
SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Welcome, everybody, at this fifth meeting of the CCWG on Accountability about the ICANN Ombuds Office Work Stream [inaudible] work we have to do. I have set up an agenda. It was sent to you and I hope you were able to watch it. There are two documents. One we have in front of us it's a PowerPoint and I will use it for the presentation. But you all have received both in Word format document and also a link to a Google doc. I hope that you received all that. I suggest that we start by going through this document – no, first I have to check the list. I keep it update with the webinar and the list of participants and the observer.

As you can see, we are a little bit more than last week but not so much. And I don't know why and what to do. Maybe it's because it's not any more interesting topic or it's I don't know. But we have very few participation and very few exchange on the mail. [Let's] time slot and as you see we are at the fifth meeting. The last meeting we were just five participants. It's not a lot. Okay, I see that there are problem with the meeting invitation. Klaus, you want to speak? Go ahead.

KLAUS STOLL: Yes, Sebastien. Just there might be a simple communication problem that, for example, I really have problems receiving the meeting invitations or the documents and maybe others are in the same boat like me and I missed several meetings because of that.

Maybe it would be a good idea just to have a check that everybody checks in or checks back into the [inaudible] group to see that we got the right e-mail addresses or what's going on. Thank you.

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.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Okay, I guess staff will send a mail to the list to check that. But I hope that's not the problem but to know about the document and about the meeting, all that it's also on the wiki then there is always a backup but I take your point. I see Ed asking for a mail to remember us an hour before. We will see. And I guess we will solve that.

Okay, now let's try to go to the agenda. I would like very much to concentrate on few topics. I pick up four of them to be discussed today. One it's about the dependency between the different subgroups. The second one it's, for a lot of you, the ATRT 2 may be a new topic. It's a new topic for us. It appears to be something we need to take into account and it was discussed at the full group meeting and we need to go into detail with this subgroup. Start some work on the Stress Test and the [ground floor] of the ICANN Ombuds Office.

Any comments on this agenda? Any points you want to add or you want explanation? Okay, thank you.

Let's start by dependency. I think we need to maybe be proactive if from your point of view there are things we need to push to the other group on each of these topics. It may be a good timing to do that as some of them are just starting and some of them will be, we don't think they'll work after the Northern Hemisphere holidays. And if you have input, it's a good time to add it, for example, in the Google Doc.

As you see, I add a new one, it's the ATRT 2, and I would like to go to this ATRT 2 points. It was what was presented to the full group one week ago. I just [inaudible] made from the presentation I given at that time. May I ask Avri to give us some information and feedback on where

is this coming from and what is the topic we need to take into account in this working group specifically.

AVRI DORIA:

So basically the ATRT both 1 and 2 had basically made recommendations that they're the ones made in ATRT 1 had been put aside in terms of the transparency and reporting structures on the Ombudsman. But in ATRT 2 the notion was really the role has been there for 10 years, it needs further review. The role itself and what the Ombudsman is doing in this role needs to be seen in the larger scope of what's going on, for example, reviewing the Ombudsman role and new gTLDs and such. So that reviewing needs to be done. And that was basically then moved over to the Accountability [inaudible] saying that work basically stopped [inaudible] was moved over.

And many [inaudible] too about possible [functions] for the Ombudsman. And so that was essentially it was review the work of the Ombudsman, if the role don't make sense, if it doesn't make sense, in what way does it make sense? And forgive me, I am doing this on very quick preparation in that I haven't read our agenda and was just kindly reminded by Sebastien at the beginning of this meeting that he would be coming to me on this.

I think that really is in some sense, the open problem that this group has is reviewing that role. And WS 1 had sort of given us clarifications of [inaudible]. Things that also came up and relates to the other group and the others is, does the Ombudsman have a role to play in the whistleblower process? It's something that's been discussed but that

[role] is not defined. So that's one that needs to be looked at – that's I guess whistleblowers being looked at and transparency. But of course the Ombudsman is being reviewed in this group.

So that is one of the larger issues. The whole view is that yes, the Ombudsman has become more transparent, is well defined, is working, but there's the whole role of the Ombudsman in giving indicators on good governance. And so that Ombudsman in respect to viewing the good governance and the fairness of that governance is something that needed further corporation in the transparency process.

So as opposed to now where Ombudsman does it but in some sense it almost seems exceptional when it's being done, is that a chartered role and if so, what does that mean? There was views and discussions about the Ombudsman's role in reconsideration and [inaudible] consideration process that there is an Ombudsman role, but exactly how that fits in and some of the details on that and again, what is the chartered role? All of these things, in some sense [expands] role and in some sense point to things that at times the Ombudsman has done and is that a Charter and how is that in the Charter. And at the moment anything that [links] fairness is in the purview but it's not necessarily well-defined in terms of how it fits in.

I think that as a start. Maybe there's pieces I have forgotten on it and such. But I think certainly those are two of the major functions, and then the issue of where they fit into in terms of the other appeal processes and how it works in the appeals chain is something that needs to be reviewed and the chartered role needs to be reviewed to see if what was defined [inaudible] more than a decade ago [inaudible]

and we [inaudible] through the WS 1 we see a frequent occurrences of, “Well, perhaps the Ombudsman can be part of this [process].” We need to take all of those. I don’t know if that helps. As I say, it was extemporaneous [inaudible]. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Avri. And sorry to have come to you so close to the start of this meeting, but thank you for your feedback.

Any comments? I see there are exchange on the chat. Maybe one of you wants to take the floor? Okay. Farzaneh, please. Go ahead.

FARZANEH BADI: Hi, Sebastien. I was just asking because Avri mentioned this whistleblower and the use of Ombudsman for whistle blower, and I had the impression that normally when we say “whistleblower,” we actually mean ICANN staff inside ICANN corporation being a whistleblower. And if that is the case, do we have to discuss the applicability of Ombudsman to the whistleblower in our group?

The other thing is, I just looked at the ATRT report which I think I asked for the final report of ATRT and what we should look at when we want to see if we want to pick up the suggestions from ATRT. The thing is, this is a very long document and a lot of recommendations. Does it make sense if we just go through the recommendations and just see just briefly look at the recommendation and see which one is most relevant and just bring them up within the group? Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. I guess Avri will give you some answer. Please go ahead, Avri.

AVRI DORIA: In terms of the whistleblower, the main issue that I think this group would have to look is at the moment, quite specifically, the Ombudsman does not have any role in internal staff issues. So at sometimes it gets talked about in terms of the Ombudsman having some role in that and at other times there's basically the notion that the Ombudsman is not involved in internal ICANN staff issues. That can indeed remain the case. And then there's the intermediate case we may need to look at of staff issues in relation to non-staff and whether that there's any involvement or role that needs to be defined there. But I don't think this group would be looking at the whistleblower function, but it would look at the more basic issue.

I think going through the specific recommendations – and that's one of the things that I would have prepared in advance in preparing for this – is indeed going through the recommendations on the Ombudsman and those where the Ombudsman is mentioned would be a good thing to do in a step-wise fashion. And I could certainly prepare something to do that. It's the thing that I've been sort of working on getting set for all of the various work teams. So yes, that would make sense.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Avri. In addition to what you say, Herb writes that it's Item 26 and we have also on the slide that it's Recommendation 9.3 that we must look at. I think with those elements we can have some work done.

One of my main question is that here in Recommendation 9.3 it's written that the review of the Office of the Ombudsman and the question is that do we have the capability, the time, to do this review or is work we are doing is the review or part of the review? Because it's not the same thing to have a review by outside advisor or done by this working groups. I think we will need to figure out exactly what we can expect from our group to be done.

Any other comments? Okay, if not... Okay, Avri, please. Go ahead.

AVRI DORIA:

If I can again, so yes, and I think in my rambling I covered most of the issues of 9.3 except for perhaps the public policy aspect of it. I think that – and this is personal view – I think that this group is in the position to review that role and to make recommendation to the larger group of any changes that it would recommend. And they say recommend in relation to the ATRT report and make in relation to the functions that were... And they were all public policy functions [inaudible] in WS 1. So I think that if this group is looking at the role, I do think that doing that review is, and especially since that task has sort of been in order to avoid duplication, it's [inaudible] that I kind of think we [inaudible].

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Avri. I see that Ed agree with you. Other comments on that? Okay , Avri if you can the next few days send us the list of the part of the document ATRT 1, ATRT 2 we need to take into account and then the possibility [read], it will be great. Maybe Herb who seems to have a good knowledge of all that can help you and you can do it together.

AVRI DORIA: Sure. As I say, I could certainly for example just start with putting in excerpts of the appropriate sections in a Drive document so we could see that. I'll definitely open it up immediately as I start it so Herb and others in the group can add to it. And I'll pull those excerpts out for you.

It was a fairly clear cut definition of the task, but then once you [look] into it, it really is quite open in terms of what needs to be looked at. When you have words the role needs to be extended or otherwise revised to help deal with [inaudible] and it gives the few that I've [inaudible]. So I'll pull those out but I really do think that this group has a very open platform for doing that. But I'll start the document.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Avri. Looking forward to this document and when you have done that, I will try to include it in the main document of this working group that we will keep it in our work. Thank you.

Any other comment, questions, remark on this topic?

AVRI DORIA: Sebastien, a quick question. Would you prefer that I just cut these excerpts into the appropriate place of the existing document, because that works for me, too. I've got it open for comment, just cut them in as a suggested change and then accept [inaudible] you prefer doing it that way, that's fine also.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's really up to you. If you can add it in the document itself, it would be great, but it's up to you. Do as it's easier for you.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, great. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Any other comments? Okay, thank you very much for this exchange on this topic, and let's go to the next item, and that was an item we didn't start to work. I know that Cheryl got some trouble and I didn't want to leave that on her shoulder at that time. Then I tried to take all the Stress Test and I found two with some link with the Ombudsman – Stress Test #13 and Stress Test #34. It's quite straightforward but if you have comment on that, it's time to do it and we can discuss.

Okay, Farzaneh, please. Go ahead.

FARZANEH BADII: Thank you for this. So for the Stress Test #13, when it says that the Ombudsman is limited in scope, I guess that it is criticizing Ombudsman that it is limited in its scope for reviewing the Accountability of the SO and AC. I think if we consider this, does that mean that the Ombudsman at the moment cannot receive disputes that are against a constituency or leaders in a constituency or a stakeholder group?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Herb, please. Go ahead.

HERB WAYE: Thank you, Sebastien. It's a very good question because I think this is more of a global question where I think they're talking about people that will use all three of the processes to delay, for instance, implementation of the new gTLD contract signing, for instance, and wrapping it up for any [put out]. Really there's nothing that limits the office from looking at something. Jurisdictionally speaking, we are only looking at whether or not it applies as per the Bylaws, but we have a tendency in the past and for the present to be very accommodating when it comes to issues if local people internal to ICANN are involved.

As for limiting the scope of what we can look at, of course we are restricted to looking at process. We are not in any way intended to look at decisions coming out of IRP or Reconsideration or other groups that, for instance, when WIPO takes a decision or a stance on something, we do not review that. We can look at the process only.

So as far as limiting our scope, it's already clearly established what we can and cannot look at. That does not prevent them from coming to the office, but it does not prevent us either from refusing to look at something if we find it is not within our scope. And I think that turnover in the past has been maybe a little bit too long, so if there is an issues that do come across the desk now I am hoping that I'll be able to turn over decisions to not look at something in a much more expedient manner to get them out of the office and back into the community for

further review if necessary or simply to move on with whatever issue is being dealt with.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Herb. Farzaneh, please.

FARZANEH BADI: Thank you, Sebastien. Sorry, I have a follow-up question, just a clarifying question – so you mean that because it's written here under Stress Test #13 that current redress mechanisms which include Ombudsman might enable one stakeholder to implementation of policy. And then also it says that the mechanisms of Ombudsman is limited in its scope of what can be reviewed. Do you have any idea what we should be looking at to address this limitation, because I think this Stress Test we might need to address this limitation in Ombudsman in what it can review? I'm not sure about this. Sorry, I don't have all the mandates of the Ombudsman in my mind so I'm just asking. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Herb, please. Go ahead.

HERB WAYE: The limitation, the way I am interpreting it, is that people are using these mechanisms as a delay factor to either block an implementation of a policy while [it's through] in all of these processes. Now there is, for the Reconsideration and for the Independent Review, there is a mechanism that has to be followed. I'd seen turnovers that are

relatively quick, but generally speaking, it is something that can block an implementation of policy or moving forward with something to a certain extent.

All three of those mechanisms have the ability to refuse a look at something. So if there is no jurisdiction or no founded reason for the review, then I think there can be a much quicker turnover in that refusal. So if something comes to my office regarding, for instance, a decision made by IRP, I should be able to immediately refuse that because the scope of my job is not to look at a decision coming out of IRP but more to look at the process to see whether the IRP process was followed.

So if there's an unfairness in the decision, it is something very different from an unfairness in the process. Asha also asked a question about whether or not disputes between individual members of these groups, they can be brought to me no problem at all. That's totally within the scope as both Ombudsman and an informal mediator of the organization.

But as far as actually blocking policy, I can see that being a very, very, limited issue with the Ombudsman Office because if something comes in and it's not part of my role to review it, then it should head right back out to the community. I would probably like to see maybe an example of a stakeholder using the office to block policy. To my recollection, that's not something that happens on a very frequent basis. I'll do a little bit of research [to my case] management system and see if I can come up with actual examples of that happening and how it was dealt with in the past.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Thank you very much, Herb. Any other comments, questions? I think it's a very good [inaudible] point discussing on those Stress Tests. If I missed something in the Stress Test, please tell us and we will add them.

HERB WAYE: Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, Herb. Go ahead.

HERB WAYE: Where did this Stress Test #13 come from? Is this something that is relatively new?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It was done by the Work stream 1 by the Stress Test Subgroup led by Cheryl. I am sure you know the name. I have a trouble to remember the name – Steve DelBianco, yes. Thank you. And maybe one way could be wait for Cheryl to come back to those meetings and have a discussion with her. And if not, I can ask if Steve can join us in one our next meeting to have a discussion on that specifically if you think that it could be appropriate just tell me.

HERB WAYE: Like I said, it would just be a good idea to maybe have an example to work with.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. I will check with both Cheryl and Steve. Thank you. Any other comments on that topic?

Okay, if not, let's go to the next topic. It's something we already discussed the current role of the ICANN Ombuds Office. I wanted to have this brought back because I want to be sure where we are regarding the inclusion of PTI Naming Function and [inaudible] ICG and what we as group need to do. I had the impression it was a done deal that it will be included in the role of the Ombudsman but with a change with people and particularly with Herb it seems that it's not yet like that. And if anyone of you have comments or information on that, it will be welcome.

Herb, you have your hand raised. If you want to talk again, or it's an old hand?

HERB WAYE: It's an old hand but Sebastien, I will be in Los Angeles next week. I'm heading down there to meet up with Chris and to complete the transition in the office. I can probably ask this of the group that works at and involved in this in L.A. So I'll put that on my agenda and hopefully have an answer for you for next week whether there is a role for the Ombudsman in this organization.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Good. I think it's important to tell us if it's already included. If it's not, do we need to propose something or is it a done deal that it must be done and then we need just to add some Bylaw proposal or then where we are and what need to be done and what we need to do. That's a very different topic. But thank you, Herb, to take that and I hope that you will find the good inter [inaudible] in L.A. to exchange on that topic.

Asha please. Go ahead.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Yes. Thank you, Sebastien. I have two comments to make on this. On the first point is related to what the PTI is in relation to ICANN. The last meeting we had we had some discussion on the chat window as to whether PTI is a subsidiary or it's an affiliate. I checked with our Legal and a couple of Board members and their opinion is that it is a subsidiary because it's 100% owned by ICANN.

And then the other point I wanted to make is on the role of the Ombudsman in the PTI. It's not explicitly stated in the PTI Bylaws, as somebody pointed out last time. But I think after reflection, it would make sense to make it explicit the role of the Ombudsman. If there was a dispute with the PTI I think it would be useful to make that explicit. The question is how do we make it explicit and I'd very much like to hear people's views on that. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Asha. I think it's a very good input on the [Ombudsman]. It gives some goal or how to go, and I guess it will be

useful for Herb to take that into account and to try to find how people may think what to do. It may be one thing we will have to make some proposal and then to go to the full group and/or ask some help from Legal team, both inside ICANN and our advisor if needed.

Okay, any other comments, questions, ideas? Jimson, maybe you can talk and or maybe we can take your point into Any Other Business or that in the next call to discuss. The question was, for the people who are just listening to the audio, in addition to Asha comment, Jimson would like to ask if Ombudsman decision are enforceable. There are some answer to say no it's not. And there are recommendations.

Okay, Herb, please. Go ahead.

HERB WAYE:

Yes, just a quick reply to that question from Jimson. The Ombudsman can only make recommendations to the Board. Those recommendations, generally speaking, are public. So as far as being enforceable, if the community wishes to make them enforceable, they have the voice and the power to take recommendations to the Board if recommendations for some reason are not acted upon by the Board. So generally speaking, no they are not enforceable by me, but they are enforceable by the community if the community feels the recommendations are justified and the organization should take them into consideration and changes should be made.

So indirectly, yes they are enforceable to what we call "moral suasion," where the community can take it upon itself to address them.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Herb. Asha please.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Yes, merci, Seb. Thanks. In light of what Herb just mentioned, I had a similar point which is if you look at the role of a mediator generally, any settlement that the mediator helps disputants to achieve, if both disputants agree to something and they agree to settlement, usually that settlement is binding. So in that sense – and I want to hear people’s perspectives on this – if that settlement agreement is binding, in a way some kind of authority has been transferred or the disputants have transferred some authority to the mediator in a conscious way. So they’re saying, “Okay, because we are agreeing to something that you have helped to broker, and therefore whatever we have agreed to is binding, and therefore in that sense the mediator has some kind of power.”

I’m just wondering, and that’s really very similar to what Herb just mentioned, if the community says yes, we would like something that the mediator, in this sense the Ombudsman who is acting as a mediator, has helped parties or disputants come to a conclusion on, then yes, we would like the Ombudsman to have the power to enforce that agreement or that settlement. I’d like to hear people’s views on that. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Asha. Herb, please.

HERB WAYE:

I agree totally that the role of a mediator is to get the two parties to come to a decision that is enforceable amongst themselves. So I was thinking straying too far into the role of arbitration where two people come together and the arbitrator has the authority to come to a decision and enforce it, usually through some sort of an acceptable use policy. As far as mediation goes, the two parties involved come to a decision through the assistance of mediation. If one of the parties then proceeds to break or breach that agreement, as far as an Ombudsman, my only recommendation at that point would be for the person who feels that they have been wronged in the mediation would be to take that to court. Because who in the organization – and that's the question that comes next – is who in the organization and how is that individual or that group going to enforce the decision that has been made by the two parties.

So yes, assist as a mediator, but to the point of making the Ombudsman role an enforcement entity, I would hesitate to go there. If the community feels that there should be some sort of a group that can enforce that – a compliance group that forces people to abide by mediation – that would be fine. But I can't really see how the Ombudsman could take on the role of enforcement.

And another point that I would like to bring up is that as far as mediation goes, it's not something that is done every day. So it's not a practice that the office does even weekly. When there is disagreement between individuals in one of the stakeholder groups or in the community somewhere, we can assist as a mediator but it's not

something that I would go to, for instance, between a registrar and a domain owner or between somebody involved in the new gTLD process and the organization. We already have the Independent Review and the Reconsideration for doing that in an official manner. I can't see how the role of the Ombudsman could be involved in that as a mediator between the parties.

There is also, of course, the CEP – the Cooperative Engagement Process – that serves as a type of informal mediation. So to go any further in my role, I would be hesitant about going into an enforcement position.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Herb. I see that there are a lot of exchange on the chat. Anyone want to take the floor? We have nine more minutes.

Okay, Farzaneh, please. Go ahead.

FARZANEH BADI:

Hi, Sebastien. Just to reiterate what I have said in chat, I think we can't have an Ombudsman that's also an enforcing body. How is that even possible? Even in like simple [inaudible] process if parties come to an agreement, there's a settlement agreement and then they go to court and they enforce that settlement agreement if one of the parties is not willing to abide by it. But at the moment what I see that as being suggested – I might be wrong – is that Ombudsman actually enforce the resolution? How is that even possible? So even if you think that's okay the community can agree to the resolution that is done by the Ombudsman and deem it as binding, you have to come up with an

enforcement mechanism that is not related to the Ombudsman. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Farzaneh. Any other then? It seem that the question is that its enforceability is that the role of the Ombuds that was in ICANN who will be doing that?

Herb, please. Go ahead.

HERB WAYE: Thank you, Sebastien. I just want to make it very clear not to confuse mediation with a recommendation that's put forward to the Board. Mediation is between two parties that are in a dispute within the community, and a recommendation to the Board – a recommendation that is made following up from a complaint – so the mediation enforceability is totally different than a recommendation to the Board that can only be enforced if the Board refuses to accept the recommendation by the community if the community feels the recommendation is justified and should be followed up on. So it's important not to confuse the mediation aspect of the job with the Board recommendations that are made. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Thank you very much. Any other comments? Okay, thank you for this interesting exchange. Let's go to the last two slides. The first one is to the next meeting will be as we are rotating the hour but we are

coming back on Monday. Today it was exceptional because yesterday it was a day off by U.S. and that's why we moved to today.

I see that Asha want to talk about that. Yes. Go ahead, please.

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Okay, thanks. Yes thanks, Seb. I just wanted to ask if – I had brought this up a couple of meetings ago – because the 7:00 p.m. UTC call would be 3:30 in the morning for me. So I was just wondering if it would be possible to do Doodle polls to see whether we could possibly change the 7:00 p.m. call to 1:00 p.m. or 5:00 a.m. I understand it won't be convenient for everyone so I just wanted to check whether it's possible to at least do a Doodle poll to get feedback from everybody.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Asha. Any comments on that?

My comment is very simple. We are rotating the three-hour slot possible and we have already had one meeting at the same hour and we were even more people than today, and I was thinking that it was a good time for maybe other part of the world and it was a good participation.

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

But you can't make a conclusion based on one meeting, Seb.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, do a Doodle poll if you want because staff is not doing it so we have to manage ourselves. I am sorry but I –

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Bernie, can you help with that? Is Bernie on the call? Bernie's typing something. Okay. Yes, Bernie. If it's something that you can help with, that would be great.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I am really very sorry because I asked staff to do it and staff answer me no. And I don't know what we are doing here but that's okay. Staff can handle and I don't take any more responsibility on the timing of the meetings as it's done and somebody will decide when is the next meeting and tell me what I have to do. Thank you very much.

Okay, then we don't know when will be the next meeting. Thank you very much for that. I would like to come back to one question asked or comments made by Mike about input in this document. This document it's a repository of all information we need to have, and it's not yet a document we agree on or then everything will be discussed in one way or another. And it's why I think it's better to have one place where we put everything and then as we will decide what part we transfer to the full group and how we done this work.

With that, I would like to go to Any Other Business. Any comment, question?

Okay, then my last point is that I will refer back to the co-Chair of this working group and see what I need to do and I will say hope to talk to

you one day to the next meeting, and I don't know when it will be.
Thank you for your participation and for this interesting meeting.

Bye-bye. This meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]