

ICANN

**Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
January 31, 2017
10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Recording has started. You may begin.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much. Good afternoon, good evening. This is the CCWG accountability discussion call on Tuesday, 31st of January, 2017. On the call today we have Ed Morris, Julf Helsingius, Niels ten Oever, Patrick Lenihan, Robin Gross, Renata Aquino Ribeiro, and from staff we have myself, Maryam Bakoshi.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much. Over to you, Robin.

Robin Gross: Thank you very much, and thanks for everyone who's joined the call this morning or this afternoon or this evening depending on where you are. Very much appreciate it. Let me quickly go through the agenda. So we can talk about big line or big picture for the entire Work Stream 2 going forward quickly. And then go through the different Work Stream 2 sub issues that I know we've got a lot of participants in and see where the work is in those groups and where we can help.

And then planning for next month, next month's meeting and then any other business. Is there anything anyone would like to add to this or any questions or concerns? I know we can move around some of the different issues in the work stream to sub issues depending upon some of the chairs may be joining later in the call for some materials of some of these subgroups. So we could possibly juggle the topics a little bit depending, but this is sort of the base line for how we'll go.

Anybody got any questions or concerns on this? Okay, not seeing or hearing any. Let's plough forward. Okay. So the first issue is where are we now in TCWG accountability? And I would like to invite folks to take a look at that link there, to the Work Stream 2 dashboard. It's on the screen, the link.

And then if you click on the most recent dashboard update, which is from like January 10 or January 11, that will give the most recent one. And it's very helpful in terms of big picture and trying to see where each one of the different sub groups is and where there might be some sticking points and a big overall timeline for what we're working towards here.

And it looks like we're basically going to be ready to or at least shooting to be ready to have this finalized by ICANN 59 this summer. I believe that's June. So we are trying to wrap this up in the next few months. There's not a lot - work isn't moving too quickly, but there's also a lot of pressure to get it done. So I don't think these are unreasonable targets at this point. It's just a question of the quality of the work that goes into the reports. But I think the targets will be met one way or another.

So that's kind of where we are in terms of the timeline, but we've seen more public comments after it goes out or after it's finalized again. But really now

is the time to get the reforms and recommendations that you want into the different groups so now is the time to do some of the work in the individual groups about what you want to see in the final report.

Okay. So, there's a lot of material here in this dashboard and so actually, I would encourage folks to sort of follow along with it as we go through some of the different subgroups because it presents a nice capsule of what each subgroup is working on now and where they are on their individual timeline and goals.

Okay. So let's just dive right in to some of the different subgroups and we've got nine of them, so it's not easy to keep track of them all, but that's why I think these monthly calls are really helpful, especially for me to try to understand where each one of these subgroups is and what we can do to help with the work in the different groups.

Okay, so let's get started with the first one, which is the jurisdiction subgroup and the issues, the influence of ICANN's jurisdiction on operational policies and accountability mechanism. And I know this is one of the subgroups that's more well attended and there's a lot of work being done and a lot of personal and - I know we've got a couple of participants on the call here who have been very active in there, in particular Avri.

So Avri if I could ask you to give us maybe a quick update about where this group is at, that would be really helpful.

Avri Doria: Sorry. It took me a while to get my way back to the mute button. So you're asking me about the staff one now?

Robin Gross: No, we're actually doing the jurisdiction one, if you feel comfortable. I know you've been a participant in that group.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Robin Gross: And I'm not sure who else on the call...

Avri Doria: I've been a participant, but certainly one of the...

((Crosstalk))

Robin Gross: ...right now has been a participant in that group.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) one of the participants.

Robin Gross: So, if you feel comfortable on letting us know where this group is at, that'd be great. In not, that's okay. We can look at the dashboard.

Avri Doria: Right. Well, I could certainly start. So basically, in a sense we've been arguing over the questionnaire that they've wanted to send out for a long time and the questionnaire is basically looking for evidence of issues where people had problems of one sort or another that can be documented with the jurisdiction, the jurisdictional situation of being a US Corporation.

So they've been looking for, you know, putting out a questionnaire that's going to ask questions about that. There was a very strong prejudice against anything other than actual cases and nothing that would get into what's considered speculative issues that had to do with moving jurisdiction.

In fact, there's been a very strong argument or reason for, you know, touching anything that may lead people to think that, you know, jurisdiction of the United States is a problem because we are committed to staying in the United States and nothing, absolutely nothing, can threaten that decision.

And of course, there's been people on the other side arguing that, "No, you know, we were told that this whole jurisdictional issue would be saved for WS2, and now you're saying that we have two stronger commitments that we can't really talk about it."

So in some ways, the group has been relatively stuck I think for a while, and we finally did agree on a questionnaire. We did put in a slightly broader question, but you know, made it very narrow. Now, we've also started to do work on looking at a number of cases that have existed and trying to pick up elements and there's a draft document on sort of explanations and (recent) research that is being worked on, which eventually should end up the final document.

But I think this group is a long way from completing, but it is also a group that has a lot of people attending, but not many people speaking. And I must say I'm one of those ones that doesn't speak all that much, though I'm never completely quiet, or rarely completely quiet.

Maybe there's questions. It's too bad Milton's not on this call because he's been very active in it and has a very strong view on some of the issues. But, sorry, I didn't prepare myself to think and talk about this one much. But yeah, I guess if there's any questions then I can start thinking about, you know, I was starting to load my mind with what I was going to have to stay about staff when you asked me about this one. So I'm kind of tongue-tied.

Robin Gross: No, I apologize. That's my fault. I'm sorry. I know you are one of the repertoires of the staff accountability group, and so I had asked you about that one, but I didn't see any other participants of the jurisdiction group. So I just kind of put you on the spot there, and I apologize for that.

Avri Doria: Okay. Well, that's okay. I see Renata's question about any talk of responsibility for providing remote participation on just jurisdiction group. I am not sure what the question applies to, to participation in that group because there certainly is, you know, the standard remote participation that there is normal. I think if we're looking for remote participation issues, you'll find those much more in I guess in the diversity group and that's one that Renata participates in.

But yes, so not many - so you're talking about at meetings that people can participate in US stuff other than online right now. That is interesting and certainly in fact there was an issue that I brought up in a related way in the last jurisdiction meeting sort of saying, can we still say that US jurisdiction is non-problematic and do we have to look at it from the plaintiff's point of view? And if you have a plaintiff that can't appear because of the seven country plus issues, what does that mean? And can we still say that this jurisdiction is not and somehow affected by that?

It was a question that didn't get taken up yesterday and was very strongly argued about by Phil Corwin who said "Well, even if they can't come, they can always you know, do a" - what's the thing where you, you know, swear in front of somebody? A deposition. They can do depositions. They don't have to come, so what's the problem?

So we haven't really broached the subject of are these jurisdiction consideration somehow changed in the age of Trump. It's a question that I did

throw in and in fact you know, asking the question of do non-US nationals still have full protection of American law when they are in the US? And that's a question I don't know the answer to, but it's a question that I know I have. I don't know if that relates to Renato's question. I see Renato is typing yes Avri. Thanks for the comment. Okay, great.

Robin Gross: I've got a question. So these questions that are going to go out I guess the community so will NCSG, NCUC (unintelligible), will one of these groups be the recipients of these questions? And so we need to start thinking about putting a team together to answer - provide written responses to these questions.

Avri Doria: Well, these questions, they are going to go out globally not just to the communities, but they are asking this is not so much an opinion question, but can you describe cases? Can you give us evidence, etcetera? So I think that if we have people who are knowledgeable about cases, events, closures, blockages, what have you, that have occurred and have documentation, it would be worth it for us to help and try collect it. But this is not one of those that is specifically asking for you know, the comment of particular groups. It's a questionnaire that's going out for anybody that knows anything.

Robin Gross: Okay. Great. That's really helpful. Anybody else have any questions on the jurisdiction subgroup? Okay, I don't see any hands or hear any voices. So let's move on to the next one with the SOAC accountability subgroup. And I believe Farzi is one of the tours of this one, although I don't hear her on the call fortunately.

Do we have anyone else who is on the call who is a participant in this subgroup and could maybe give us a quick update on where they are? Okay, I don't see or hear anyone, so we can come back to that one later if we get more

participants on this call who are also in that subgroup and can provide us with some information.

When I look at the (dashboard) information, it says on the progress they are about 45% of the way done and they are on track for meeting the overall goal. So it looks like they are actually one of the groups that might be a little bit further ahead than some of the others. The dashboard is actually pretty helpful for checking down where the different groups are.

Okay, so shall we move for now on that one and we can go to staff accountability? I think Avri is one of the chairs of that subgroup. So Avri, if you want to give us a quick update on that it will be great.

Avri Doria:

Sure. Okay. So, okay. Yes, okay. So the staff accountability, we had a very slow start because we basically started out with a bunch of questions to staff trying to answer our, you know, our charge because the charge in this, and I bring this one with Jordan Carter). Unfortunately both of us have been sometimes too busy to pay full attention to it.

But we, the job we've got is one, is to define the role of staff vis-à-vis the community and then to define what measures there are for their accountability and such as - so you know, are there instructions? Is there training? Is there a code of conduct, etcetera? So those and then to make any recommendations about changings.

I think we're saying we're somewhere around 30% done. I think those percentage numbers are very much, you know, finger in the wind and see what it feels like, but sure, 30 sounds close or certainly not half done. We finally did get some answers from the staff on our questions. However, in many cases it was yes, there's a code of conduct. Yes, there's a whistleblower.

Yes, there's this and all the document is behind a, you know, is in the staff areas of the web so it's not stuff that we have access to.

So we've sent a further question saying hey, can we have access to the code of conduct. Can we have access to, you know, what training they get? Can we have access to training for transparency that they are getting? You say we have some. What is it? What audits are being done etcetera? So we've had to ask a bunch of questions again.

So we've got two documents that we're working on, one of them called document A, which basically covers the relationship of staff and community. That one has had a fair amount of work done on it. Hopefully will be almost ready after our next meeting for a first reading in the full plenary that describes that. It was largely written by (Jordan) and (Klaus) and has had comments and edits by a bunch of the rest of us.

Then there's a second - and (Jordan) is responsible for that document. Then there's a second document called document B that is basically trying to document, to list all of the measures that are currently in place you know, and it's listed ICANN.org policy on employee contracts and work rules as well as policy on prohibition of harassment.

So we're trying to collect the information from those. As I said, we have an outstanding request to give us access to all that documentation and we're still waiting for the answer on that. But we've been able to pick up other stuff just by looking at other documentation that came out, looking at some of the performance key indicators, the PKI, whatever they are. And I get the initials, KPIs, that's it, Key Performance Indicators, not indicators of Performance.

Basically you know, because you can look at those and in some of those you can see what their responsibilities are listed at and extrapolate on basically both their relationships to community and the rules they are working under, but still looking for the direct information.

And then they also, in response to our questions, they sent - staff sent us a set of questions that we're now working on answers. And I'll just give you the questions they've asked because - for example question one, perhaps people here will have ideas on answers to them and, you know, can participate.

Question one, what are some of the concrete examples of concerns that the community has with regards to staff accountability? Are the concerns about individual service delivery, individual staff or about the potential that staff might cause a violation of ICANN policies, processes or bylaws? We haven't answered that one yet.

Question two, in the staff accountability group there have been suggestion that people within the ICANN organization are afraid to speak to the community. Can you provide more detail to support these suggestions? Is the reluctance to speak based on perceptions of how the ICANN organization will respond or how the community will respond? Since I'm one of the ones that have relayed some of these issues from my conversations with staff members, I did put a draft answer for that one.

Another question is ICANN expects all people within ICANN organization to be respectful to the community in interactions. If the community is not treated with respect, that would clearly be an issue about which ICANN should be made aware. What are the expectations for the community in addressing members of the ICANN organization?

And then the fourth one has one of the key areas in it that we've sort of danced around, I haven't really spoken about. You think there should be areas where people in the ICANN organization should be directly accountable to the community? What would this look like and how could it be done in a way that does not interfere with the employer relationship? Are the enhancements of the reconsideration in IRP process where staff action can be challenged sufficient to address the sub group's concerns? How does one prevent inconsistent feedback to ICANN.org employees?

First of all, just want to notice that ICANN.org seems to the way they've been referring to staff community. And of course they've been very specific in conversations that the CEO is, you know, where the buck stops. The CEO is the one to whom all employees are accountable, et cetera. So that question on whether community facing staff members have a responsibility is still one that needs to be answered. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Thank you. So I'd actually like to invite anybody who wants to answer any of these questions to go ahead and get in the queue and provide some feedback now. I think the subgroup would welcome that feedback. I've got a question for Avri about this particular subgroup.

I'm wondering if, looking at or able to get access to information with respect to the performance pay of staff, sort of the bonus incentives structure because sometimes it feels like, you know, they've got these bonuses and they get bonuses that they are able to steer us into one policy decision or another policy decision, or get us to do our work in a more hurried fashion.

So I'm just wondering if there's any - if anyone is looking at or able to get access to some of the information that's kind of meta information about how

this performance pay, bonus pay works in terms of, you know, what kinds of goals do they need to - are said about the work that we do.

I think that would be really interesting to know particularly with respect to work that we do, how do their pay change dependent upon the output that we have? Okay, so that was my question but I see we've got a queue. And Ed, you're up first. Please go ahead.

Ed Morris: Yes, thanks Robin. I just want to pick up on what you just said and give a little bit of information about how we (concentrate) on ICANN and then in trying to tell us what folks get bonuses for. Stefania Milan and I did a comment on the PTI budget. So we noticed in the PTI budget there was this extraordinarily large amount amounting to, if memory serves me correct, about \$10,000 for the 22 FTE employees that have been assigned to the PTI.

I was like, you know, what is the bonus part? And the response we got from ICANN was basically ah, you know, well, it's part of the overall budget, but they seem not to want to tell us what folks are getting bonuses for, is we specifically asked that question and we didn't get a response in the staff report.

So I just want to say this is something we need to look into further during WS2 when we still have a little bit of power to try to get them to respond. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Thanks, Ed. And I see Avri is next, so I think Avri can give us a little information on this stuff. Please go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Unfortunately I don't think I can give you much. It's not a question that they've answered and I'd have to go back and check, but I'm not even sure

that it's one that we concluded in our set of questions to them. I think it's an excellent question. I think it's one that we should add to the list and certainly in all of our documents, by the way document A, B and the questionnaire are all open for comments and for suggestive text.

So after I finish talking, I will paste those URLs in the chat so anybody can go and add the questions. I'll make a note of these questions to bring them up at our next discussion. But I don't think - I'm not sure that we asked. We certainly haven't gotten an answer on that. And speaking personally, I've had sort of the same question at times.

You know, when a staff person is encouraging something are they encouraging something because you know, they are thinking it's the right thing and they are trying to be helpful? Or are they indeed, you know, working towards their bonus? And I think knowing that is as important as anything that we put in our SOIs because I mean, I want to be able to listen to a staff person and know and sometimes indeed they are, you know, making suggestions and trying to be helpful on the basis of something they believe, but it is really difficult to know when that is. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Thank you. Thank you very much, Avri. Does anyone else have any questions or comments on this staff accountability group? It sounds like there's a lot of opportunity for people to put their thoughts in these documents or join one of the subgroup, and or give Avri or one of the other participants in this your thoughts so we can make sure this gets into the work of the subgroup.

Okay well, I don't see any other hands or voices on this subgroup. So let's move on and I'm going to go out of order a little bit here because we've got Niels ten Oever on in the call with us and he is the chair of - excuse me, the repertoire of the human rights subgroup, the group that's working to create a

framework of interpretation for ICANN's new commitment to respect human rights through a bylaw. So Niels, why don't I just turn over to you and if you could give us an update on where we are, and what you need from us, that will really be helpful.

Niels ten Oever: Thank you very much, Robin and great that everyone here. Can you all hear me? It's somehow indicated that I sound a bit off. Is that true? Can you hear me well?

Robin Gross: It's very, very low. The volume is very low so if there's some way you can get...

Niels ten Oever: Like this?

Robin Gross: ...closer to the microphone. That's far much better.

Niels ten Oever: Oh, okay. Okay. Normally I'm too loud. I don't hear too often that I'm not loud enough. So I guess it's also a kind of progress. So hi all. Thanks all for being here and for caring so much about this process that's already going on for quite a while. There's quite some good news and some interesting roads ahead for the human rights sub groups.

The good news is that we finished with the preliminary framework of interpretation and we re-consented about it in the subgroup. It has subsequently been submitted to the plenary where it had two readings and up and right now it's off to go off for public comments, which means it's the first document from Work Stream 2 to go into public comments, so that's very good.

And at the same time, it would be very good if explanation start here, but there's also a bit of discussion on how our mandate that is reflected in the Annex 6 and Annex 12 of the Work Stream 1 report should be interpreted.

So the question is, should we perhaps have had a big broader view when we developed the framework of interpretation? Should we do another document or are we actually done? So we were not completely sure and as a subgroup, we did not want to come up with our own, to set our own mission so to say.

So for that, we went back to the plenary to ask the plenary, "What do you think we should do?" The plenary responded, "The co-chairs will come up with a suggestion." And the co-chairs have come up with a suggestion which pretty much said, we think you're done. If you want to do more, get it up for the subgroup to decide.

That discussion that has led to some discussion within the subgroup and that is exactly where we are now. So, in a couple of hours at 1900 UTC, we will discuss within the subgroup preliminary, the suggestions by the co-chairs and discuss how we go forward.

So will we see how whether we need to make some amendments to the framework of interpretation? Will we do that perhaps after the public comments and see what the public comments say about that? Are we going to continue to work on a follow-up document or are we just going to make high level recommendations, how we think this work could be taken forward by the community and ICANN organization? That is what we're discussing now.

So what you could do and what I think we'll see up ahead is that we will need to come up with a response to the public comment period through the framework of interpretation. That is the rough path I would say is ahead of us.

Luckily, we had time for that because the public comment period will take up to after the Copenhagen meeting. So even at the Copenhagen meeting, we can discuss it in detail.

If you don't mind, there are other people here that are in the subgroup as well. So if others have additions what I said or might just think that I did not give a proper representation or have an addition, I would of course greatly welcome them to do so. Thank you.

Robin Gross: Thank you very much Niels. So, it sounds like we need to start thinking about putting together a group of people to work on the public comments for this particular subgroup and I guess this summer, right after - no, no, no. Like right after Copenhagen, right? Is it too soon for us to start doing - to start looking in that direction of putting together a group to work on comments, do you think? I mean is it still a moving target?

Niels ten Oever: No, it is out, but let's see how it gets framed by staff and the plenary, I'd say. I mean the public comment period has been made longer, so I think we have ample time to go through it. And it's not like it is an extremely long document. So I think we would have ample time.

Robin Gross: Okay. Okay. Thank you. Did anyone else have any questions for Niels or any other comments they wanted to make on the human rights group? I know one of the issues that have been a bit of a sticking point in the past has been this issue of "applicable law" and how much change can we realistically expect to come from ICANN as a result of this bylaw's commitment to human rights if it's all dependent upon "applicable" law since no human rights law applies to ICANN let's say.

So, I'm just wondering Niels, if I could just, you know, hear from you about how the teeth, how much teeth are we expecting we can really get out of this? Will there be much change coming out of ICANN as a result, do you think? Should we be hopeful?

Niels ten Oever: I think we're going through quite great changes. I think other people are more skeptical. And I think it's up to the historians to say who's right. I think if we look at the changes that we've made since the LA meeting where Steve Crocker said, "Human rights are great, but I still really do not see what they have to do with ICANN."

Two, where we are now in Work Stream 2, that human rights seems to be one of the simplest themes. I think we've done a lot on awareness-raising on the topic. Critics might say that in the bylaws it is that is human rights are respected as mandated by applicable law. It doesn't go very far. No, by the bylaw it doesn't go very far, but it doesn't mean in the implementation we cannot go further and seek how it's being done.

So it's a mixed bag. It's consensus, but I think there is a lot of space for constructive engagement and also a lot of willingness in the community and within staff as well as the board in doing so. So, I'm hopeful.

Robin Gross: Thanks Niels. That actually gives me hope as well. You know, it's important to remember that, you know, this kind of progress happens in small baby steps every few months or every few years, we can make another step forward and another step forward, and there isn't going to be any one grand moment where "Oh no, we have human rights." So, thank you. That's very encouraging. Did anybody else want to give...

Niels ten Oever: And Robin...

Robin Gross: Yes, please.

Niels ten Oever: Robin, one point on that and I've been hitting my head a lot of this. So like the "Ta-da, we have human rights" thing. It will never be like that, because we also do not want the IPC to come up with something that "Ta-da, we have property rights," you know. The nature of ICANN, but I'm preaching to the converted and people much more experienced than I in this, is that it is slow and we counterbalance it.

But I think that the awareness-raising and the agenda-setting we have been doing is really helping progressing the topic. So it might not be a revolution, but I actually think that revolutions in ICANN is also not necessarily something that we want.

Robin Gross: Great. Thank you so much. I see we've got a queue. Ed, please go ahead.

Ed Morris: Yes, and thanks Niels for what you've just said. That deals with some of my concerns for the IPC, but one thing I - just something concrete and something hopeful going forward for the use of this for free speech for example, as Robin knows, as a California attorney, shopping centers, private shopping centers in California have been held under the California constitution to be obliged to provide the area's free speech.

So there is something in applicable law, at least in California we might be able to use in the future, while at the same time, I understand completely what you're trying to do and support it and trying to restrict the ability of the IPC to have their ta-da moment.

So I just want to thank you for - it's been an - watching this group has been incredibly difficult I would think (demanding), so I just wanted to thank for the fine job you've been doing in trying to straddle both lines between the two views. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Yes. And I certainly would echo that. Thank you very much, Niels. Anybody else want to get in the queue on the human rights subgroup? Okay, I do not see or hear anyone, so let's go back to our regular rule agenda and the next item was number 4, diversity. The subgroup that is working to increase and enhance diversity at ICANN and I think (Renata)'s been pretty active in that group. Am I right (Renata)? Can you give us an update about where this group is at?

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Hi. I hope you can hear me well, (Renata). Yes. I am a volunteer member of this group and I also volunteer for the drafting team for the questionnaire. And Rafik is the repertoire, so he also mentioned something about appending a few points about this, but we have now closed the first questionnaire. So the first phase of comments on the questionnaire for SO/AC about diversity. And we are finishing up the strawman document.

First, there was a change to include some elements of diversity that were not focused yet, like regional diversity and I guess also we have had some very interesting diversity statistics from ICANN sent over by staff. So I highly recommend that they can look at that at the dashboard. I don't know if you can let me - listen to me okay. Hope so.

Robin Gross: Yes, loud and clear. Thank you very much. So these questions that are going out, are these also questions that will be put to sort of just anyone to answer or will they be going specifically to the stakeholder groups and constituencies

where we need to sort of act more actively, get a group together and respond to, you know.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: I think that we are going to actually see the leadership with help from staff. There's an interesting awesome new development. There's an idea of a global account for ICANN. We had a presentation from Chris Gift last - 25 of January.

So, an account that would track all - a community member moved from the (register) to a working group participation and this is also something that they are interested in interacting with the diversity subgroups. So I think that will be an interesting - that can definitely expect moving forward with that help from staff on identifying people for the questionnaire and on SO and ACs.

Robin Gross: Okay. Okay. Great. Thanks. I'm really glad you're keeping an eye on what's happening in this group. Did anyone else have any questions for Renata on this or on this group in general, I should say, on diversity subgroup?

Okay, well I don't see any hands or hear any voices. So let's actually go back to the SO/AC accountability because now we've got Farzi on the line with us and she's one of the co-rapporteurs of that group. So, Farzi, if you could give us a quick update about where that group is and what we can do to help with the work in that group that'd be great. Thanks.

Oh, it looks like Farzi got disconnected. Okay so we can move onto another group and then come back to you after the next subgroup. And again, I apologize for sort of bouncing around here with some of the different subgroups but I think it's probably the best way to go given the participants we've got.

Okay so then let's go onto Number 5 on the agenda which is reviewing the Cooperative Engagement Process, the CEP, which is the first step filing an independent review panel matter. And Ed Morris is the rapporteur of this subgroup, so, Ed, if you want to give us a quick update on where your group is what we can do to help that'd be great.

Ed Morris: Sure. Thanks, Robin. If Farzi gets in while I'm talking just feel free to interrupt so we can go right to her because I know she has to leave shortly. I need help. There are a few members of the group on this call and within the next 24 hours you're going to get an email from and there are going to be questions.

The questions having to do with how to use data if we can get it, and I'll explain that in a bit, and the next one is what exactly we want the CEP to be. We're wrestling with these since we started. We have no conclusion; we have to reach one if we're going to meet deadlines.

Calls just are not working for this group. There's - it's not the type of topic where you have people yelling and screaming and excited. It's important but it's not fun. Human rights can be fun, jurisdiction can get passions going for the meta issue. This is detail work. So I'm going to try to move the work to the list. Last call we have four people show up and only two participated.

So let me just briefly tell you the two issues we're wrestling with now. One is data. The current CEP, as Robin certainly knows from having been in one, is opaque, it's behind closed doors. So at our first meeting we get a commitment from ICANN Legal that they were going to give us names of community members who have been involved in the CEP so we can reach out to them. They haven't given us those names.

In December we contacted ICANN Legal asking for access to files, trying to work with them to try to find out how we can see how the CEP has worked, has not worked, even cumulative data. No response.

Two weeks ago I got Leon Sanchez involved along with one of our staff members from Accountability. They've contacted Legal. No response. So the only thing I can conclude is that Legal believes that by not giving us access to the data we're just going to keep the same CEP we have now, which they expressed in our first meeting, which is what they wanted.

So the first question is going to be, what do we do if we can't get the data? I've reached out to some SO/AC leaders trying to bring in people who have been involved in CEPs into our group or even just to talk to them, if they can't get so involved. I got one response which was interesting in that some folks believe that they can't talk about their experiences within the CEP because there's a confidentiality situation here, which is ridiculous. But it's been - I've been told that by two members from the BC.

So we have no - this is not an uncommon problem for many of our groups - we have no data to work on. And I need to sort out what the group wants to do going forward if we don't get any more data.

The second and more important issue is what the CEP - and we have to come to a conclusion about this - what do we want the CEP to be? A mediation? Negotiation? Conciliation? Or what came out when I took this to the plenary about a month and a half ago, a structured negotiation. So I'm going to be sending questions out to everybody in the group. I'm going to be begging for responses and see if we can get a discussion going on list because we haven't been able to get one going verbally on calls.

The one area we have made progress, I've worked with David McAuley, to work out issues that relate to both the CEP and the IRP. So for example, we - there's not going to be a problem with the CEP going into a conciliation repeating what we've done before there. But we've agreed that we need to work out the time scales as well between the two groups. So that's going well.

But we have a roadblock that apparently has been thrown up by ICANN Legal intentionally or not and we have a problem of participation. So I'm going to hope, and I'm begging the folks on this call, when you get the emails please help me try to get a discussion going on the matter.

And I just want to thank Farzi and Ana have been fantastic. They have been the folks who have actually contributed the most and I appreciate their participation in the group. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Thanks, Ed. And thanks for your work in this group as well. I'm really just shocked - not really shocked but really disappointed I guess, to hear about the roadblock that ICANN Legal is putting up. And it sounds to me like, you know, this should be escalated to the entire CCWG that - and it sounded like you sort of started to get Leon involved and his communication was ignored as well.

So, I mean, maybe the entire CCWG needs to send a letter to Göran or to - I guess Göran - to say you need to get your staff to participate in this process because it's just not acceptable for them to just, you know, refuse to answer questions like this especially when that CEP process is - has been something that ICANN Legal has used as a tool against would-be litigants and against people who have claims against ICANN.

So, I mean, it certainly is understandable in one sense the roadblock they're putting up because it's a little gold mine for them to have. But it's just not acceptable that, you know, they won't let this group do the work that it said it was going to do. I mean, Göran approved all the Work Stream 1 recommendations, not him personally but, you know, the CEO and the Board approved those recommendations. And so now they need to follow up on that.

I don't know, I think it needs to be escalated to the entire CCWG, the plenary and, you know, bring some attention, maybe Milton, we could get him to do a blog on it because I just - I just think this is outrageous. Anybody else want to...

((Crosstalk))

Robin Gross: Please, go ahead.

Ed Morris: Thank you, Robin. I believe that Leon is getting ticked off as well so hopefully in the next call of the chairs that - in fact I know he tends to press this further. I'll just give you one example, we've gotten to the point where Ana Lupe - Ana is in Los Angeles - she was going to try to construct a survey, if we decided to go that route if we get - at least get contact information - she has actually offered to take an ICANN Legal staff member out to lunch to talk about this. And again, no response whatsoever.

I mean, we've bent over backwards trying to work through their holiday commitments. I know Sam Eisner was away from the office for a while. But thank you so much for your support. And I think, yes, if we can't get a response in the next seven or eight days or so we are going to have to take it to the plenary. Thank you.

Robin Gross: Thank you. Anybody else want to add anything on the - this issue - reviewing the CEP? I want to also echo Ed's call that people join this group. It sounds like they desperately need our help. And to provide some written text or some feedback on other's written text, this would be a good one to do.

Okay anybody else want to get in on this one? Shall we move on? I don't see or hear anyone so let's go back to - have we got Farzi on the line now? Can you do the SO/AC Accountability now, Farzi?

Farzaneh Badii: Yes, hi. I'm connected I think. So the SO and AC accountability so far we sent out a questionnaire, I'm one of the co-rapporteurs in this group - we sent out a questionnaire I think a month ago or so. And asked a couple of questions about the accountability mechanisms of SO and AC.

This is just to come up - because one of the tasks of this group is to come up with a work plan for enhancing SO and AC accountability. We talked about whether these recommendations that the group is going to come up with - what sort of recommendations there are. And the group is kind of more aligned with going with these recommendations are just best practices. And SO and AC can consider them; they might not want to implement them. They might want.

So these questionnaires were out and NCUC responded. We are still waiting for NCSG. I think Avri is going to send that. We are also waiting for NPOC. So if anyone from NPOC is on this call we are waiting for their - of course it is not compulsory to respond to these questions. We are going to come up with the working plan within the timeline that is expected for us - from us. So what - but it is not a bad idea to submit these answers.

So what the group is now doing is that we are compiling data and responses and then come up with like very, at the moment very like draft stage of recommendations for example, for outreach or how to enhance participation or transparency or what sort - I mean, it's a very practical recommendations, for example, that they should put their committee members on the Website and stuff like that.

And it is a group work so anyone can join and can join the drafting team and help me going through these answers. But, yes. So I also wanted to say something - I have to go in three minutes. So I would like to - I don't know if you talked about jurisdictions at all. But for jurisdiction there is the questionnaire that is going to go out. I am going to share that with NCSG later on.

It is a very important questionnaire, it's asking important questions. Yes, it has important questions about - oh sorry, I can hear myself, there is an echo so I got distracted. So important question about jurisdiction, how jurisdiction affects them and affects their businesses. I have also written a blog post about this and have given the IGP perspective on it.

But it's - when the questions are finalized we need to discuss it with our members especially in jurisdictions that they think that they are affected and come up with answers. And this is very important. Thank you, Robin. If there are any questions I have two minutes to answer.

Robin Gross: Thank you, Farzi. Okay, anybody - this is your big chance to ask Farzi a question. Grab her while you got her. All right, I don't see any hands or hear any voices okay so we can move on. Thank you, Farzi, very much.

Let's go onto the reform of the ombudsman office. I believe Ed Morris has been rather active in that group. Ed, can you give us a quick update on that group?

Ed Morris: Hi, Robin. I've actually decreased activity out of frustration. Let me just - actually mix ombudsman and transparency and one issue I'm having with both to at least get the issue out there. If I could start with - transparency has not recommended, and we just got the final (twist) to the report today - that when something has been declared vexatious, in other words so they don't have to respond for that, that - that the decision - that a complaint has been vexatious and their DIDP requests can be ignored can now be made by either the ombudsman or the complaints officer.

Now, if you recall in India, Milton was very adamant that the complaints officer should not be doing work that we would want the ombudsman to do. So let me tell you how this happened and why I'm concerned and why it goes to both 7 and 8.

We had some questions, the ombudsman's group, about whether the ombudsman should be participating in the review of his own office. And I was very vehement that they shouldn't be; that ethically that's just not his role. Considering also the fact that early on some of the calls had five or six people, two of whom were the current ombudsman and the former ombudsman.

In any event, it went to ICANN Legal and they came back and said, sure, you know, there's no problem here. We have the leadership - the Legal Committee meeting and I raised that. I wanted to send it to outside counsel, but that was the call Robin, that you missed and Greg missed. And so those who were a little bit more suspicious of ICANN Legal weren't there. I lost that battle.

And then two weeks later, the ombudsman comes back and says, you know, I shouldn't be the one declaring things vexatious, let's send it to the complaints office. And let me tell you why I think this is a problem. The - ICANN Legal currently, and I assume in the future, is the department within ICANN that tells you whether you can get the DIDP, the document or not. They're the ones that currently say okay, grounds 1, 4, 12 means we can't give it to you.

I don't think that's going to change going forward although the rules for declining are going to change a bit. So now we have a situation where ICANN Legal could basically say we're not going to give it, we think this is vexatious. Under the system that had initially been proposed, it would then go to the ombudsman who is going to have some - the community is going to be involved in his appointment.

But now under the new proposal, ICANN Legal can say, no, this is vexatious and then it can go to the complaints officer who can then say, oh, this is vexatious and the complaints officer, of course, reports to ICANN Legal. And this is the system that's going to be proposed to the plenary.

So I'm sorry for messing up the transparency (unintelligible) so I'm very sorry, I'm not as up to date as I should be on where they currently are. Another thing is Sebastian seems to like 5:00 am phone calls and that's not just hours that tend to work for me.

But there is a problem here that goes between the ombudsman's office, it goes in the transparency. And I'm somewhat outraged right now but we are actually going to propose that the accountability for rejections of DIDP requests for reasons of vexatious, in other words that vexatious conduct, in other words, we could just pound them with requests to ICANN Legal and say, hey, this is ridiculous. This is nothing done in good faith. We're not going

to do it. And then the decision maker at that point largely is going to be, in one instance, the complaints officer who reports to ICANN Legal. I find that unacceptable. Thanks.

Robin Gross: No, I find it unacceptable as well. And I'm also concerned about the process by which that particular recommendation has appeared and seems to be going forward. Is this a recommendation that's coming from the reform of the ombudsman subgroup or is this from the transparency subgroup?

Ed Morris: It's coming from transparency. I'm sorry for confusing the two but it's an issue that sort of...

((Crosstalk))

Ed Morris: The ombudsman has been very involved in the transparency group as well. And he's the one that made the proposal. After we...

((Crosstalk))

Ed Morris: ...after ICANN Legal said he can participate in the ombudsman's office, two weeks later he's proposing to shift the responsibility for determination of whether it's vexatious or not from him to ICANN Legal.

((Crosstalk))

Robin Gross: But this - this decision is ultimately in the hands of the members - the participants though, it's not in the hands of ICANN Legal or the staff in any way. I mean, so this idea has to pass muster in the subgroup and the plenary in order to go anywhere so I'm (unintelligible) understanding how they can just say well this is the way it's going to be now without our assent to that.

Ed Morris: Well...

((Crosstalk))

Ed Morris: ...has come up today. I had objected quite strongly on the list. Alberto had joined with me. Michael has come up today with a new report and he's considered the thing. And basically there was one email - one of our has done a great job of transparency who said I want to see if Ed's complaints have resonance.

And quite frankly, the group - it's not captured but we have two cochairs who (unintelligible) as experienced in developing accountability as perhaps some of us have, and it didn't hold. The group seemed to be largely okay with doing this. So we're going to have to fight in the plenary, I hope.

Robin Gross: Is it too late? Is it too late? I mean, I could post to the transparency group and I can talk to Michael and...

((Crosstalk))

Ed Morris: Take a look, please. I would love the support. Yes, please.

Robin Gross: Because this is the first I'd heard of this. This is really disappointing.

((Crosstalk))

Ed Morris: Michael has an email out today where he says he altered the report to have the vexatious determination made by the ombudsman or the complaints officer. That is a compromise because the ombudsman wanted it all to go to the

complaints officer. And again, when you look at what Milton - the guarantee Milton got from Göran in India was the complaints officer was just going to be involved in simple operations. This is more than that. Sorry. It's just I...

((Crosstalk))

Robin Gross: No kidding. This is a big - this is a big change about, you know, how they're going to be handling accountability and if they want to offload some of that onto the complaints officer...

((Crosstalk))

Ed Morris: I'm sorry. And the other thing which I don't - I keep trying to stress but I don't think it's getting in the heads of our cochairs and transparency, they seem to think that the appeals mechanism is just going to be up to the IRP. Correct me if I'm wrong, when you redesign the reconsideration motion, I see no reason why the first appeal from transparency won't be to reconsideration. And you've already inserted the ombudsman in the reconsideration process, no? Or unless I'm missing something here.

Robin Gross: That's right.

Ed Morris: So if staff labels it vexatious then if we don't have this special privilege of the complaints officer the normal appeals would be the reconsideration appeal which includes the ombudsman. So I'm not even sure we need to have a special section there. But again, when you read the transparency report, I don't believe there's a mention of reconsideration in there; they keep speaking about IRPs as being the appeals of DIDP rejections. I don't think that's true. So we have work to do there. And thanks for offering to come in.

Robin Gross: Can you hear me? Can people hear me? Yes, yes, yes okay gosh, sorry about that. I don't know what happened before. I was just sort of yodeling and singing and chanting and all sorts of things.

Okay all right where were we? Okay so we were on the ombudsman's office reforms, that subgroup, and also discussing the transparency report. So it sounds like what we've got is we need to go look at that transparency report that's just come out with these recent changes and look at some of the discussions on the mailing list from the last few days about this issue of compliance deciding whether or not something is vexatious and being able to deny requests as a result of that.

Avri says, "The transparency report is one person's work and I find it to be an unreadable mess." Oh well it sounds like you better go take a look at that and see what's - what we can do to fix that before that is finalized. Does anybody else want to weigh in on the transparency report? Anybody take a look at it? The last I'd seen, and I haven't seen the latest draft, but the last I'd seen seemed okay to me, not ideal but okay. Good enough.

Okay well I don't see any - or hear any other comments. The remaining subgroup then is the guidelines for ICANN Board standard of conduct. Renata asked, where is the report? And it is on the transparency subgroup mailing list. I could probably dig that out and email it over. Okay.

I'm not sure it's going to be on the dashboard because I think the latest report has come out subsequent to the dashboard - subsequent to the latest dashboard report. It sounds like the latest transparency draft just came out a few days ago. Okay so let's move on in the interim to the guidelines for the ICANN Board standard of conduct and this is with respect to moving Board members and the indemnity provisions that were created in Work Stream 1.

And I think this is the group that is the least far along of any of the different subgroups. I think the chair is Lori Schulman from the IPC. Let's take a look at the dashboard here and see where that group is. Okay, yes, the status is behind and it looks like they've got about 20% of the work done. So there hasn't been a whole lot of work done in this group, by the looks of it. Although I believe they - I believe they did have a report.

Now that I'm thinking about it, there was a report that last week was supposed to be sent to the subgroup and then the subgroup would approve that and then send it to the CCWG Accountability plenary. Because as I remember there were some folks who were trying to sort of push it directly to the plenary skipping the subgroup sign-off on it. And that didn't happen.

So I believe that - now there is a report, an initial report for the guidelines for the Board standard of conduct. And so now is I think a good time for us to go and take a look at that. I think it will be or it is being presented to the plenary in this timeframe right now or will be if the subgroup approves it. And I'm not sure what to anticipate with respect to the subgroup approving it as is or if it's going to need some changes.

I don't know if anyone else has had a chance to take a look at that report. But it sounds like we need to. Yes, and as Julf reports in the chat it's only reported as of about 20% done and so I think it's got a bit of work to do.

Okay so we're lucky now that we've got Michael on the call. And because we were just talking about the transparency report and so it's great that you've just joined the call because we weren't exactly sure about where that was and what has - because it sounded like there'd been a few changes to the - in the last few days to the previous report and so we were just trying to figure out

what had - where we are with that. So, Michael, if I could put you on the spot here to give us an update on that report it'd be really helpful. And, you know, just a general where we are and what the next steps are that we need to do to help.

Michael Karanicolas: Hi all. Sorry to be a bit late. So we have - I just sent around a new version of the transparency report today. Basically where we left off is at the last plenary there were a couple of issues that were raised at the first reading namely there was concerns about our interactions with the - both the human right and the - yes, both the human rights and the ombudsman subgroups. And there were a few concerns raised about resources.

So to address the first one I reached out both to Niels and to Sebastian, who are the rapporteurs for human rights and for ombudsman respectively. Niels indicated that he really didn't think there was an issue in terms of the overlap between the human rights issue. And there was a reasonably long back and forth between myself and Sebastian, the ombudsman, and the ombudsman subgroup that led to some small changes to how the recommendations are phrased where we sort of leave the door open to the complaints officer playing a role in a couple of the roles that we originally delegated to the ombudsman.

Namely that were previously - the monitoring and evaluation role and the review of requests that are dismissed because they're frivolous or vexatious. Previously we delegated that only to the - we'd recommended that that be delegated to the ombudsman. After getting a little more feedback we'd said that it could potentially be delegated to the complaints officer and sort of left the door open depending on how that latter body is structured.

So that was one of the changes that was made. We initiated a discussion regarding resources and the practicality of some of our recommendations,

again in response to feedback received at the last plenary. I don't think that that resulted in any substantial changes partly because that had already been discussed quite a bit at the working group level. And so we included - we made a bunch of changes in response to that already so there wasn't a whole lot of follow up to that.

There were some slight changes to the - the section on interactions with government. But I'm - I don't think it was anything major and it's a little tough to speak on that because that was something that Chris himself dealt with. But anyway, that's a basic summary of the changes that have been made. It's nothing very huge. But I've just sent around a new version of the report and we're hoping to do the second reading at the next plenary to open up to general comments. So that's where we stand now.

And sort of just jump in. I'm not sure if that's what you were looking for but if there are any questions or anything, you know, I went fast through comments regarding what I said or the report generally I'd be happy to answer further.

Robin Gross: Great. Thank you very much, Michael. And while we have a queue starting to form - oh, there already is a queue starting to form, okay, I was going to jump - try to jump ahead of the queue but I'll wait my turn. Ed, you go ahead please.

Ed Morris: Thanks, Robin. Michael, as you know, I've been quite loud about not wanting the complaints officer to be involved in dealing with frivolous or vexatious determination. That's largely because ICANN Legal is the one that's going to be saying we don't want to do this, it is frivolous or vexatious. And now we're leaving open the door for the person that's going to make the determination

being somebody who's reporting to ICANN Legal. I just - I'm going to bring it up in the plenary. I can't accept that.

But I have another question for you. As I read the report and I look at the appeals mechanisms, you guys seem to be stressing you appeal to the IRP. Are you aware that the first appeal would be reconsideration and the ombudsman already has a role in reconsideration? In other words, I'm not even sure we need to have a special process there. If ICANN Legal were to say this is frivolous or vexatious, the appeal would be a reconsideration where the ombudsman is already in place.

So I just want to know if you've thought about that or if I have something wrong here? Thanks.

Michael Karanicolas: So should I go ahead or should we - okay. So, yes, I mean, I obviously read your concerns regarding the complaints officer and responded but also opened it up to one - to hopefully have a broader conversation. I'd be happy to chat with that - chat about that further during the plenary.

Just for now, regarding the roles that the - regarding the role in reviewing the frivolous and vexatious exception, I think you hit the nail on the head when you talked about how the ombudsman already has a role reviewing and that's sort of why I didn't necessarily see it as a fatal issue to hand that first review to the complaints officer because the ombudsman would always be standing behind him with their own review. And as I understand it, the IRP is also already back-stopping that.

The role of having that initial review, and whether you call it a review or consent to exercise the exception or approval of the exception or what have you, basically what we're looking to do is to make sure that because as you

say, the frivolous and vexatious exception is so sensitive and so prone to abuse, we want to make sure there's an extra layer of oversight over it.

Partly to make sure it's being used properly but also because having that extra layer of oversight will hopefully make the information officer or whoever is responding to the request think twice about using it knowing that there's going to be somebody over their shoulder. And that's, again, what we see in governmental systems and that's something that we're hoping to replicate here.

We didn't recommend in the end, just to clarify, that it should be to the complaints officer. What we said is rather than saying just to the ombudsman, we said either to the ombudsman or to the complaints officer. And again, partly the reason why I didn't think that it would be a fatal flaw to shift it out was because you still have traditional means of oversight over it including the ombudsman.

So that being said, I'd welcome further discussion either at the plenary or here. I'm not, you know, personally I'm not super-wedded to that change. I sort of made it in response to some objections that were made to some feedback that we got and I felt that, you know, I try to be responsive to this stuff when we get it in.

If there's strong resistance in the other direction I'm very happy to take it out. And so, you know, if you want to bring that up at the plenary then I would definitely welcome that but just looking at this opportunity to explain my reasoning on that. And regarding the monitoring and evaluation functions, I don't think independence is actually that important for that because it's mostly clerical, where really it's just tracking and releasing the statistics which the complaints officer can do that, the ombudsman can do that.

You know, other clerical functions within ICANN can do that, it's just making sure that somebody is on that task. So that's basically the thinking that informed us thus far. And I'd welcome further feedback about that if - or if (unintelligible).

Robin Gross: Thanks, Michael. Yes, I share this concern as well about leaving the door open to move these issues back over to the complaints officer. I think one of the reasons why we wanted the ombudsman to look at them was they are, in a sense, one step removed from the legal department, from the department that's making the decision of oh this is vexatious, this is frivolous. So, you know, putting it back in their hands by putting in the complaint officer it seems to be just to, you know, kind of putting it back right exactly the place where we tried to remove it from in Work Stream 1.

You know, we were trying to build an ombudsman's office that was a little bit more robust and able to - able to be a check on some of the other parts of the organization. So I understand, you know, we're going to get resistance to that perhaps from even the rapporteur in the ombudsman group, but I still think it's important that we try to stick with the original proposal and move some of those decisions into more impartial hands. I don't think anyone here is going to claim that, you know, this is perfectly impartial. But it might be one step removed and that's something, that's progress in my view.

So that's just my view on that particular issue. Let me put my chair hat back on and take my participant hat off and see if anybody else has any views that they want to add on that particular issue or really the transparency report at all - the transparency subgroup. And I want to encourage everybody to go take a look and read the new report and let's get some feedback and see if we can't get that one shipped up and ready to go sooner rather than later.

Anybody else want to weigh in on this issue? I do not see or hear anyone. So that would be all of the - the nine subgroups that we have gone through now. And great, so that takes care of Item 2 on the agenda, Work Stream 2 issues.

Let's go forward then with Number 3, which is our next meeting. So our next meeting has been scheduled for about four weeks from today which is February 28, last day of February. And that'll be about 10 days or so before the ICANN meeting in Copenhagen gets started so, you know, we'll want to consider that one really our big preparation meeting for the Copenhagen ICANN meeting so I hope we'll get a lot of folks to turn out next month as well.

I note that it's going to be at a different time of 2000 UTC and so we thought we'd sort of try to share the pain a little bit here by breaking up the start time going between 1600 and 2000 UTC so next month we'll do the 2000 UTC time zone which will be more painful for the people in Europe but less painful for the people in Asia so we'll just try to spread the pain around. Does anyone have anything they want to add on that issue, on the issue of next month's meeting?

All right, I don't see or hear anyone. Is there any other business that anyone would like to add? Or do we get half an hour back of our day? Okay, I see Ed's got his hand up. Please, Ed, go ahead.

Ed Morris: Sorry, Robin. Yes, I mean, I think an issue we're going to have to confront, you and me particularly because of our membership of the group that never meets, the legal subcommittee, is that the tri-chairs seem to be on a mission not to spend any money on legal advice. And in the CEP I've had conversations because we're going to need that. Once we figure out where

we're going we are going to need some advice because drafting arbitration rules is not a job for amateurs.

And the feedback I'm getting there is, oh no, you can do it. Yes, I can do a rough outline but I'm going to need legal help. And I'm already getting pushback that that is not going to be available to us unless we want ICANN Legal to draft it. So I think a meta issue we're all going to have to think about and we're going to have to come out fighting is as we come to the end, if we want independent legal advice, we're going to have to be fighting our own tri-chairs as well because they just do not want to spend money on it. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Thanks. No, I had the exact same conclusion as a member of that working group. And believe me, I absolutely plan on pushing back. If there's a question that comes before us and I really think it needs to go to independent counsel, I'm not going to accept the oh, we've got to save money, because we've done that every single time.

So, you know, now when the question really comes that we really need the independents I'm going to say fine, I agreed with you the last eight questions that came before us and we've sent them to ICANN Legal; this time it's going to independent. So I agree with you about that pressure that we're facing and I also am completely prepared to push back on it. And I suspect you and Greg and others in that group will be as well.

Okay, Ed, is that an old hand or a new hand?

Ed Morris: Sorry, old hand.

Robin Gross: Okay. All right well this is your last chance, if anybody has anything they want to add to this meeting, not seeing any hands or hearing any voices, I will

thank you all for your participation and also for your hard work in these different working groups and let's meet again online. Thanks so much. Bye-bye.

END