
SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much. Good morning, good evening, good night, for people participating and the one who will listen later. It's an additional call on the ICANN Ombuds Office Subteam of the Work Stream 2 of the CCWG on Accountability for ICANN. We have this specific call to have an exchange with the team selected by ICANN to fulfill the review of the ICANN Ombuds Office and to help us with the work of the Subteam.

I will try to go through some slide and prepare for this meeting and I have put some questions there, but it was to suggest some questions to start the discussion and not at all to prevent any other participants to ask a question, of course.

If Debra, you have question on my presentation, don't wait if you want to ask a question during the presentation and if others want to add something at the same time, feel free to do it. Thank you.

We will take the roll call by the Adobe Connect and I hope that Phil Khoury will join us shortly, and if we [any] join us someone know that [inaudible] it will be good. Thank you.

This additional call is on the 8th of March and it's a very interesting and important date for everybody, but especially for who will participate in this call and thank you for taking some time of this day for us and this topic. We are the Subteam ICANN Ombuds Office and I will try to go through the agenda. The agenda will be to have this meeting with Cameron Ralph – it's a member of the team who will do the review and the ICANN Ombuds Office Subteam [second edition]. I have started to list some useful [inaudible] but of course it's not a full list and [timely]

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.

list, and we may want to discuss in the next meeting who will be [inaudible] the face-to-face meeting in Copenhagen, the 11th of March in Any Other Business.

If I forget something with the agenda, please try to add if you wish some items now. If not, I will go to the first part of this meeting between Cameron Ralph and the ICANN Ombuds Office Subteam.

I wanted to start by [inaudible] –

PHIL KHOURY: Hello. I do apologize for my late arrival. I got held up on the way back to the office.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: That's okay. Welcome, Phil Khoury. I suggest that during the course of the presentation the other will have the opportunity to make sure [we have] about themselves. I am the rapporteur of this ICANN Ombuds Office Subteam. Are you able to see the Adobe Connect room or you are just on the call, Phil?

PHIL KHOURY: Just on the call.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Then I will repeat quickly and [what is the right] slide for what is the agenda for today. It's of course to meet with you and Debra with some of the participants of the ICANN Ombuds Office Subteam and

we'll do a short presentation and then we will have some question and answer and one slide about start [inaudible] useful document. It will be good for you to read and discuss about the next meeting with you.

Now I want to start with the Scope of Work of the ICANN Ombuds Subteam and it's coming from the first part of the work of the Cross-Community Working Group on ICANN Accountability. It was written like that. "The Ombudsman can perform a critical role in ensuring that ICANN is transparent and accountable, preventing and resolving disputes, supporting concerns [inaudible] and protecting bottom-up [inaudible] decision making at ICANN. ICANN Office of Ombudsman must have a clear charter that reflects, supports, and respects, ICANN's mission, commitment, and core values, and must have sufficient authority and [inaudible] to ensure that it can perform these important roles effectively as part of Work Stream 2," – that's what we are doing now.

"The Cross-Community Working Group on Accountability will evaluate the current Ombudsman Charter and Operation against industry Best Practices and recommend any change that is necessary to ensure that the ICANN Ombuds has the tool, independence, and authority needed, to be an effective voice for ICANN stakeholders."

That was under the title of, "Considering Enhancements to the Ombudsman [Roles and Mission.]" And part of your mission, I guess Phil and Debra, it's to help us with this evaluation of the Ombudsman Office work and what can be done through this Work Stream 2.

Here you have the list of the participants. I will not read the list of participant but when you will look to the slide it shows that there is 23 active participants, and I will say a-hem. If you take a real participant, I would say we are a handful of participants. And we [inaudible] 22 and we have a Board liaison [I share] with the call, actually [inaudible] who is the backup of the call, I guess. And one other co-Chair of the CCWG on Accountability which is Mathieu and we'll have the opportunity to meet him and some other participant in Copenhagen.

One of the reason I chose that is that we are very few people really engaged in this work, and the one who participate today are really the one who are the more active member of the subgroup.

In doing this work, the Work Stream 2 of ICANN Accountability was split into nine subgroup and one [addition], and those subgroup have some [dependency] with our work. We have already tried to figure out what are these requests from the other subgroup to be added to the work of the Ombuds and just to be sure the 10 [items] – the nine subgroup and one [addition] – it's Diversity, Human Rights, Jurisdiction, Supporting Organization and Advisory Committee Accountability, Staff Accountability, Transparency, Review of CEP – it will not come [inaudible] CEP but that will come later – Guidelines for Good Faith Conduct, and IRP Phase Two, and one of the overarching item is ATRT 2 that's the Accountability Transparency Review Team #2. And we would see during Copenhagen. We would discuss about #3 and why it is important for us because one of the reasons are the review and after your participation, Phil and Debra, it's because it was one of the requests ATRT 2 and one of the requests our subgroup work, and we got

together and our responsibility and with the help of some staff we're following the ATRT 2.

I am sorry. I try not to use too much acronyms but it's the ICANN life. I hope that you will get [inaudible].

I suggest that if you agree, you present your organization. I have put the slide with the [inaudible] by staff but you can use whatever method you want or as you want. And then we will have some exchange and question and answer, and it will give the opportunity to the other participants of the subgroup to [inaudible].

Phil, Debra, if you have first if you have question my presentation, but more importantly, if you can some information about your organization and yourself it would be great. I have a second slide with your summary of your summary and whichever slide you want me to use [inaudible] your work.

Debra or Phil, [inaudible].

PHIL KHOURY: Debra, are you happy to lead off with the –

DEBRA RUSSELL: Phil and I have been working together for about 15 years or so and have had a specialist interest in Ombudsman schemes throughout that period. We've both got a regulatory background and I think I was looking through the slides of your last meeting and I think you saw that

we've both got a background at the Australian Securities and Investments Commission.

We're used to that public policy type perspective of things and have in the time since leaving the Australian Securities and Investments Commission we have worked extensively with Ombudsman schemes in Australia, New Zealand, and Canada, in a range of sectors – a lot of schemes in the financial service area but also schemes in telecommunications, schemes dealing with legal in relation to lawyers, public transport – what have I missed, Phil – energy and water. So there's quite a range of Ombudsman schemes. I suppose what we've taken away from that is that all Ombudsman schemes adhere to some fundamental principles of the way in which they try and do things. Fairness is incredibly important, accessibility, efficiency and effectiveness – those sorts of principles you find in schemes in all different sectors trying to adhere to those principles.

How those principles work out in the detailed operation of Ombudsman schemes very enormously, and have to vary. It does depend upon the context, the nature of the dispute, lots of factors. And so I suppose we pride ourselves on really trying to understand the context very well, the particular nature of the complaints that are being made and the types of complainants and the need to provide a good service to those complainants. We don't just think it's one size fits all, but you roll out the same model for all Ombudsman schemes.

We've also worked extensively in governance and change management and regulatory areas. They're the interests that we've pursued. Phil knows more about ICANN, having worked with auDA – if I got its name

right, Phil – with the Australian Domain Name Authority. I'm much newer to all of this, but really looking forward to learning about ICANN and we've been reading madly the information sent to us. We've been provided with links to the work of the Work Stream 2 and also the subgroups as well as the Ombudsman material. That's all been tremendously interesting.

We're looking forward to meeting you in person in Copenhagen. I think that it's a terrific opportunity to use the conference as a way of engaging much more directly with the large number of stakeholders for this particular project.

PHIL KHOURY:

[I have nothing in] particular to add to that but I think we'd be happy to take any questions just about us to help direct our input to where you would like to expand your knowledge of what we can offer.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Debra and Phil. I will give the floor soon to my colleague but I have put some question. I will read those question and then I will ask my colleague if they want to come and speak and I saw that I have written in bad English and I am sorry about that. As a matter of introduction about that, you need really to be careful. I know that I am not English speaker first language, but I always had some trouble even if I travel sometime to Australia to understand Australian accent and I am sure that I am not the only one in ICANN. It's one thing you need to have in your head that you have to speak to a very diverse audience with different level of understanding of English and of understanding of

various accent or even the various English languages, and that's important. I know that you will not have any trouble to exchange with Cheryl but maybe with some other like me, you need to exert more effort than you do usually in your work. It's very important that you be understandable by the large part, if not all, the participants in [inaudible]. It's important. And you have to know that part of the meeting are interpreted and also it's important to know that when we [participated] we use this tool and it's a way to interact [if you] maybe will be provided to [inaudible] different exchange during the [inaudible].

I have put three questions. I will read these three one [inaudible] you will put some idea about [inaudible] who don't see the slide I have put the following question: "Your understanding of the Mission. Your vision of the timeline. And how do you want to interact with us?" And that was my three questions from yesterday when I start my [advance] presentation. Of course, you will have also the opportunity to ask us any question.

But before you answer this question, I would like to ask my colleague or the staff if they wish to add something before the Q&A or if they want to have a specific question before the one I put on the table. Please feel free to [inaudible].

Asha Hemrajani, please go ahead. Thank you.

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Thank you, Sebastien. This is Asha Hemrajani. I'm on the Board of Directors for ICANN. I do have some questions but since you asked if we had any, I do have some but I would like to hear Phil and Debra address

the three questions you asked first and then I'd be happy to come with my questions after that. I think that would be more appropriate flow of order. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Asha. Any other who wants to say something now? If not, I give back the floor to Phil and Debra, and if you can – [now] wait a second. I have Farzaneh Badii who wants to speak.

Go ahead, Farzie.

FARZANEH BADI: Thank you, Sebastien. My question would be, if they have been briefed on the ICANN's charter and the community and the stakeholder groups, and if they need any further information. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Farzie. Maybe you can say a few words about you just to take this opportunity that you are taking the floor, where you fit within this SO/AC (Supporting Organization/ Advisory Committee) of ICANN.

FARZANEH BADI: Sure, Sebastien. I'm a Chair of the Non-Commercial Users Constituency which is a part of the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, and that stakeholder group is a part of the Generic Name Supporting Organization. It is very complicated but... So we are part of one of the Supporting Organizations at ICANN, and ICANN has Advisory

Committees as well. I'm sure of course if you need more information, I believe that all the Chairs are willing to discuss with you briefly how the ICANN works, but it's quite overwhelming as well. I'm sure you can get a grab of that. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I guess I will give back the floor to Phil and Debra and feel free to answer the question we posed for you in the way you want and [inaudible] can you please... if you want me to repeat the question I can if you want me but [it's up to you].

DEBRA RUSSELL: I think I managed to get the questions down. So I'll begin by saying my understanding or our understanding of the task, and please if I speak too quickly let me know.

We had a meeting yesterday by phone and understand from that that there are two aspects of this task and both are very important. One is to look at what the Ombudsman is currently doing and how well it is doing that, and to provide our recommendations in light of the best practice that we have seen at other Ombudsman schemes.

The other aspect of the task as we understand is to look at the various suggestions that have been made for additional functions for the Ombudsman's Office and to evaluate those and to provide our recommendations, taking into account factors such as whether that will or how the new functions will fit with the Ombudsman's existing responsibilities and whether new functions are appropriate, or the

proposed new functions are appropriate for an Ombudsman's Office and issues of duplication and so on.

So we have begun some reading and are starting to understand some of the proposals for expanded scope and understand that Work Stream 2 has already identified a new [kind] of work for the Ombudsman's Office.

Is there anything more that you wanted to say, Phil, about the task as we understand it at the moment?

PHIL KHOURY:

No. Only just to say that at this stage of any project like this, we're still probably have the theoretical understanding of what the balance is between those two broad groupings of objectives, and we're expecting the [depth] interview process in Copenhagen to really help us flesh that out and understand it in more detail, just what's inside each of those two groups of objectives, and what will work to I suppose to provide compelling case for any change to either of those.

One of the questions we will be asking in our interviews will be around getting people's sense of the balance between those two and whether there is a clear understanding of future challenges that should be driving any change to the Ombudsman function, that sort of thing to get a sense from people about the balance.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much for the answer to this first question. Maybe we will make a stop here and ask the participant if they wish to add

question about the scope of the mission. Now maybe, Asha, you have some question who are [lead] with that. If not, we will wait for [later].

I have some question but I will suggest that we will come back on that later. Maybe you can give us some inputs about the second question – your vision of the timeline and if you feel comfortable with what. That was a request [from] you about the timeline. Thank you.

PHIL KHOURY:

Sure. I might take this one, Debra. The agreed timeline in the RFP that we've worked on is really to have a draft report by the end of March and a finalized report by the middle of April. We've, as always in these projects, the opportunity to... Things have changed, so the opportunity to do in-depth interviews in Copenhagen has really changed the order in which we'd like to do this. So we will do the depth interviews first and then follow that up, again, subject to the issues that come up with a online survey to capture, see if we can reach out to a broader audience and possibly get answers to specific questions.

I think as I understand, those dates were set to fit in with other ICANN activities. Consultants always want more time. We always do a better job with more time. But I think that's a tight timeframe but at this stage we think we can deliver a meaningful report on the issues that have been put to us in that timeline. In the course of our discussions, it may be that we want to revisit and ask for some flexibility, but right now we have no grounds for that. We're happy to proceed on the current timeline.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Phil. That's an important point and I guess we as a subteam and we as Work Stream 2, it would be one of the topic of what would be the timeline and if anything will change, but for the moment it's where we stand with the timeline and [think you] will try to fit in with this time.

My last question was how do you want to interact with us? Not too much during the face-to-face meeting in Copenhagen but do you want us to set a specific meeting and if the time is very short, do you want to participate to our weekly call and interact with us at that moment? You want something else? Of course, when [inaudible] available but you may have other wish to interact with us please let us know. Phil or Debra.

DEBRA RUSSELL: I suspect that it would be best if we could try and participate in your weekly meetings to try and avoid the need for an additional meeting. And speaking to you weekly after we get back from Copenhagen would probably really help us. We can talk to you about times and I know that the different times in Australia and other parts of the world might make that difficult on occasions but we can try for that if that's possible.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Debra. I think, Asha, it's a good time if you wish to add questions and then if other want to do the same, feel free to raise your hand in the [issue].

Asha, may I give you the floor?

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Yes. Thank you very much, Sebastien. Once again, my name is Asha Hemrajani. I'm on the ICANN Board and I'm also the Board liaison to this Ombudsman Subgroup in Work Stream 2. Thank you, Phil and Debra, for addressing Sebastien's questions and I thought it would be appropriate for me to come in after you had spoken to those three very basic and fundamental things we need to get clear.

I wanted to ask you a little bit about your actual work methodology. The first area is, you mentioned you've reviewed other Ombuds schemes. I have about four or five questions. What I'll do is perhaps I'll list them all out and then if, Debra and Phil, you could just jot them down and then maybe that would be better to address all of them at once.

The first question I had was about you mentioned you had reviewed other Ombuds schemes and I think I read somewhere about 16 different Ombuds schemes that you have looked at. So I'm very curious to know what areas of reform have you proposed before – not specifics really, because we don't have the time to go through all of that in this call – but maybe some general areas of reform that you have proposed in the past. And in relation to that question, what do you look out for when you decide on proposing what areas to reform?

You mentioned sending out surveys and interviewing people. I'd like to understand a little bit more about that methodology – how do you select who gets interviewed? How do you select what you ask? I see Farzaneh has asked the same question in the chat so I really agree with

that question, Farzie. I had the same thought in mind. How do you decide what to look out for when you propose areas of reform?

My third question is, have you worked on cases where you have proposed that the Ombuds function should be expanded – as we are heading in this direction for ICANN?

Those are the three big areas I wish to ask. Thank you. I'll stop here.

PHIL KHOURY: Do you want me to start, Deborah?

DEBRA RUSSELL: Yes.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay. I should say that normally when we do a review of an Ombuds scheme it's usually over a longer period of time. So there's a certain amount of compression to our usual methodology here. During these next few days in our depth interviews, we'll be attempting to do perhaps two stages of our normal methodology. The first is really to understand what exactly the Ombudsman at ICANN is achieving and the functions that people are expecting of it as it sits now. We would normally map that model, if you like, back to an international standard or a domestic standard for external dispute resolution. And from that, we would develop a model of what's unique about this Ombudsman service. What are the functions that this Ombudsman does that are normal, expected functions? What are the unique functions that are

part of this environment? What are the things that this Ombudsman doesn't do that in a generic sense people might expect from an Ombudsman?

That will give us a framework to be able to start to answer the question about whether the Ombudsman is meeting the need and whether it's reasonable. So there are times when stakeholders will have an expectation that's unrealistic, and the only real response in that space is an expectation management strategy in communication. We would also look in that to say, is there reasonable, for example, against the standard, can people easily access the Ombudsman scheme? Are people aware of it? Is it comparatively seamless to be able to take a matter to the Ombudsman? And we've made recommendations in the past to make the Ombudsman more visible, to remove obstacles to people putting a complaint to an Ombudsman scheme. For example, in some sectors a simple thing like requiring all complaints to be in writing can be quite a substantive obstacle to people participating and using the scheme.

In other cases, we've recommended more powers for an Ombudsman because the Ombudsman isn't meeting stakeholder perception or expectation because they are unable to have access, for example, to decision-makers or to change a decision themselves or to award compensation, again, depending on the type of Ombudsman function that it is. But we would always try and frame all of those recommendations as fitting into what's a reasonable and fair model for the way that particular Ombudsman should operate.

We think at this early stage that the Ombudsman at ICANN is a combination of an internal Ombudsman and an independent external Ombudsman in the way that it functions but we won't really know that until we've had a chance to really understand the nature of the complaints that come, how they're dealt with, and what stakeholders think of them functioning.

There's some examples of the changes, the sort of reforms, that we've made as a recommendation. Typically in an Ombudsman review it's very much a multistakeholder environment and it's pretty critical in making any recommendations for change that every major group of stakeholders, that their perspective is taken into account in the recommendations and that they feel that their view is put forward and considered and then a recommendation made in full light of everyone's view, which tends to make our reports a little bit longer but we've found it's essential to properly rehearse the issues before you make recommendations in there.

I'll stop there. I risk of boring everyone. Did I miss anything in that, Debra?

DEBRA RUSSELL:

I suppose the thing I would add is that we find that often there are fine issues of balance. For example, Ombudsman decisions have to be fair but they also have to be timely and they have to be an informal process, not like a long, drawn-out, court process. And so there's a bit of a balance that has to be drawn there and where exactly you draw the

balance differs from one scheme to another. But often it's looking at issues in combination that's important.

PHIL KHOURY:

Sometimes – I should just if I may add two more things – in terms of an expanded Ombudsman function, probably one of the common expansions to an Ombudsman function that we've recommended has been to remove an exclusion, to allow a broader population to access the Ombudsman scheme, and that might be by perhaps increasing a monetary limit or including a different class of complaint into the Ombudsman's powers. One additional function we have recommended in one or two cases has been to allow the Ombudsman to make recommendations on systemic matters. So not just an individual's case, but if the Ombudsman discovers a process or a rule or a way things are done that is affecting a large number of stakeholders, that the Ombudsman should have power to make recommendations about those.

That's an illustration. To go back to the first question about interviews, at this point we rely on the advice from the organization usually. We ask for a stakeholder map and work from there to make sure that our interviews are covering all the key stakeholder areas because we invariably find that if we aren't getting to people at the beginning then at the end of the process people won't have credibility and there won't be support for recommendations. So we begin with the advice of the staff or a group like this, and then take recommendations from people as we go as to who we should be talking to or if we were going to survey, who we would send to.

I'll stop there.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Phil and Debra. Farzie, do you want to speak out your questions or do you want me to read them? I prefer if you can speak to allow you to do it. Please go ahead, Farzie.

FARZANEH BADI: Thank you, Seb. I think, Phil and Debra, it's not [really] what I'm writing in the chat. This is my personal opinion. I think that for the past at least [inaudible], ICANN has been the pioneer for online dispute resolution and online Ombudsman, and a lot of work has been done to make it more efficient and accessible. Even one of the former Ombudsman wrote his thesis about online dispute resolution.

I'd say that efficiency, cost effectiveness, all these sort of values, have been discussed at length. You will see that. I think what is really important for the Ombuds Office to be looked at, the angles are the independent and how it interacts with the governance structure of ICANN which is very special and I really like that Debra mentioned that one size doesn't fit all. I think the evaluation has to consider this very special nature of ICANN – ICANN organization, ICANN community – how we interact and what that reaction would do.

That's one thing, and the other thing that I had – I'm sorry. I'm talking too much – I think that it's okay if you just as you go on you take on interviewees and interview them but I don't think there is any harm in – Sebastien, correct me if I'm wrong – but we could ask the community if

they – of course, not all of everyone that wants to can have the survey or an interview – but we could potentially ask the community that there is this opportunity to be interviewed and surveyed with the questions. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Farzie. Very useful input. As we have eight minutes to the top of the hour, I will stop here the question and answer –

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Sorry, Sebastien –

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Go, Asha.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Sorry for interrupting. I'm not able to get my hand up on Adobe for some reason. Can I just squeeze in one more question if we have time?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: We don't have really time but yes. Go ahead, please.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Yes. A very quick one. First of all, thanks Phil and Debra for that pretty comprehensive answer. You've addressed most of my questions, and I think we can definitely continue this discussion in Copenhagen. I just

wanted to ask you one last question about in terms of what you have proposed before and with your other clients in terms of mediation. Is that something you look at when you're looking at the function of Ombuds? Have you proposed that mediation be included in or excluded from the function and role of an Ombuds? Thank you.

DEBRA RUSSELL:

We've certainly reviewed schemes that do already have a mediation function as part of the suite of [inaudible] dispute resolution strategies that they use. We've got a reasonable amount of experience around some of the challenges around that and if the mediation isn't successful, how that fits into an arbitration, a formal decision-making, model, if the dispute continues on in that way.

I don't think off the top of my head that we've recommended mediation in a scheme that doesn't already do some of that. Mostly where we have seen mediation occur, it's been appropriate and where it hasn't been part of the suite of possibilities they've been smaller schemes where perhaps it wouldn't be easy to or and the nature of the scheme made it less appropriate as a tool to resolve disputes.

PHIL KHOURY:

We have recommended in some cases expansion of the use of mediation where we thought a scheme had too tight a criteria for use of mediation. So for us it's always about the right mix of techniques.

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. We have five minutes to go. I need to say that we don't have the current Ombuds – not because he was not willing to participate with this call but because he's on a plane from Canada to Denmark – but you will have the opportunity to meet with him in Copenhagen and that will be an important part and we have to see how everything can fit well together because I'm sure that there will be some question raised around that and how to interact with him and his duties.

Thank you for those questions and for all the answer. Unfortunately we don't have time to ask you to ask us questions but I would like to suggest that you prepare some of your question and we do that during our face-to-face meeting in Copenhagen and that we will be very happy to discuss with you during this face-to-face meeting but also during the course of the ICANN meeting in Copenhagen.

Next topic was to start the discussion about the document. As I heard, you have already received that a lot. I don't know some and a lot of document, but I wanted to be sure about three document and maybe a fourth that's not on my slide. We have a long time ago start on a draft report on our subgroup to have somewhere where we have a different [inaudible] and then I start to do any enhancement of these document in last October and it's a long time ago. But it's still a document that could be useful to go through. I don't know if you get it yet. We will have to see with staff how we can be sure you get it.

We have two overarching discussion and topic for our face-to-face meeting on Friday with the Work Stream 2 people. One is about [draft

glossary] to know how we call each part of ICANN and the whole ICANN. That's I guess a useful document to see that we are still in the discussion about that. We will also discuss how to organize the various Work Stream 2 requests for [more] mechanisms to increase ICANN's accountability. And yes, one part could be to go to the Ombuds Office but it could go to some other places and that's an important discussion to have and an important element for you to have to keep in mind. And the document I am referring to I am the author of, but it's a draft, draft document. Nothing else and we will see the discussion going on during the meeting in Copenhagen.

I will see with staff how we can be sure that you have it. And my last idea was if we have any already done review of the Ombuds function within ICANN previously, it may be useful to have them. I have not checked that [inaudible]. And as it will be the time I have to rush. Sorry about that. And that's our document [main item] of the document but you will see the document itself.

The last two slides it's we will get the face-to-face meeting on Saturday, 11th of March in Copenhagen. I don't know if we have yet finalized the time but as soon as it's done we [will handle it] to the group. I hope it will be [inaudible] for everybody [inaudible] participants to be there. It will be a useful meeting. I hope that it not be too short but at the same time, not too long. And maybe we can target one hour [inaudible].

The last point that – no need for discussion – is just to let you know the next call has to do with different time set and different dates [inaudible] on Monday [when] Monday is not a day open for work or staff. It's on Tuesday, I think. I guess it's the end of my presentation and I am sorry

to rush but it's our end of the call. Any last issue you want to raise before we wrap up?

If not, sorry for the short time but we will see you and see us in Copenhagen for most of us. Some will not be able to travel and be thinking about [inaudible] travel and we will try to keep you informed during this meeting. Thank you for your participation and I must adjourn this call and see you in Copenhagen. Safe travels if you are traveling.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]