
SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much. Recording started. And once again, welcome to everybody. I know that some others will join a little bit later, but I suggest that we start this meeting #13 on the 19th of December, 2016. It's the ICANN Ombuds Office Drafting Team Meeting.

We have – let's go to the right. First of all, we take the roll call from the Adobe Connect, but we have people just on the phone bridge that they are not on the Adobe Connect, please. Okay, hearing none I guess all the people are on Adobe. That's good. Thank you very much.

Let's go to the proposed agenda. We have already done the roll call and the welcome, and now we will go back to the external review of the ICANN Ombuds Office and how we want to organize our team to this specific issue. Then I would like us to discuss what are the other tasks that we have that we need to postpone up to the end of this external review and the one we can handle in parallel.

And we didn't have time to discuss the next meeting's schedule, and I hope that this time we will do and we agree on the next meeting on the 9th of January.

Any comments on the agenda, or you are all okay with this proposal?

Okay. Thank you very much for your quiet approval. Let's go to the next page. We have the same participant observer liaison co-Chair following us. I try to keep the co-Chair informed all what is happening. It's quite easy as we are on the same time zone. But, you see that we are around six people participating from the active participant and we were

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.

supposed to be 22. That's far from optimal, but that's where we are. Thank you. And thank you very much for the ones who are here.

Okay, that's the current time slot and we will come back at the end of the meeting. I hope that I update this one. Okay, we will see. Thank you.

Now I suggest that we spend half an hour, maybe a little bit more – but not much more – about where we are on the external review of the ICANN Ombuds Office. I guess ICANN staff have prepared some specific slides and a specific presentation at least.

Maybe I will give the floor, I guess it will be to Lars. Lars, if you are ready to take the floor and tell us where you are with your team on this external evaluation, will be good. And at the same time, Lars, can you present yourself because we have a question who are you? Go ahead, please.

LARS HOFFMANN: Thank you, Sebastien. Can you hear me?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, we can hear you well.

LARS HOFFMANN: Alright, that's good. Thank you. I'll give you the short version of who I am. I work in the MSSI Department with ICANN – the Multistakeholder and Strategic Initiatives Department. It just slips right off the tongue if you say it a couple of times. I'm working on organizational review

mostly in the team that's led by Larisa Gurnick who's also on this call. I'm currently, for example, helping out with the At-Large Review, and I will hopefully assist here as well with the review of the Ombud – or the assessment rather, in this case, of the Office of the Ombudsman.

Yvette, thank you for putting up the document.

Yes, I'm an ICANN employee. Absolutely. I just saw that question in the [inaudible] chat. I've been putting together, with the colleagues, the Request for Proposal for the assessment of the Office of the Ombudsman (Sorry, I have trouble with my headphones).

As Sebastien says, we've been working on this RFP. We were planning to distribute the full document to you over the next coming days – probably on Tuesday or Wednesday of next week. We have a draft [work] document ready to [inaudible] the [AC]. I'm going to walk you through that in the next couple of minutes to give you a rough idea where we stand.

And the reason we have just a couple of colleagues who need to look over this because we want to give it to you in a state that we think it would be ready to go so that any amendments you make are then hopefully final and we'll be able to post this as soon as possible.

So, if you take it here through the second page, it's under RFP. For those who weren't on the call last week, I believe it was, we talked about how an RFP is structured. I'm not going to repeat this. You can go back to the recording if you wanted to.

This is a very standardized document that is obviously focused, in this case, on the Ombudsman, but we use these kinds of RFPs for other review purposes to find independent examiners as well.

There's the introduction of the document. It explains what it is and what it sets out to do; and then a very, very, brief overview of ICANN, you can see at the bottom with a link to the home page.

And then it gives the assessment itself – what this RFP is asking for: for an independent examiner to assess the Office of the Ombudsman. It sets up the scope of the review: the subject area; talks to you about why the review is necessary; about what the Ombudsman is according to the Bylaws; and then explains the background of your group, in fact, and the work that's going on here as part of Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2. These are all relatively unexciting for you, at least – effectual issues.

And then we get to the meaty bit here – the scope of work. I presented, in fact, very similar wording last week [inaudible] bold. I'm going to read that out if anybody is in the AC room.

“The RFP is to identify an independent reviewer to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the current Office of the Ombudsma Charter operations against industry Best Practices, and provide recommendations necessary to ensure that the Office of the Ombudsman has the tools, independence, and authority needed to be an effective voice of ICANN Stakeholders.”

And then the next section here goes through the criteria and methods of the review – what methods are used: interviews, observations, etc., documents. I’m not going to read through all of this.

And then the criteria – again, part of the meaty bits: evaluation of the current office and the existing Charter. This is in line with the scope that was laid out above; for example, the [determination] of how the enhanced role of the Ombudsman would interact with other ICANN accountability mechanisms, [etc.]

And then here we see the structure of the assessment report. So this is what we would ask of the independent examiner. That’s just an [inaudible] summary [based on fact], obviously. There should be an analytical section where hard data needs to be collected.

And then the conclusion – obviously, again, be based on findings from the data analyzed. The report should show what does work well and then those areas that would need improvement. And then, [obviously in the] conclusions, also we would see some suggestions and recommendations on how to improve, if needed, the effectiveness of the Office of the Ombudsman.

Then we have here the final section, of real interest, is the selection criteria for the examiner, vis-à-vis the criteria we would use to score applicants to make sure we find the best person or the best contractor [to conduct the] assessment.

[inaudible] forward understanding [inaudible] obviously what they need to do. They need to have knowledge and expertise relevant to this particular assessment. They should propose a workable methodology

within the time frame and within the requirements of what they are asked to do. And they should have some flexibility, especially that they are dealing, obviously, with ICANN in this case: timing, etc.

And then we will do a reference check and financial value independence, including a conflict of interest. These are fairly standard procedures and – or requirements for these kinds of RFPs.

Then here are the high-level business requirements and the timetable. The highlighted section here – I’m sorry it’s [an intel] document. It just means we have to update these – the date. Obviously, it will have to be adapted exactly to the timing. When the RFP would go out, we would adapt it accordingly. So, these are placeholders.

This is the projected timeline here. Again, placeholder dates or placeholder timeline, [but] the deliverables that are under review at the moment [we are looking at the present moment] [inaudible] 15th of April.

And then, the last bit. I would spare you the terms and conditions. We will not change these. It’s always the same, and I’m sure you will be able to gleefully read through them when you see the document there on Tuesday.

I think this is what I have at the moment. May I scroll this down a little bit, maybe, to the section of the scope. And with that, Sébastien, I am handing it back to you, I think, unless there are any questions. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Okay. Thank you very much, Lars.

We will discuss how we will review that in a moment when we will discuss how we will want to be organized. But to answer some of the questions that Farzie raised, it's a document set up by staff taking into account the input of both ATRT2 and what was on the Work Stream 1 and what we have already discussed in this group.

And, obviously, we will need to review that, but I have the impression that it's really close to what was asked in all those working groups. And all those working group are composed by different members of the community, and not the same when you look to ATRT2 and Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2. Therefore, I think that a broad range of people – stakeholder groups – were able to have input.

But nevertheless, we will get a draft version in a few days, as Lars said at the beginning of his presentation, and that we will have not so much time to give our feedback for two reasons. First of all is that we are entering, or we will even be very close to the Christmas break and any other New Year's feast around the world. It's why we are not planning another meeting of this group as such in the next two weeks. But then we need to be quick in our reply.

And the other reason is that we are becoming the bottleneck for all the Work Stream 2 work. That's not the fault of anybody, but is the situation where we are. In this review, it's important to be carried on in a timely manner to allow the Work Stream 2 in general, but specifically our group, to release not just only the external report, but what other things we want to add and involve in our work and findings.

Therefore, I don't remember what are the date, but I guess if we get – I'm looking for a calendar. If we look to get this information in two days, we are almost at Christmas and I hope that you can deliver the final document as soon as possible.

Maybe what you can do is to... I am thinking as speaking. But maybe you can send us this version and send us a revised version where we can see those changes in two days. It will allow us for some immediate feedback when we receive the final proposal or the final draft. Because if not, we will just have one and a half days to give you feedback before – hopefully everybody will go to a weekend and maybe for some holidays for Christmas. That's how I see the timing.

Please, Farzaneh, go ahead.

FARZANEH BADII:

Hi, Sébastien. I'm sorry I missed many meetings, so I apologize if these questions have been answered. But when I look at the scope of work here, you say that the objective of this RFP is to identify an independent reviewer to conduct a comprehensive assessment. And then it goes to comparing it against the industry Best Practices and provide recommendations.

What I would like to suggest is that we have to consider the nature of ICANN and what ICANN does as an [inaudible]

Oh, really? I'm sorry about that. I don't know why this is happening. Okay, so can you hear me?

Okay. I'm going to dial in again because it seems like the Internet doesn't work in the U.S.A.

Alright. I will be back.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Thank you, Farzie. Now she's calling and we need to wait for... I guess...

Yes, thank you, Klaus. You will take this Christmas time to catch up with ICANN-pending work. I am sure that you will do that, but please take care of you and your family. It's, I am sure, much more important to do that during Christmas time.

Okay. I don't know if we can wait for Farzie to be back. I don't want to try to answer. Okay, you can hear us, Farzie? If you can hear us...

Any other comments? Please, Herb, go ahead.

HERB WAYE: Thank you, Sébastien. Just one thing that jumped out at me is that in the scope of the work, it seems to want to focus the review and the assessment on the Office of the Ombudsman. And I was under the impression that it was more an assessment of the Office of the Ombudsman *in* the community and how the community and the organization, ICANN community, and all the people involved – how the Office fits in with that and not so much an actual evaluation of the Charter.

It sounds like it's getting right into the nuts and bolts of the Office, and I thought it was more of a focus on the role of the Ombudsman in the community that was going to be a focus of this review.

And the scope of the work points at the Office, but further down in the paper it talks more about the role in the community. So there seems to be a little bit of conflicting focus there. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Herb. Farzie, are you back online?

FARZANEH BADII: Sébastien, can you hear me? It seems like Asha only has a problem with my sound. Can you hear me okay?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I can hear you well. No problems. Please go ahead, and we will give the floor to Lars after you. Thank you. Go ahead, please.

FARZANEH BADII: Alright. Great. I think that the scope of work here, if we are going to talk about if this group is also to have independent and neutrality and effectiveness of the Office of Ombudsman, there should be a focus on the Office of Ombudsman and how it is designed – how ICANN has a contract with the Office of Ombudsman; how it works – because these are the elements that are crucial in maintaining neutrality and impartiality.

Also, what I was trying to say in the beginning was that when I look at the scope of work here that you have, it says that it's to, "Compare assessments of the current Office of the Ombudsman Charter and operation against industry Best Practices and provide recommendations."

We have to be very careful with this. I'm sorry, I have not read through the document thoroughly, so it might be addressed somewhere. But we have to be very careful with this. But what do we mean by "industry Best Practice" because a lot of the time when the Ombuds offices are established, they work within employee/employer disputes and corporate that are not in with the structure of ICANN, which has a community of volunteers and does not necessarily only limit itself to disputes between employers and employees and customers and stuff like that. So, we have to consider this.

This is just one of my comments. The other comment that I would like to make is on the review work method and criteria. It says that – in the bullet point #3... no, it's the second one – "One on one interviews with individuals who are deemed relevant to the examination." It's passive voice. We don't know who is going to decide.

I suggest that we change this, that we are going to ask the SOs and ACs and [inaudible] group, like this group, the Ombudsman Subgroup here, is appropriate to approach. But I think, definitely, the SO and ACs should know about this and should know about that there is an opportunity to be interviewed.

I don't want to take much time, but I did see something else in the 2.4. I cannot see it anymore. These are just my comments. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much for your input, Farzie. I guess the question of the wording you raise about why we talk about industry Best Practice, I will say, unfortunately, it was something that we [iterated] from the scope of the Work Stream 2 defined by the Work Stream 1 final proposal where it's written like that.

My reading of this industry is much more about – and maybe it's not the right word – but how the Ombuds are working and the industry of the Ombuds offices, not the industry of whatever type of industry because we want to be able to compare with what is done for government outside of Ombuds. Therefore, it's a wider scope than just what we may call the domain name industry because it's not to compare the Ombuds of ICANN with the Ombuds of a large provider of IT, but more generally.

But we [iterated] that from the previous work. Now we can ensure that it's well understood and it's taken all that into account. I will ask first Lars, and then Klaus will have the floor.

Please, Lars, go ahead.

LARS HOFFMANN:

Thank you, Sébastien. Sorry, Klaus, to butt in. Yes, just [direct to Herb] and to Farzie very quickly. Herb, your comment is noted. My understanding is that by "Office of the Ombudsman," the Charter and operation would encompass everything, so that we're not [inaudible]

appraise the operation or procedure of the Office itself, but also the interaction with the community. But I will go back with my wiser colleagues and we can maybe rework this for the document that we'll send out for you, to make that clearer. That's very helpful.

On the other two comments – the first one, I believe, Farzie, that you made was about the industry-wide standards that Sebastien also just commented on. I tend to agree with that; although, it does come as from the Work Stream 2 mandate. The idea would certainly be to identify processes that could be transferrable even if it was certainly different circumstances.

ICANN is a very special animal and so, obviously, you can't find a second ICANN to compare this. But maybe there are some standards that could be transferrable to the circumstances. And it is certainly something that we're looking for in an applicant, so this is where this RFP comes in where we can ask those questions. The [inaudible] comes in, understands what kind of environment they're entering, so then they can make the right assessment and be the right [partner] for this enterprise.

And then just very quickly on the outreach – reaching out to SO and ACs – during the last presentation you said, Farzie, that you weren't on the [inaudible]. This is actually where you will also come in. We will rely on your help on this, helping to outreach to the community those people that should be interviewed or that would like to be interviewed and have something to contribute. That is certainly something that we encourage for all of you to reach out to your colleagues and do that. So that would be great.

And with that, I suppose I'll pass it back to Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Lars. Klaus seems to have trouble to stay connected with us. You are changing your name. But I guess you are the one who wants to talk now. Go ahead, please.

KLAUS STOLL: Thank you. Sorry, I just lost the connection. I think what I wanted to say is what Farzaneh is raising –

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Did we lost you, Klaus? I guess so. Maybe staff can try to see with him, if he can dial out. He seems losing Internet connection. Okay, thank you very much. Waiting for Klaus to come back.

KLAUS STOLL: Can you hear me now? Sorry.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, we can hear you now. Go ahead, Klaus.

KLAUS STOLL: Okay. I'm sorry about that. I'm losing the connection. What I wanted to say is what Farzaneh – the point are raising – in a way, they are all more or less in the document. But it's only more or less.

So, I think we should use the review time to put in these documents these points, just for clarification so when the review is happening, that reviewer knows exactly in which direction we would like it to go and doesn't give too much room for interpretation in the text. That's all. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Klaus, for your input. Any other comments? Lars, you want to add something?

LARS HOFFMANN: Yes, just very quickly. While I completely understand Klaus' point, and I agree and we will go back and look at the wording here so that, notwithstanding, just also again to kind of reassure you about the process –

For example, when the independent reviewer is going to prepare their survey – for example, if they want to do an online survey or even kind of the course of questions they would take on one-on-one interviews – obviously, the questions might divert, but quite often, they walk into an interview with five core questions from this and then they spin off different questions depending on where the conversation goes.

So, those kind of issues – the core questions or the online surveys – we would certainly insist that the independent reviewer consults with you to kind of make sure that the kind of question they're asking go into a direction that is useful for and wanted for this assessment.

So, I just wanted to give that as a look to the future, that the involvement will not stop once the IRP is posted. If anything, it will start. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Okay, thank you very much. I guess there are different documents you can refer to, but I will suggest that you take the draft – and it was, I guess, number seven of what was supposed to become the report of this group. It's just a place where we put all the idea exchange we have – not so far, but we had two months ago before we were talking about this review. And maybe there are parts that can be useful to explain and to put it in the RFP.

I suggest that you send us, as soon as possible, a draft version, and you send us, when you are happy, with a final draft version, taking into account changes or showing the changes you send us. And our goal must be to be ready for - I will say Friday, 12:00 UTC.

That will give us a long time, but if we wait... If we need more time, then so be it; but if we do so, it will be after Christmas and then we will be between Christmas and New Year in Western Europe – or some part of the world's New Year – and we will be late. The 1st of April will not be anymore a possible target.

To answer the question of who will select the reviewer, at the end it's the task of staff to contract, but with our input. And it's why I suggest that now we go to –

Nathalie, if you can come back to the PowerPoint presentation, it will be good.

I would like now to discuss how we want to organize ourselves. But first, I will go quickly to what we have already discussed – and it came from the staff presentation last week – to give feedback for all the people who were not there.

There are candidate evaluation criteria. Look at the presentation of last week, Farzaneh, if you want. And we can discuss that by mail or in the later call if needed because the evaluation will take after ICANN receives the answer to the RFP.

The life cycle, I will not go into any detail on that, but it's interesting to get there to keep that in mind. Now the timeline, each year, and it's where we need to do as quick as possible. But once again, if the end of the week is not enough, we will manage that.

[Great.]

And here is the role and responsibility of each part of the...

I'm sorry. I always have trouble with the new names of ICANN staff with ICANN because I am always talking about ICANN as an organization where I am part of, but I know that if it's a disagreement with the boss of ICANN org, then I have to fit with this decision.

Therefore, I was talking about the overall ICANN, where we have our group, the actual ICANN Ombuds and the ICANN org or ICANN staff. And that's something we will need to, in more detail in the presentation of last week.

We had [said that] two ideas about this evaluation of the ombuds. It was something written in Work Stream 1 for us, but of course, we have to take into account all those questions about jurisdiction for the ICANN Ombuds Office – the power of this office, the independence, neutrality, impartiality, fairness, confidentiality, informality and other standards, communication, and output.

And one of our questions must be what will be done by the external reviewer. Is it all of that, or do we want to keep part of the work to be done by only our group? Or he can do everything and we will review that. That's a question we need to ask ourselves in the next few days.

And now, what I would like to do is to discuss this issue. Maybe it will not be so different from today's call, but I would like to have this subgroup to be able to meet occasionally, but on the short timing information.

It looks like the [all crown] group almost, but it's to be able just to send a mail to this group and to be sure that there is exchange between all of them. Then, I received a request from Farzaneh to be a member. I have no problem with that.

I suggest then I will still play the role of the rapporteur, even with this subteam [inaudible] subteam, and with Farzaneh, Avri, Cheryl, Alberto, Klaus, and the current Ombuds, Herb.

And I would like very much, but Asha needs to tell us if she agrees [available], but I would like very much that Asha be part of this group just to be sure that we have the right liaison to the Board as it's an important piece in all this work.

But she will not change roles because she's a member of this subgroup. We need to be sure that she agrees with that. Please, any comments on that? Any feedback?

Okay, if not, I hope that the full group will be okay with that. I asked this on the mailing list, and I take into account the feedback. Okay, thank you very much.

We are 15 minutes to the top of the hour. I would like to go to the next topic, and I would like to be sure that we can think about and have our first discussion of what needs to be delayed after receiving the external interview report. In other words, what will be done or taken care of by the external reviewer, and what we can handle in parallel, if anything.

I have two or three slides. The one I think we need to take into parallel – it's to give you my input, but it's everything who could have some interaction with the other drafting or design team, because I think we can't because we do this review delay everything on the Work Stream 2.

And I know that there are some discussions in transparency about the role of the ICANN Ombuds Office in the, I guess, staff accountability and in the SO/AC accountability. I guess we will have also in the human rights discussions, and maybe in diversity.

Then, we will have in all those groups some inputs, and I think we need to deal with that parallel with the review. Eventually, we will give input to the reviewer specifically on those works.

Let's keep those slides for the moment and come back to this. I guess now I have a version seven, but it was a version six and it was some time

ago. But it's to show what were supposed to be the headline of the report, and I would like you to go through. Maybe I will resend the current version, or my current version of this draft document, and you will be able to see which one you think we need to keep parallel work on during the review process.

Okay, I think Asha agreed to be following this subgroup and subteam. Thank you for that, and you will be liaising with the Board and with this group. Okay, thank you very much.

And just to be sure that the question of what we call jurisdiction of the ICANN Ombuds Office is not linked with the overall discussion about the jurisdiction within ICANN or for ICANN, it's really what is the role of this office.

But I guess it's more precise in the bigger document. Any comments, inputs on all that? Okay.

Keep in mind that we will rediscuss that at our next meeting. It was more a heads' up. And the same with what I will show now.

I cut and pasted in this presentation. You will get feedback of this meeting. It's a place where – what was in the [inaudible] report from the Work Stream 2 Transparency Report group, and I cut and pasted all the places where we had something that's written with the ombudsman, and what the Ombuds Office needs to do.

DIDP's link with the document; disclosure of the document. And therefore, I would like you to go through at least those parts, if you have no time to go through the full document, and see if you have any

comments in this report. And I would like very much that it would be done in the next few days. What I suggest that I will send those parts of the document specifically to the list and ask for comments.

You have a link with the ombuds mandate in improving the DIDP and the whistleblower protection, and I guess [the] summary. That's all those points.

Okay, I hope that it's clear. Is it better, the sound now? I hope that I'm not cutting too much. Okay, my last sentence weren't clear. Then I will try to give you those sentences.

I will cut and paste all that information that's linked to the transparency report working group and I will ask for feedback on the list in the next few hours.

I am not better. I will say that's a question of Internet, and even with a fiber Internet connection.

Okay, anyhow, to be short, I will send that to the list. And I would like to ask you if you have any comments. Okay, thank you.

We have just ten minutes to go, then I would like to go to the calendar. That's the current proposal for the next meeting. I keep with [inaudible] time. As you can see, the next meeting will be in January, after Christmas and New Year. And the next one will be – if I remember well – after Chinese New Year.

It's why we have the next meeting on the 9th, and then the next one is the 23rd. Then we will try to go back to one meeting per week, and then we will be at the Copenhagen meeting.

If you have any concern with dates, timing – as we are a small team – just raise the issue and we will try to see how we can fit better. Our next meeting will be January 9 at 1:00 PM UTC.

We will go back to tell to the full group where we are with the external review. By that time, I hope that the RFP will have been sent. We will discuss the other task. I will come back on what will be done in parallel and what needs to be postponed in the next meeting.

Okay, I need to take into account the new year for other countries, but as you can see, I didn't went after the Copenhagen meeting yet. Thank you, Farzie, to let me know that the Iranian New Year will be on the 21st of March, and I will keep that in mind for the future meeting, as I try to accommodate as much as possible the breaks all around the world, even if it's not easy to know and to follow.

Okay. Let's go to Any Other Business. If you have questions, comments, any other business you want to raise?

Okay, if not, I would like to thank Lars and his team for preparing this meeting.

I see that Herb wants to take the floor. Okay, go ahead, Herb, before I...

HERB WAYE:

Merci, Sébastien. I want to be clear. So, the next step will be the reception of the RFP in a draft form for us to review? We're hoping that's going to happen next week. Then, through e-mail exchange, or we would be having a subgroup or sub-subgroup meeting on Adobe to discuss that?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you for raising this issue, Herb. I have not thought about that, but that's a very good point. I will discuss that, but I think we will need a call. Okay, I will try to think about that in the next few hours and come back to the list, or at least to the small group exchange to define if we can have a call if we need – and if we have a call, when we will be able to have it.

I don't think that it's useful to have it before we have the final draft version from staff, but the schedule for the moment, it's – I understand why you say next week, but I want to be clear because you are on Sunday in your part of the world. But we're already next week in other parts of the world.

So, the goal is to have, as soon as possible, the draft-draft of the document; and on Wednesday, to have the final draft report of the document, the RFP. And then at the end of Friday before Christmas, we will try to have our feedback to have a final version.

Once again, if we are not able to do that because we need more time, then so be it, and we will see how we work during the Christmas. My thought could be to have a call on the subteam for Friday, if it's feasible for you. I would ask you that in the mail and come back to that work.

Okay, but thank you for the question. And I saw that we need to have a schedule. We will try to do that with [inaudible] schedule. And yes, if we ask staff to send us a draft-draft report, it's to make comments right now and to allow staff to include that in the final draft document.

Okay. Asha, please go ahead. And I am sorry, but we will be a little bit late at the top of the hour. But please go ahead, Asha.

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Thank you, Sir. Just a quick question – some quick points I wanted to make here. The first one was regarding the schedule. I think there's a misunderstanding because Chinese New Year is at the beginning of February – the 1st, 2nd and 3rd.

So, we don't need to skip. I'm looking at the notes on the right-hand side, that the meeting after the 9th of January is being skipped because of Chinese New Year. That's incorrect.

The second point I wanted to make, a question – or rather a request I had made on the chat, but you missed that perhaps – is that it looks like both Klaus and myself cannot make it on the 9th of January. Is it possible to change it to the 10th, at the same time? If no one else objects to this. I'm not requesting a time change.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I take that into account. I can't answer like that because I need to go back to the master schedule if there are slots on the 10th or not. I take that into account, your input from both Klaus and yourself about the 9th of January. And there is no need to skip the call this week. Yes, definitely. [inaudible]

ASHA HEMRAJANI: I'll leave it to you to see whether it's possible. I just wanted to make the request and make sure that – because I know today we're kind of running over time because we had to go over again what we had discussed before.

The third point I wanted to ask is, I remember in the last meeting or the meeting before that, we had a slide which had the timetable or the sort of schedule that staff had put together regarding – because this is something I had asked before as well – as to when the selection of the reviewer would be done.

So, there is already a slide on that, if I'm not mistaken. Maybe you can scroll up to that.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I already showed that.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Yes, this one. What I was suggesting is that maybe we don't need to have another separate slide on the timeframe, but what we could do is take this one and add to it, so that we have one master slide for the timeframe.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: That's exactly what I was suggesting, just to add some dates as we have something before January, how we want to be organized, and it could be a frame in this slide.

But thank you for your inputs, and it seems that on the 10th, there is one slot available at the same time as this one. I will send a proposal and see if it's okay for all of us, or at least for the main part of all of us. I don't think we can discuss that here.

But thank you very much for your inputs and for your time, and sorry to be a little bit late. I would like to ask you for your indulgence and we will finish this call now. This call is adjourned and we can stop the recording. Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]