, I know that means Alan and I will hear it all again, but I think if you can take us into a couple of details, part of our purposes here in this call is to brief everyone else on the call with a little bit of gory detail. So, if you don't mind, Avri, that'll be great, thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks for this, Cheryl. It's Olivier speaking. Avri?

AVRI DORIA: Yeah, okay, I can do that. Okay, so, on the first document. That document deals with describing the role of ICANN staff, vis-à-vis the ICANN board and community. It includes description of the powers held by ICANN staff and the Board of Directors, where they do need to come back and don't. So, it's basically looking into roles of Board staff, the relationships between them, proposing any changes in that, and activities.

So, the document went into a very long explanation of the roles and responsibilities and basically the discussion has more been that there was too much content in the document and that it was supposed to be short and sweet and not. So, it defines main functions. I don't know

that we have any specific disagreements ongoing in the calls at the moment, but perhaps Alan or, especially Cheryl, have specific issues that they think I should be bringing up, because my biggest issue is how do we finish this work on time, and paying less attention to any of the specifics.

So, in terms of staff roles, you know, we started out defining what they don't do as an easier approach than what they actually do. And that they don't decide long-term strategies. That they don't set policy. And that it's not really theirs to decide on the boundary between policy and implementation. So, that's the kind of issue. Still trying to figure out how all these roles empower community and Board and staff interact and then that's still part of what's being talked about.

In staff Doc B what we're working on is what measures are in place? Is there a code of conduct, has it been defined? Part of the challenge we're having here is, when we finally got the answers from the staff on what they've got, they referred us to documents that are on a website that only staff has access to.

So, again, we've got a little further down the road saying, yes, we have codes of conduct, yes, we have the whistle-blower policy, yes, we have, what are some of the others? You know, we have transparency criteria, yes, we have training. And so we're now trying to dig a little deeper into what those are. We have not gotten terribly deep into recommendations yet at all.

And in terms of the staff questions, just so people know what questions they came back to us, they asked us for concrete examples of concerns

---

that the community has with regards to Staff Accountability. And they, sort of, put the shoe back on our foot as opposed to us giving you information about what we do, tell us what your specific concerns are. Are the concerns about individual service delivery or about potential that staff may cause a violation of ICANN policies and processes? We have not crafted an answer yet.

Another question they asked, in the Staff Accountability there have been suggestions that people within this organization are afraid to speak to the community. They then asked, is that because they're somehow... is the reluctance based on perceptions of how ICANN organizations will respond to their comments or how the community will respond to their comments?

I thought that that was a very interesting twist on the comment. It had never occurred to me that the staff was afraid to talk because of how we would react and I had assumed that all the people that spoke to me privately were afraid of how the organization would react to their speaking and that's what I got from their conversations. But that's an issue and there is an initial answer in that one.

The third question, you know, ICANN expects all people within ICANN organization to be respectful to the community. If it's not treated with respect that would be an issue about which ICANN should be made aware of. So, what are our expectations about respect and did we feel that we weren't being treated with respect? And the fourth question, do you think there should be areas where people in the ICANN organization should be directly accountable to the community?

---

---

The accountability lines of command as described are strictly hierarchical within the staff and with ultimate responsibility being the CEO. There are no lines of direct accountability between staff and community. So, this is a question of, should there be some? And we have not answered that one yet. So, that's a little bit more into the detail and I'll stop there. I see hands, so, people might have things to contribute or to ask. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Avri. Cheryl Langdon-Orr is next.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Olivier. And, Cheryl for the record. Thanks, Avri, that's great, that's the, sort of, meat on the bones that I think this group in particular greatly appreciates. A couple of things from what you just said. Mine is going to take me more back to the responses to our questions that you've just outlined and it's something that for variable reasons, usually a highly inconvenient time of middle of my night for the calls, I haven't raised with the call.

But, I found in the response we got to the questions sent to staff where it mentioned, you know, this, that and the other policy are all available on the ICANN website and it appears that is to staff, that's something that, I think, we as a group probably should be taking up further. Like you, and a number of others, Alan included I'm sure, if you do a search you can get some excellent links to policy documents and process documents back in 2002, but whilst I'm sure they exist, finding them is like finding where in the desert the billboard is.

And so, I think if we're looking at the transparency aspect so that an empowered community can have an understanding of the expectations of the norms for expectations on staff, that, I think we still need to address and I'm raising it here because I think it's the sort of thing that this group, within ALAC and At-Large would be very interested in. And the second part that I wanted to just flag in in today's call is the importance of the work we're now getting into in the B paper. And to that end I wanted to encourage anyone who in interested in this topic to become a participant.

And as you said, Avri, we are extraordinarily small in terms of active people and I know that you'd be open to having participants or members join. But you also use excellent collaborative documentation, you and Jordan are doing that very, very well. And I think as we move into a B document now, that's a fresh opportunity for us to perhaps to encourage some of the people on this call to jump in and join us. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The start of my intervention is to some extent a mea culpa. I am a member of this group but it is not one of the ones I have been focusing on to a large extent, and that will change. I am perhaps well known as a critic of staff in a bunch of different areas and I will make sure that these ideas are captured in the documents as we go

---

forward over the next couple of weeks, and certainly well before Copenhagen.

I think it's more an issue of culture than anything else. The new CEO has made comments that they are here to serve us, but in reality, the perception in many cases is, they are here to control us. Yes, they do not necessarily write the policies but they have absolute control over many things and of course travel policy and how it's implemented, are perhaps among one of the better examples. But the fact that you simply can't find out who anyone reports to makes people far less than accountable.

So, I will be getting much more heavily involved and that's a commitment I make both to At-Large and to the sub-team itself. I won't go into specifics here but I think this is an area where we can ultimately have significant effect on both the work product that volunteers do and their quality of life. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Next is Tijani Ben Jamaa.

TIJANI BEN JAMAA: Thank you very much, Olivier. Thank you, Alan to say that because I 100% agree with you and was really, really frustrated by the staff taking initiatives for the community without even the information of the community, of the community members. And done in a hidden way perhaps to, I don't know, to help up X or Y. But it is not normal, it is

---

something that did not have the right, in my point of view, to take initiative that costs money for ICANN without the consultment of the community. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Tijani. I think this is a topic which seems to be now slowly gathering some pace so we'll no doubt have some future updates on this. There are two last topics on this long list of topics. We have ten minutes until the end of the call. We still need to be discussing any other business, the timing of this call. I wanted to briefly touch on those two seemingly new topics. The IRP Phase II and the ATRT II.

I know the discussion on ATRT II and the Workstream II topics is led by Avri Doria. I don't know who leads the IRP Phase II. Could we have just a very brief update on these two processes that are starting and then we will move back to Guidelines for Good Faith and so SOAC Accountability and spend five minutes on these topics. So, first, IRP Phase II and ATRT II, is there anything to report? Avri Doria on ATRT II work stream, is that just starting its work now?

AVRI DORIA: This is Avri again. There is no real ATRT II sub-group or work effort. There is certainly talk now about, you know, how ATRT III is going to be scoped and I guess there's an issue that that will be starting up relatively soon, but I'm not quite sure of the details. The ATRT II component has mostly been trying to contribute in all of the groups and so I'm a member of all of these WS II sub-groups, at least sitting in the background, chirping in if ATRT II issues and content when necessary.

---

But there is no ATRT II track per se. And were you talking about the IRP oversight team's second phase?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct.

AVRI DORIA: Because I'm in that group too. That's continuing on. Not really a different phase of it so much as continuing the work and having changed Chair, because our previous Chair became a Board member. But, you know, we've got one set of rules basically under review, the guidelines, you know, the supplemental rules, under review now and there are a couple open questions that are still being tracked.

And then we've got to get into what is perhaps the second phase, how do we actually now staff this thing? How do we actually get the new panels unpaneled and get that whole thing constructed? And that will be an implementation work where we'll be working with staff and the community but we haven't really started talking about that, so there is blessed little I can tell you about it at this point.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Avri. It's Olivier speaking and since this is the beginning of some work, if there are any volunteers to go onto that working group please can they get in touch with you, Avri, I guess they can let you know and they can be added to the working group. Let's shift back quickly then to Guidelines for Good Faith, the first reading is to come.

---

Cheryl, Avri, Alan are listed as the people that are following this topic closely. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. The sub-group is in the midst of its final review of the document prior to going to first reading within the CCWG plenary. I believe it reasonably addresses the question of what do SO's and AC's have to do to make sure that, among other things, if a Director tries to take legal action they are indemnified. And that was the prime reason for the group being formed. But we also felt that there should be some overall guidelines that AC's and SO's act upon.

I believe we are close to wording that we will agree with. It tracks the requirements set out in the Workstream I, pretty closely. It's been an interesting rollercoaster ride because various people came into this group without the background of Workstream I, and presuming that the removal process was quite different than actually it was documented. But we're very well on track right now and our work should be finished moderately soon. So, stay tuned. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Alan.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

If I can just briefly jump in, it's Cheryl.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you're following a big green tick, so I'm sure you can jump in.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, I appreciate that. Cheryl for the record. Just to say when Alan was saying 'on track', it means that we are looking to have the publication of the document to the CCWG plenary on or about the 1st of February, so that's seven days before the plenary which runs on the 8th of February. The letters, the new rulings for our methodology within the CCWG, and that means that our expected first reading is going to be on the plenary, so that's February, just to give a bit of depth and color to what Alan said. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking—

ALAN GREENBERG: That was thank you, Cheryl.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, sorry, Cheryl, yeah. I'm getting completely messed up, aren't I? Thank you, Cheryl, for this. I note that the Draft Report Version 1.1 is linked to our group. Is there going to be some significant change between that and what's going to be put out for the first reading?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: We worked yesterday on 1.3 and then I believe a 1.4 or a one point something has been circulated among the group. I won't say whether it's significant or not. We've put a lot of hours into changing it from then, so I would not put a lot of focus on 1.1, but it will bear striking resemblance to it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I note Avri mentioning in the chat that, yeah, if you want to join any group, get in touch with staff. If you don't know which staff to get in touch with, get in touch with At-Large staff and they will point you to the right people. The SOAC Accountability is another thing that we didn't touch on in any depth. Just reminding those people who have joined us at the top of the hour that we have had an extensive feedback on Human Rights, Transparency and Jurisdiction.

So, SOAC Accountability is really the last big discussion, and if you would like after that to comment on any of the first three topics, then you are very welcome to do so. SOAC Accountability, I believe Cheryl Langdon-Orr is the co-rapporteur for this, and this is what the call that clashed with this current call was all about. Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. And one day I'd love to understand why, of all topics, this particular clash occurred. Cheryl, for the record, and I am thoroughly practiced at being in two Adobe Connect rooms and telephone conversations at once, but when you're Chairing one of them, it becomes an additional challenge. That said, and yes, that is a

---

complaint. One of the things we're doing at the moment in the SOAC Accountability is what's being referred to as a data capture exercise, and it's an analysis of that data that has been captured.

So, to be very clear to you all what that means, and this is just a very, very brief overview. We sent out our questionnaire, we have received during December and in some cases January, yes, almost at the end of January, feedback from the SO's and the AC's. I believe now, without exception, but I will have to double check on the (inaudible) to those questions and we have discussed at some length in our group working matters and methodologies for now having got all this material back, how are we going to analyze it.

Today's call explored a deep dive on the responses to one particular topic from the questions and that happened to be the one of Transparency. I'm relatively happy, and I'd like to hear if Alan is otherwise, that as a working method, where we have a drafting team which does stand-alone work in collaborative documents and manages interchanges on the email list, between our weekly calls and then we'll start looking at topic line by topic line out of the questions.

As I said, today was Transparency, next week will be Outreach as a subset or action item for participation, because there was questions on participation in our questionnaire. I think we'll probably go ahead with that methodology for our group. Noting that what we're trying to do is get meaningful material put together so that we can make specific recommendations with a view to minimizing risk of capture, that's particularly our mandate with all of this, to minimize risk of capture for

---

the SO's and AC's by strengthening their accountability with recommendations.

And so, that's the job at hand. Our aim is to have substantive documentation, including general reporting, as well as this data capture exercise, in a fairly good shape for more fulsome discussion during the Copenhagen meetings and then it should be included in the public comment to follow during the first part quarter of 2017. So, that's as brief an update as I can give you on what has been, to date, 18 separate calls, all on an identical time rotation schedule. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl, for this extensive update and very comprehensive should I add. Alan Greenberg is next.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. As you may recall I had committed to doing the draft of the ALAC response to this group. I did complete the first path late last night, because the group wanted to get some feeling for where we were going. And following today's meeting I have an update that I will be doing, a revision I'll be doing, and I will then be distributing it widely on the ALAC lists, and I'll send it to this list as well, so we can get comments and feedback that right now, given my history in At-Large, I think I have a moderately good grasp of how we work, but certainly I'm not unique in that end, and we have to make sure that everyone in the group buys in to the response. So I will be sending that out and we will be needing a moderately quick response to it because, sadly, I and we are very late in getting this in. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this update, Alan. That's also helpful and good to know. So watch out for your mailbox contents everyone. We have been told by the interpreters that we have a small extension of time beyond the half-past two UTC time. So I'm going to let you all engage in more Workstream 2 update for another two, three minutes and then we will be discussing any other business after that.

So, human rights, we've already touched on completely, through and through. Do you have anything to add, those people who have joined us recently on transparency, jurisdiction or -- well, guidelines for good faith we have done. But transparency or jurisdiction, or indeed any of the other topics that we have here? for the record.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I could just click -- thanks. Thanks, Olivier. Cheryl for the record. Just a very quick jump in and it's a personal intervention on the jurisdiction question. And I thought the covering of all of that material was quite good from Sebastien, Tijani and others, I think, Tatiana -- you know, you've got the right of it all. But I just wanted to make very clear as an Asian Pacific representative member for the ALAC on these activities, I was one of the people who was not supportive of the fourth question in the four question set that is going to go out from jurisdiction. Up until the very last part of now what is a consensus outcome.

So I was one of those people who were being a bit of a difficult hold out, but I do think the consensus on the Q4 that's in the questions is as good as we're going to get. And I was happy then to switch my no seems

---

three not four questions view, which was a relatively hard line that I had kept to a with a new question 4 I'm ok, good to go. So just so you know from a very specific point of view, what I was doing and why I was doing it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's great. Thanks very much for this. Anyone else? I don't see anyone else wishing to jump in on any of those remaining topics. So that was a very good update that we've had. Thank you very much for this. I know that there was an action item which we're waiting for Alan to look at very quickly. Let me just quickly turn to this. The review of the At-Large action items. I'm just working for this. I think it was to do with the -- raising the question of the role of the complaints officer with regards to the ombudsman with your undoing the ALAC wrap up section during ICANN57. And Alan, as you are in touch with V, is there going to be a follow-up to that?

ALAN GREENBERG: To be honest, I don't quite recall what the substance was of that action item. But, we will be meeting with the newly appointed complaints officer in Copenhagen. Does that address the question?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's fantastic. Thank you. That's a good thing. Sebastien Bachollet?

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Alan, I just want to be sure that we talk about the complaints officer and not about the other duty who will be led by the guy from -- the VP of North America. Sorry, I don't recall his function, but I didn't heard -- Jimmy -- I didn't heard anybody to take the complaint office role. But maybe I'm wrong. Sorry.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan Greenberg? Yeah, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I'm having a mental gap. There was a position that was going to be advertised under Alan Grogan: Manager of Consumer Confidence, or some name like that. That, I believe is now integrated into -- the complaints officer, I believe, is integrated into that. I may be wrong. And Sebastien, you may be correct that that's a completely different position. I thought that the two were one and the same, but you may be right and we need to check. Do we have any staff on -- Heidi should know that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi Alan, yes.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I can tell you -- I can tell you -- okay, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Go ahead, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, as a complaint officer, it's a newly created position within legal staff, and we are still to hear what will be the function of this person, and when it will be hired. And the discussion we had on this specific issue both at the beginning of the meeting with the CCWG plenary and then during the ALAC meeting and other meetings during the ICANN meeting. We gave some feedback to V and now we have to have some feedback to us. But that's two different jobs, I guess. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien. You are correct. That completely went out of my brain. So the answer is I don't know what's happening with that. And we haven't gotten any feedback and we haven't heard about anyone being in the position. So maybe Heidi can enlighten us.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Alan. I have heard a little bit.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Heidi Ullrich.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, hi. Thanks, Olivier. I have heard a little bit. And I think I would like to first confirm the announcement and then I will let Alan know and Olivier know. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Heidi. It's Olivier speaking. Perhaps will you be able to just let the mailing list know? As this was an action item and we obviously need to clarify this. I'm looking at the time. We have five minutes. Let's have this as an action item please for Heidi to come back to us with regards to the ICANN complaints officer position. And now we are in --

ALAN GREENBERG: Once it is something she can say publicly.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you for that, Alan.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I thought she was going to tell us the top news before anyone else. But okay, never mind. For any other business, we've had a problem today with the scheduling of the call and the problem is that everyone, or the majority of people, answered the doodle and gave it a green and said, "Yes, that's the best time."

I did notice that Cheryl was very diligent in marking this part as red, but others were not as diligent. So we ended up with a call where a significant number of active people could not make it. Let me just ask

---

with Terri, what our current arrangements were going to be? And I think we might have to change those. Terri Agnew?

TERRI AGNEW:

Thank you very much. Back in October, we had sent out a doodle to come up with a rotating date and time for the ICANN Evolution. It was agreed upon that this group would now meet weekly on Mondays with a rotating time of 12:00 UTC and 18:30 UTC. So we're just checking with the group. Can we keep this scheduled weekly on Mondays and rotate back and forth between the two times? Clearly, if there's a conflict with another call, we could go to the alternate rotating time. So our next call, right now, would be next Monday at 12 o'clock UTC. [CROSSTALK]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks, Terri. I think we're all digesting this. Tijani Ben Jamaa?

TIJANI BEN JAMAA:

Thank you very much, Olivier. I think that the subgroup meetings are not decided for [inaudible]. So they are decided ahead of time, so that our call and change is in conflict with any of those subgroup meetings. So I think that the doodle, the only problem is that the doodle let this slot of time free for us to choose. Because normally it is booked by this subgroup and normally it shouldn't be among the proposed slots.

So I think that each call we have to have a doodle and we have to have it at the last days because we have to avoid to be in conflict with the other subgroups. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Tijani, this is Terri, if I may. We did check in advance for the Workstream calls and currently, at this time, there would be no conflict for what has been planned for the Workstream calls at this time. And we do have a little bit of a window into their planned calls that we were able to see; up through Copenhagen there would be no conflicts.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Terri. Sebastien Bachollet is next.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. This is Sebastien Bachollet speaking. We plan to have a one hour meeting or a one and a half hour meeting?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I think 90 minutes has proven to be the good window.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, then if it's okay, I feel that we start at 11:30 UTC; like that, any meetings from any subgroup on any day start at 1pm UTC, and then we'll avoid any conflict with Workstream 2 meeting. The same because it's meeting our schedule at the same time for all the subgroups three slots -- the day and if we avoid those slots of one hour, it's great. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Sebastien, it's Olivier speaking. Are there any Workstream meetings scheduled for Monday?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, for example the ombuds group goes on Monday, but as it is the Chinese New Year at the end of January, I have not scheduled any meeting on that day as we have done it for the New Year for -- I don't know how to call that -- accidental people or whatever. And I think it's fair to do the same, and that's why there is no meeting for the ombuds next Monday. But in general, we have one of three slots on Monday each week going on. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sebastien. Are there any objections to having 11:30 UTC call on Monday?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, this is Heidi. Can I just -- just a quick question, just to confirm. Today's Thursday. Are you talking about another call this next Monday or the week of the 5<sup>th</sup>?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We're speaking about overall rotation of calls Heidi. So it would probably miss next Monday because next Monday I'm going to be flying anyway. So it would be for Monday two weeks from now.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, Cheryl here.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I love this assumption that 11:30 is convenient, but anyway. Rotating call times is a good thing. Everyone shares the pain. I have no problems with calls on a UTC Monday, and the ombuds calls are predictable, so we should be able to avoid it. But I am finding it, with the demands of not just Workstream 2, but as Avery also is engaged more deeply than I am, because she is in the ultimate leadership, not just one of the work teams, but also the new subsequent procedures for new gTLD calls.

We were meeting weekly and fortnightly, and with people like Avery and I who are on all of those calls, but for me to be awake midnight to 1 or 1:30, and then having calls at 2 and 3 in the morning, and then having my working day, ridiculously impossible, when it's three and four days a week. So noting that, I'll be turning up, but I'll be a cranky little bunny when I do. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Cheryl. What would be a time that would be suitable for you? Because we are currently looking at rotation at only two different times, and usually rotation takes place with three different times. So at least one time out of three you get something that's much better for you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, and that's why I turn up to the ball. To be honest, not working -- I'm perfectly happy to start my working day at what is my local 04:00, 4am in the morning. So that's I think UTC -- Terri help me -- is that 16 or 17:00? One or the other. 17:00, I think it is.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's the second call rotation. So --

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, I understand that, but what it does mean is that every second week all it means is that instead of having three nights a week where I am getting a midnight to 1am call, I get four nights a week, when we have the Monday call as well. That's all I'm saying. Because the other calls all rotate and all take up time zones which for me include regular routine of 3am and 2am calls. Now you do the math. Midnight to 1 or 1:30, 2am call, 3am call, you know, and then I start my day at 4. [Inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. We are way beyond the end of our regular call. So we're going to have to end this call now. I see that 17:00 UTC is fine with you, Cheryl. So perhaps we will have to stick to 17:00 UTC and not

---

rotate, but clearly we need to make sure that it doesn't conflict with anyone else on the Monday -- that would be on the Monday. Let's follow up by email.

Thanks, everyone. Thanks to the interpreters for having stuck out an additional 20 minutes. And this call is -- well, before I adjourn it, next week, no call I believe. I think it's too early. Let's meet in a week and a half's time when we have a bit more movement on various things. In the meantime, we'll be on the meeting desk. Thanks, everyone. This call is adjourned.

TERRI AGNEW:

Thank you. 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]**