
SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good whatever, night, or everybody who participate to this meeting. It's meeting we have postponed two times, and I am happy to go to this 17th meeting. We are [on] the 6th of March and it's the ICANN Ombuds Office Subteam on the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2.

We will take the roll call by the participant in the AC room. Do we have people just online and not on the AC room? Thank you. And as Yvette asked for, if the person [may be] unavailable on the chat, on the AC room, can identify yourself, it will be great to who is participating to this meeting. Not because it's a closed meeting, but because it's always better to have the full list of participants. Thank you.

Okay, I suggest the following agenda for this meeting. Roll call and welcome done. We will get a report from staff, external review about ICANN Ombuds Office. Like to exchange with you on the possible roadmap and timeline with no preparation specifically from my side, but I think it's important to get some ideas. And I hope that you get it. I am now wondering. I would like to discuss with you a draft document I sent two or three days ago, it's this new version about what I call Complaints and Records [Offices], and then to discuss the next meeting.

Any comment on the agenda? Okay, if not, we'll go through this agenda, and starting by we have still the same number of participants supposed to be active, but as we can see, we are just a handful of them, and I don't know what to do with the others. If they are supposed to be active, it's not the case. That's a pity.

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.

The next meeting will be in Copenhagen, and we will discuss that also a little bit later. And then I suggest that we go to the next item, and the next item is where we are with the review of the Office of the ICANN Ombudsman. And for that, I give the floor to Lars just to be sure that [inaudible] included in the presentation your slides and you'll just go through I guess. I give you the floor, and then on the presentation. Thank you.

LARS HOFFMANN: Thank you, Sébastien. Can you hear me okay?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, good.

LARS HOFFMANN: Great, thank you. Good afternoon, good evening, and good morning, I guess. You're putting up the other session, I think.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I have put all in one slideshow.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, I was putting up version two so that way you have an all-in-one. There you go. I just realized that someone [inaudible]. My apologies.

LARS HOFFMANN: No worries, [Karen.] Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No worries. Just a second to check, Asha, you're online. You want us to wait a second to be sure that you're online? Staff, can you check if she is? Because we have not so much people, and I really would like to [inaudible]

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Can you just wait one minute? Can you just wait 30 second?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: We wait the time you tell us to go through. Go ahead, please.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Okay, that's fine now. Thank you. I'm in.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, great. Thank you very much, Asha. Okay, Lars, your turn. Go ahead, please.

LARS HOFFMANN: Thank you, Sébastien. Yes, I'm here to give you finally an update on the assessment, on the procurement especially. We have contracted a reviewer, so I suppose that it's good news. I'm going to talk you through a little bit of what happened, who they are and what's going to happen moving forward.

Just a reminder, [inaudible] copy from the [Extra] Procurement Department went through this with you, I think in December last year. So the bids that came in were independently assessed by several members of the ICANN organization, and then what we did is we conducted one or more interview [inaudible] or group interviews that were several from us on the phone and then the bidders with the three bidders that received the highest combines scores when we assessed the application.

And then we followed that up by checking the references of the top two bidders following the interview. And then the decision we made at the very end, the last two kind of – unfortunately, I can't tell you who the second candidate was, but one party had particularly good knowledge of how ICANN works itself in the multistakeholder model [inaudible] with ICANN.

The others had great experience with alternative dispute resolution, including Ombudsman offices, and have conducted lots of reviews of Ombudsman. The others had conducted no assessment or reviews of any Ombudsman offices or had any direct experience with dispute resolution or alternative dispute resolution.

That's kind of what tipped it for us, that we figured for the purpose of this assessment, it's really important to understand what an Ombudsman requires and [inaudible] some comparisons and experience from related but different offices. So that's really what I think swayed us with this candidate.

Just a little point here on the evaluation criteria that were applied when we made the selection and that kind of came out with what I said, the highest scores I suppose of the assessment. And this is flexibility that they showed in the application, the financial value – and I'll come back to that in just a second – the proposed methodology that they brought forward, the understanding of the assessment, and then obviously, arguably the most important one, the knowledge and the expertise that they bring to the table.

The [inaudible] of these categories just to kind of give an idea how this works, each of these categories had between one and up to 12 different subcategories where we would kind of assess it. The financial value only is really one category [inaudible] additional questions. In fact, you see at the bottom here that kind of to show you that it's not about choosing the cheapest.

It's really how it's done is that we have a certain budget. Remember, we talked about this. I don't want to bring this conversation back up because we had to redact it for obvious reasons, so no need to do this again, but we had a budget that we shared with you. So anybody who was within that budget received the highest mark of financial value, whether they were spot on or half of it or 10% of it, it didn't matter. There was no ranking whether they are especially low or just within budget. Only if they go clearly over the budget are some marks taken out. And I think I will not be going too far ahead to let you know that none of the bids received were above the budget that we had in this case.

In each of the categories, as I said, and then there are some questions to kind of – if you were looking for [demonstrable] understanding of not-for-profit organizations, ability for engagement [inaudible] tiers and obviously in this case, also the knowledge of the Ombudsman office.

And so the company that we contracted is called Cameron Ralph LLC. They're based in Australia. They're a consulting firm that specialize in governance and performance [inaudible] and policy. As I said in the beginning, they're expertise or experts in Ombudsman schemes that reviewed I think 16 of them in Australia, New Zealand, and also Canada, and a lot of public and not-for-profit organizations among them.

They have assisted Ombudsman schemes, strengthened the quality of the assurance and also other processes. And there's a website here that you can go to. I can also copy paste it in the – I'm not sure whether you can link from the – oh, yes you can – AC room. Go to the website. But if you type in Cameron Ralph into any browser, it will come up with the website.

These are the two consultants who will be conducting review. They're Phil Khoury and Debra Russel. Phil is going to be the lead on this assessment. He's also the Principal of Cameron Ralph. He worked extensively with industry parties in [inaudible] schemes, and as you see here, the former Executive General Manager of the Australian Security Investment Commission.

Debra Russel has a legal background. She was a Senior Manager at PricewaterhouseCoopers. She lectured at the law school and also has a strong legal and regulatory compliance background.

Both of these have conducted these sort of reviews over the past I think 15 years together, so they're an established team as well.

The next steps and the assessment, both Phil and Debra will travel to ICANN 58. I can tell you that this was a small miracle to happen with the timing we had and having them in Australia. I'm sure Cheryl's on the phone, you probably didn't have your flight booked two days ago.

Anyway, it took some time but they're going to be there. They won't stay for the entire meeting, but they arrive on Friday and they will leave late on Tuesday, so they're going to be there for most of the meeting. I suggested this, here's the second bullet point. It's obviously up to you, Sébastien and the entire subteam, whether you would like to have a phone conference with Cameron Ralph with Phil and Debra, maybe tomorrow or the day after. I'm just putting it out there, you can discuss this among yourselves. We can send a Doodle as well if that will be helpful.

The reason for that would be for you to kind of help identify – first of all, to get to know them, for them to give them a chance to introduce themselves to you rather than me talking about them, but also for you to [give] some feedback for them, what you expect from them during the time in Copenhagen but also during the assessment, to maybe think about who they should talk to. I think it's very important that we get some feedback from you. As happy as I would be to direct them to various people, I don't think I or any of my colleagues really have the knowledge that you have dealing with issues for I think several months now, to kind of know the community and know who they have to and should speak to.

So I think for that reason a call would be useful. However, I appreciate if for reason of time it's not possible. We can discuss many of this as well on the list, and I'd be very happy to send out a request for input to the group. Maybe not later today, but first thing tomorrow.

I would also suggest that there would be a meeting between you the subteam, whoever among you is going to be in Copenhagen and the two examiners. We would also be very happy to facilitate that, we might be able to get a [sign-up] room. The meeting would most likely not be able to be recorded, but I think it would be a fruitful undertaking for you to meet with them, Debra and Phil.

With that, I think that brings me to the end of this presentation. I'm looking forward to some questions. Asha, are you –

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Lars.

LARS HOFFMANN: Sorry, Sébastien, if I just may quickly be – Asha, you raised your hand. Asha, I'll address you when you're on the phone. Please go ahead. Sébastien, over to you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Thank you, Lars. And Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien, mine's almost a piece of trivia, so just go to Asha first and come back to me.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Asha, please go ahead.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Yes. Sorry, I'm in a very noisy environment, so I don't know if you can hear me.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, it's okay. Please go ahead.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Okay. Yes, I have two questions, Lars. First of all, thank you for the great summary. Who will be paying for these people to be coming to Copenhagen? I'm just wondering where the budget is from, and also, which dates are they expected to be in Copenhagen? Thank you.

LARS HOFFMANN: Absolutely. ICANN will pay for their travel, it was part of the budget and it didn't break the allocated budget we had. And the date, as I just said in fact, Friday to Tuesday. That's their arrival and departure dates. They had a non-negotiable [inaudible].

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Friday –

LARS HOFFMANN: Friday the 10th, I want to say. I have to look at my calendar. The Friday before the meeting starts. 10th is correct, so Tuesday 14th. [inaudible]

ASHA HEMRAJANI: So they will be available for meeting? [inaudible]

LARS HOFFMANN: [inaudible] on the Monday and Tuesday.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Right, so they will be available to meet with us after Friday, right? So Saturday, Sunday, Monday.

LARS HOFFMANN: Asha, I'm going to be honest with you, definitely Saturday, Sunday, Monday and the morning of Tuesday. They also might be able to on Friday, but I'm not sure who of you is available, and I would have to check the arrival time. But they're ready to go when they come off the plane, according to themselves.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Okay. Thank you.

LARS HOFFMANN: You're welcome.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Asha. Thank you, Lars. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. Just to let you all know, I've worked indirectly – I should almost say against – Cameron Ralph, and Phil Khoury in particular. That shouldn't be rather [inaudible]. Let me see if I can make it clear. After I left the auDA Board, Cameron Ralph and Phil in Particular were commissioned to do a report for auDA, which is the ccTLD operator for Australia. I have very little problem at all with the extensive recommendations that they made, some 16 recommendations for Board governance, etc. Some of the I's could have been dotted and some of the stuff could have been looked in more deeply, etc. I have however spent the last 18 months of my life fighting tooth and nail – including with the government – against the implementation of some of what auDA did based on what I think is a bastardization of what Phil and his team wrote.

So they are known to me, they may recognize me. It shouldn't be a problem, but whilst it isn't directly against their report, I am becoming a little bit of a problem for the existing Board as a result of their report. I thought that I should come clean.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. And now, I was trying to find out where I have already seen his name, and I was trying to, and I didn't check in the right direction. But yes, I really think that it's raise – not for you, but it raised

for me issues on, yes, I don't know what to do. But I tried to read some of the information about auDA a few months ago when it was published or sometime after, and it raised some question.

And I don't know really what to do. But Asha, please go ahead. Thank you.

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Thank you, Séb. I have two questions. First is to Cheryl. Cheryl, I think I know what exactly you're referring to. Just remind me, refresh my memory, please. The study that they do was mostly on governance and this is nothing really specifically anything to do with an Ombudsman function or office?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

That is correct, Asha. Yes, that's correct. Remember, of course, that was exactly what they were asked to do; a report for the Governance Committee on the auDA Board and putting some recommendations forward regarding auDA and how in particular its governance should be managed.

As I say, I have very little problem with their report. I could perhaps suggest some of it is a little boilerplate, and some of it pointed out things that surprisingly enough had certainly already been done while I was on the Boar. But that's not a criticism, that just happens when you're working with consultants.

I have no direct work history with them from Ombudsman's records, but I'm sure I could certainly ask our banking Ombudsman who was on the

Board of auDA when this report was done. And I suspect he may very well have been – because of his Ombuds history, he would have certainly raised an issue if it was an issue to raise. So I don't have a problem with the company at all, but I just want to let you know that I am known to them.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Yes, thanks. So my second question is really... My concern is more about their expertise in terms of reviewing the Ombuds function. I know Lars you had a slide on that. Could we go back to that one, please? And for whoever is typing the notes, it should be the auDA, which small letter A, small letter U, and big letter D, big letter B. Right.

So when you say that they reviewed 16 schemes located in these countries, were they all Ombudsman schemes, please?

LARS HOFFMANN: Yes. Absolutely, Asha. Those were 16 Ombudsman schemes.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Okay, and nothing for technology. Okay, there are telecoms in there. That's good enough. Alright, that's good. Okay, thank you very much.

LARS HOFFMANN: You're welcome.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Oh, sorry, one more question. I'm not sure, Lars, if you're allowed to share this, but are you allowed to tell us how much this is costing?

LARS HOFFMANN: I definitely am not able to share this on the call for sure, Asha. And I'm going to be honest with you – are you going to be in Copenhagen?

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Yes, of course. I'm on the Board.

LARS HOFFMANN: Okay. I will tap you on the shoulder and find out whether I can tell you or not, and then let you and other people of the group know as well. My gut feeling is that we can't share this, but if we can, we will.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Yes, please do check if you can share it, because I think I would like everyone to know in terms of transparency, for the sake of transparency.

LARS HOFFMANN: Absolutely, but I can –

ASHA HEMRAJANI: [inaudible]. Whatever you're allowed to do within the confines. Thank you very much.

LARS HOFFMANN: We will share whatever we can share 100%, and I will investigate.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Okay.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, thank you very much, Asha. The question raised by Cheryl, just make me to ask you this question: did you the review the review of the review to choose the team which was the bidder, did you know about their role in the auDA work and the review they have done for them? Have they released that information to you?

LARS HOFFMANN: Sébastien, I'm going to be honest with you, I would have to look at the application details. They are long applications and they have listed a lot of jobs and tasks that they did, and so they might have done, but I don't want to commit to this so I'm going to say I'll get back to you and I can write that certainly on the list as soon as I have the information.

They might very well have done [inaudible] extensively about the work as well with Ombudsman schemes in Australia. But I have to check that.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Because I think it would be very important to know what they have done in the area now of ICANN responsibility, even if auDA is running

ccTLD and not directly. And there's the decision for the ccTLD of ICANN, but they are participating.

Okay, it create me some trouble here, but I don't think I can send anything on that. Do we have other question or comments on that? If not, let's go. And once again, thank you very much, Asha, for your question and, Cheryl, for your inputs. Very important, and I hope that it will not create any distortion, because you are, Cheryl – amongst other – one of the important people they need to talk with, because you have some experience dealing with the ICANN Ombuds, not only the current one but the previous one and different roles you have done, and I really was thinking that one of the main person to meet with and discuss with was you, and I really hope that it will not create any difficulties.

Okay. Thank you very much. Lars, are you staying with us until the end of the meeting or you will drop after we go to the next item?

LARS HOFFMANN: Well, I was going to drop. I'm going to be honest here with you. It's 10:30 on Sunday, so I was hoping to enjoy a bit more of the weekend. If you want me to stay on, I'd be happy to stay on as well.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, just because –

LARS HOFFMANN: I think –

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay.

LARS HOFFMANN: Sorry, Sébastien. I think would be good if you could maybe ask the group here in the room whether we should try to Doodle a call maybe on Tuesday early morning, Australia time.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: And in UTC, what does it mean?

LARS HOFFMANN: That's a good question.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Anything between 19:00, 20:00 or 21:00 UTC. That's 4:00 AM, 5:00 AM, 6:00 AM, 7:00 AM. If you go to 22:00, it's 8:00 AM, all of which is perfectly reasonable in Australia.

LARS HOFFMANN: Okay.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Asha, you had your hand raised. You want to take the floor before we go to this question?

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Hello.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, go ahead. We can hear you now.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Okay. Yes, thank you. I just wanted to ask before Lars leaves us a little bit about the schedule. I don't know whether – if you can just remind us all of the schedule again, that would be really helpful.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's the next slide, but yes.

LARS HOFFMANN: Asha, I didn't hear that. You wanted the next slide? Next steps?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, she wanted to discuss this issue here about what is the timeline, and if we are still – where we are with the timeline. It was next topic on our agenda. And yes, I think it's important to have your inputs here and what they tell you about when they will fully deliver a report.

LARS HOFFMANN: Yes. Do you want me to answer that, Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, please. Lars, go ahead.

LARS HOFFMANN: Thank you. So we are still I'm going to say within the boundaries of the timeline. I think I can share with you that all of the bidders – including Cameron Ralph – expressed that the original timeline – as you also expressed and we fully acknowledge – was very [shite], let's say. It's not a lot of time for this review, so it fits in with the rest of the Work Stream 2 work obviously was the reason here.

But we are aware that obviously the review might have to go on longer for a variety of reasons. They might have to spend more time, Work Stream 2 might get extended, etc., so there are a lot of extremities. So we did raise that with all the candidates during the interviews, whether they would be able to be flexible, to work longer on this project if the need occurs, and whether they have the bandwidth. And Cameron Ralph – as all the others did as well [inaudible] agreed to that. So while they think the timeline is tight, they think it is doable. But if more time is needed, they have more time available.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, Lars. I don't understand what you meant by the last sentence, if more time is needed then more time would be made available to them. Could you elaborate, please?

LARS HOFFMANN: Asha, I'm so sorry. My headphones just [inaudible], I did not hear your question. Could you just repeat?

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Okay. I'm concerned – okay, no worries, Lars. I'll repeat. I would like you to elaborate on the last bit of what you just said earlier, which is that more time would be made available to them if that would be needed. Because I'm very concerned about the timing of this, and when we will finish.

In terms of extension of Work Stream 2 work, I think that is not a given, so it really needs to go to the SOs and ACs to see whether this will be – to see their perspective on that. And I'm aware of the fact that this working group is a bit floored than the other work groups in terms of completion date, so that's why I wanted to check with you what you meant by more time would be made available to them if needed. Could you elaborate on that, please, Lars?

LARS HOFFMANN: Asha, thank you. Yes, in fact I will not only elaborate, but thank you for [inaudible] kind of correct myself, I think. It is not for them to ask for more time. There's a timeframe, the date – I think it's around the 20th of April. I would have to look this up, I'm sorry. But definitely submitting the report in April as you can see on this roadmap.

They agreed to the timeline. What we said is that when they come to mid- and late April, and by that time for reasons – as you quite rightly point out, I understand that Work Stream 2 may be extended. This is an

issue beyond certainly my realm of work but also beyond this group, that might have implications on the assessment just because other things might come up, things might get delayed, etc.

So if for any external reasons through this assessment there is more time required, they would have the bandwidth. It's not about them demanding more time. That's not what this is about. So the timeline as we see it here stands, we're committed to that. What we have assured is that if there needs to be more time, there is a flexibility on their end to do that.

What we didn't want to have is that in late April, they have a giant client coming up that will take 100% of their time for the next six months and then they can't spend any more time on this if need be, and that is not the case. I hope that made it clear.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Yes. Thank you, Lars.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, thank you very much, Asha and Lars. I know that it's an ongoing discussion within the Plenary Work Stream 2, but my feeling is that we need a good review. Timing is important, but if they don't have enough time, I want to be sure that they've got the time. They need not three years, but I think really this one and a half months, even less now, it's very short, including travel to Copenhagen and some knowledge about the situation of ICANN.

And ICANN is not a trivial organization, and the time to understand, even if it's one specific topic, the Ombuds Office, may be tricky. And I think we need to have this discussion with them and with the full group. I don't see how we will be able to stay with the current timeline for Work Stream 2, then it will be a discussion in Copenhagen. Thank you.

Now I suggest that we send a Doodle with different possibility to meet with them, starting by – as Asha asked – 10:00 AM Australia, and to see at what time people could be available. I don't know, in the next –

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Or 11:00 AM. Sorry, I made a mistake with the calculation. If 11:00 AM would be possible, that would be great. But of course, it depends on everyone else.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, but let's start with 10:00. You will say that you can't, and 10:00 AM Australia time, and it will be late for Europe as it will be middle of the night.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Oh, okay.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: But in the same time, for my personal timing, I will be traveling by car on the night of my Tuesday 7. Then I am okay with late I will be arriving in Paris at that time, and it's okay. Just can we try to have different

possibility schedule? I know that people will start to travel and it will be tricky, but Staff, can you send us a Doodle with different possibilities? And we will see which one we can pick up with more people participating, and I understand that not all will be able to.

The second point, if we come back here, do we need face-to-face meeting? I will say yes, and now we have to figure out when we can do it. I think on Friday will be difficult as we have a full day of meeting with the CCWG Work Stream 2, and they will just be arriving, but I we find out a time on Saturday. I will work with staff to find out what could be the timing, and maybe send also a Doodle to find out when it will be the best solution for all to be able to participate as we have also to be sure that we have a room for that.

I am sure that Herb will be able to give us our own room for short meeting, and I hope that he will be participating also to this face-to-face meeting.

Okay, I don't know which was the first one, but I will ask Asha first, and then Lars. Go ahead, Asha.

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

I think Lars was ahead of me. Please give Lars the floor.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Okay. Go ahead, Lars.

LARS HOFFMANN: Thank you, Asha. Thank you, Sébastien. I was just wondering whether I can – I just had a quick check [back] for times. I was just going to pave the time possibility into the chat, and then my colleague reminded me that the calls for the Work Stream 2 are kind of fixed for three different slots, and I was just wanting to inquire whether for this one meeting if we can arrange something by the phone in the coming days. We could go beyond these three slots as an exception to the rules as well, so we can have the Doodle a little bit more diverse, let's say.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I definitely agree with you. If it's to stick with the timing within our three slots, then I will not be able to participate at 7:00 PM. I will be driving, and I don't want to run a meeting and driving, and it's not fit with the possibility of others. I really would like to have a Doodle with not taking in to account just the specific three slots. And hopefully we will find a slot where there is a possibility to use this AC room.

Yes, I hope that it will be possible to be outside of the three allocated slots. Thank you. Asha, please.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Yes. Thank you, Sébastien. I wanted to go back to what these two consultants will be doing when they are in Copenhagen. Is there a schedule or a plan for them? Is the idea for them to attend ICANN meetings to understand better how we work, and then also meet with Herb and just to learn what the current Ombudsman function is all about? Or is there a formal plan for them?

I'll tie this back to why I was asking about the cost, because I'm conscious of the fact that we should really make best use of the money for this project. Since we're paying for them to come all the way to Copenhagen, I just wanted to figure out what are they doing and how we can ensure the best use of money. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Asha.

LARS HOFFMANN: Thank you, Asha. Mind if I reply, Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Go ahead.

LARS HOFFMANN: Thank you. Asha, it's a very good point and I'm glad you brought it up. And I think I can already give you a little bit of reassurance that actually, Cameron Ralph has had asked us from their end to provide us with a to-do list for Copenhagen. So we're certainly wanting to make the most of the time. It is indeed to do two things. To get to know ICANN a little bit better than they maybe do at the moment, but that's almost an added benefit. And the main goal for them is to meet in person with as many people as possible who they could talk to who have knowledge of both ICANN, but especially obviously how the Ombudsman Office works and what that relationship is with the organization as well as with the community obviously, and the wider world.

So we will from our side, from the ICANN org side, we will point out to them people within the community, SO/AC Chairs, the usual suspects really who we think they may want to talk to, and then see whether that's possible. And then as I said, we really look forward to your input. Obviously, they'll be meeting with Herb, and I'm not sure whether Chris will be at this meeting or any of the other previous Ombudsman. I think that would also be useful.

And then we're really looking to you to also provide us with a few names and ideas who they could speak to from your end who you think might be important, and then we will work with Cameron Ralph to set this up. Obviously, they don't know the community, they can't reach out to them as efficiently as we could, so we will work with them very closely to make sure that their time is used as effectively as possible. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Lars. Asha, you wanted to talk again? Okay. May I suggest that we as member of this group start to provide a list of people they might meet? And I suggest that as an action item, you send to – I don't know if it's good to the list. No, I don't think to the list. You send to me the five top people you want them to meet, and if you have five other you think could be useful also, do that. If it's three and three, it's okay also. But I think it will be interesting to have your inputs, and it's an action item for us to do that as soon as possible. And I will compile all those names and send that to staff, or you can send to Lars also. I have no trouble with that, but it's depend of if Lars agree with that and if you agree with that.

Lars, you raised your hand and then you took it down. You want to something?

LARS HOFFMANN:

Thank you, Sébastien. Yes, I was typing but speaking might be quicker. Yes, I was just going to say I might also be happy – while I welcome that you reach out to me, it might be useful by a list so you also know what other people have suggested and you kind of don't suggest the same people others have.

But yes, you can e-mail me directly. I'm wondering, Sébastien, whether you would like me to send out a quick note to the list or whether you want to do that actually, as the Chair might have more authority to ask those who weren't on the call and who might not be listening immediately to ask them for some input for people to contact, and also maybe document to study that people think that might be of importance.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I think my trouble is to send name of people and dropping name in the list on a public list. Not sure that it's the best way for people, because, "Oh, you don't put my name?" Or, "You put my name and I disagree" or so on and so forth, and it's why I was wondering if we can't just send a note with yes inputs from if you have specific documents you want them to read, if you have some specific issue you want to raise, and to send to you and me the possible list of people they need to meet and we will take that into account.

That's my feeling, but if you think that we need to do that in another manner, I have no trouble. If you agree with that, I will try to send a mail later today in my day, hoping that you will have it, and then the other member of the group will get it.

Okay, any other questions about the review? As you guys know, I want to raise one, and I wanted to put that in the Any Other Business but as Lars will leave, I just want to tell the group that I was little bit disappointed not to be our group or even subgroup of the subgroup more involved in this choice. I am sure that some part of the evaluation could have been done with us without jeopardizing anything on the process and on the fairness on the process. But it was done like that and we have this result.

I am sure that involvement of some of us will have been helpful, but it was not the case. Now let's go as we are today, but I hope that in the future, there will be some way to involve other part of the community, not just staff or what [inaudible] decide to call you organization, but others with possible inputs.

I raised this issue by mail, now it's where we are. Co-Chair asked me what I wanted to do, and my answer was, "Let's go and do the work that we are supposed to do, because we have very short time." But I can't leave that without my comment on that. Thank you very much for the work, and I hope that this review will go smoothly and will give the results we need for ICANN.

Okay. Thank you. Any other final comments on this specific issue? We have eight minutes to be on the top of the hour. I'm not sure that we

will be able to go through the other document I wanted to go, but that's life and we will discuss that in the Copenhagen. We discussed that. I will skip this part of the schedule because I would like to have some exchange with you with the calendar.

As you know, the next meeting will be in Copenhagen, and then we will have to add few meetings there with the reviewers. I had discussion with Bernie about the next meeting, and here you have the full list of what is schedule. One of the questions is, do we want to have a meeting, or can we have a meeting on the 20th of March, knowing that it's very short after the meeting?

I have kept it in the schedule because of the review, and maybe it will be a good time to have an exchange after meeting with the reviewers. But if some of you feel that it's too early, we would like that [encircled] knowing that 20th of March is just one month before they're supposed to give their report. It's why I keep that on the schedule, but if you really think that it will be difficult, just tell us or tell me. Up to you.

Yes, that will be our next goal, and as we discussed, we will try to set up a specific call with the reviewer Tuesday or Wednesday morning, UTC time. We will set up a meeting with the reviewer in Copenhagen, hopefully on Saturday, taking into account the different time arrival of the different participants. And our next meeting is for the moment scheduled on the 20th of March. Okay, before – any comments, question? Any Other Business?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Nope.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. I really think that starting a discussion for four minutes on the document I find it's not good use of time. It's a bit too short. Then I will not start with that, but if you have comments or question, please really feel free either to the list or to me directly. It will be useful. We have still some work to be done, and I tried to put that in the document where I have some information of what was the link with the Ombuds Office or other activity that those subgroup wanted to be given to Complaints Office, but if you have some specific part of those work to be added in the document, just also feel free to give it to me or to the list. And we have still a very old document. We will need to go back one day. Hopefully after Copenhagen I will be able to restart some work on this document with you.

With that, I guess if you have no other question, I will be happy to meet with the one who will be able to do the call with the reviewer on the Tuesday or Wednesday. Please as soon as we get the Doodle answer, and I will be happy to meet with you in Copenhagen for the one traveling.

Safe travel for everybody, and all the others, I hope that you will be able to be online for some of our meetings. And with that, if there are no any other comments, I would like to call this meeting for a close, and see you in Copenhagen. Thank you very much for your participation today. Goodbye.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. Bye.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, Sébastien. Goodnight. Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you. Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]