RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, thank you very much. We are at the ICANN Ombuds Office, to 13 call, it's our 19th, even we may have one additional one we had with the review team, but it's the official 19th one. And thank you for participating. And any people who are not on the Adobe Connect, and only not on Adobe Connect and just on the phone?

Okay. Thank you. And I guess this time, it's Phil Khoury who join us from the team of reviewer.

PHIL KHOURY: Thanks, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Let's go to see what will be the [inaudible] agenda, and suggest agenda, what we have done, welcome, and then [inaudible], we'll go quickly to participation and dashboard, and we will spend, I guess, most of our time on the external review.

We will discuss where we are with interviews, and where we are with the survey. Short feedback where we are with the ICANN [inaudible] policy, just to give you the link of the different documents and have a short discussion. And then the next meeting in any other business.

Any comments, questions, requests from this agenda?

Okay. Thank you very much. And participation and dashboard, participation is still the same, and as you can see, it's a small group of all of the active participants who are here, but thank you very much for joining us, and participating to this discussion. I have made a draft, sorry, a draft slide for the dashboard, and the only thing I make any change on the left side, and if you have any comments, either now or later, I have to send it to the next two or three days.

I will be happy to have your input on that. It's just an update what we have done, and what will be our next activity. Okay. And now let's go to the main substance of this call. I have taken this slide we use last time about the interview, I didn't update it. And it's still the color of last week. I just add, from my knowledge, and maybe I am wrong, from which part of the community each of the interview, or future interview, are coming from.

And from the last time, I just add, what I'm right, I add other, because I didn't find another place to put it. And we… I had a short discussion with [inaudible], and she was willing to answer an interview. Maybe, I don't know, Lars or Phil, or both of you, can give us an update on where we are with this part of the work, and then, as you know, we will go to the survey discussion. Thank you.

Okay, Lars first and then eventually Phil will come. Lars, please go ahead.

LARS HOFFMAN: Hey, Sébastien. This is Lars for the record. Yeah, I mean, Phil can offer his perspective as well. We've been in touch last week, and we reached out [CROSSTALK]…

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Lars, we are not in a hurry. Please, thank you.

LARS HOFFMAN: Can you hear me? I'm sorry.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, I can hear you, but you speak too fast.

LARS HOFFMAN: Oh, I'm [CROSSTALK]… Sorry. I will be slower, I'm sorry. [CROSSTALK] with Phil and Deborah last week. We reached out to most of the people already on this slide you see here. I've also been in touch with some policy stuff, from those that support the technical SO and AC, make sure we get maybe one or two of those as well to contribute to this assessment by interviews, and we fill in, Deborah, working behind the scenes, to kind of set this individually with those people, and conduct the interviews.

They might obviously overlap with the survey, but we don't think that's an issue, and I think [inaudible] diversity that similarly. I think that's the update from me. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Lars. Phil, do you want to…?

PHIL KHOURY: Only to say, we've begun the process of reaching out to the [inaudible]. So, Lars has sent introductory emails, and we're in the process of making contact directly with people. They respond in trying to organize times and so on. So, the first one arranged is Crystal [inaudible], who we'll speak to on Thursday.

And Deborah is reaching out to the other names that are coming in as people respond. So, some have responded saying there will be available later on, some haven't yet responded, but we're working away as best we can to connect to those, to the orange names, by and large.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Any questions, comments?

Okay. If not, let's go to the next slide. There is nothing on my slide except the title. If you want to say where we are with the survey, maybe Lars and Phil again. Lars?

LARS HOFFMAN: Thanks Sébastien. This is Lars. I thought we might be able to go through your comments. Hopefully everybody on the call has seen the proposed survey that I forwarded last week. And maybe we can pull up that document, Sébastien. I mean it depends on… I suspect you've seen this already, as well as you've seen Sébastien's comments.

I'll leave that up to you, Sébastien, how you would like to run this. If you want to go through them and explain anything to the group. Maybe somebody else would like to make a comment, otherwise I would suggest, from my perspective, there was nothing dramatic, or controversial in your comments about the GNSO. So, I would have thought that Phil would have been able to incorporate most of these, and then we can launch the survey, hopefully within the next few days.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. I don't know who has read either the proposed survey or they survey with my comments, if staff can find out the proposal with my comments and put them on the screen, it will be very useful. And I didn't send it with my last mail, then it has been in all the mail, and I have to confer that I am unable to find it right now.

I rely on you if you have it somewhere. If not, just put the one sent by Phil and Deborah. Therefore, let's [CROSSTALK]…

LARS HOFFMAN: …this is Lars. We'll put them up in just one second.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Thank you.

PHIL KHOURY: Sébastien, it's Phil Khoury here for the record. I might just make a comment about the survey before the document comes up.

EN

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, go ahead Phil.

PHIL KHOURY: Thank you. I just want to say that I don't think we're expecting a huge number of responses. We will be limited to, you know, 10 days or two weeks of exposure, I think. And we're looking for qualitative input, but I'll be surprised if we achieved quantitively reliable input from the survey.

There may be enough to make some comments about the numbers who responded and their reactions, but we may well not. So, I just didn't want to have people expecting that we get a vast number of responses to this.

I don't think it's a top of the line issue, you know, in the scheme of the many issues floating around in ICANN. So, I'll be expecting sort of deeper, but less response that would be my guess.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Thank you. I feel the same, I guess. We are doing the survey, managed to allow different people with some knowledge, who want to give some input. But, yeah, we are not to wait for hundreds or thousands of people to answer this.

Okay. Then maybe you can go through the question, and then the… Yeah. In fact, I don't know how we want to proceed. The participant has already gotten this document, and if you want to discuss it, question

by question, and see if there is something missing, or something we don't need to ask, and other things like that.

PHIL KHOURY: Sébastien, it's Phil here. Would you like me to get through it? I'm happy to be guided, the response that I can step through the survey and respond to the comments that I've received from you. If that's helpful.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. We can do that, but I want to be… My comments, you can take it, we can discuss it. Mainly, I would like to be sure that all the participants, if they have inputs because they didn't have the opportunity to do it by writing, it's the right time to do it.

After this call, we will, I will say close the comments and ask you to finalize the questionnaire. Then it's really… Yeah, go question by question. If [inaudible] and if there are no comments, then let's go to the next question.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay. The first section in the survey, I'm happy to accept the changes to the words in the introduction. The first question, I'm again, happy to be guided by ICANN, experienced ICANN people in terms of what the categorizations are. I should just caution that we may not, depending on the numbers, we may not able to report back against any of these, or against some of them.

While maintaining confidentiality. So, I just caution that we don't make it to over-engineered given the small numbers. I'm happy to take comments on question one categories.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just to…   One of the reasons I make some comments at the first sentence, it's just, we need to be consistent with the work. And there are two things I was asking for is that, if we talk about, if we, you are called advisor, or you are called reviewer, but just take one where, I don't care which one, and use it consistently into the document.

Even if it's repetition, you decide which one you prefer. And the second is that, we have decided as a subgroup to try to talk about ICANN ombuds, and not anymore [inaudible]. I know that it's not coming from men and women, but we are thinking that it will be better to talk about ICANN ombuds.

ICANN ombuds can do two things. It's a question later on, of trust. So, it's very easy, the office, is it the person? Is it a group of people? And even you talk about the ombuds scheme. And it's also this part of the wording, we need to be consistent throughout the document.

PHIL KHOURY: Phil here again. I'm happy to pick up the language. ICANN prefers the, in some couple of cases, there is a difference in meaning. But I will edit the document to make sure that it talks about the ombuds, and I think I will use function.   I think that's the why we would like to ask the

questions of people are thinking about [inaudible] rather than the person will necessarily have the current regime works.

So, there will be a slight difference depending on the tone of the question. But I will pick up your suggestion edits. I am happy with that.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, I feel it's not too much to pick up my edit, but to be sure that you are using, that you are consistent. And I will not argue about… If I ask you to put one or the other, I would like just to be sure that when we talk… And we have one question from Avri, even she left the call, but she asked the following comments.

Might also be good to ask people whether they have ever been a target of an ombuds investigation and compliment in [inaudible] to three and four. Yeah, maybe somewhere, we need to add. It's not just the people who complain about something, but people who are under the review, under the complaints.

It would be useful if we add it as a question. Okay, and Cheryl saying that she agrees both with your points and feel about focusing on the function, and the addition from Avri. Thank you.

Cheryl, do you want to talk? Go ahead, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just briefly. Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. [Inaudible] because I'm typing with the [inaudible] to another thing. By the time I [inaudible] what I wanted to say. Just on that point of Avri, if you're

going to answer that question, and I think it's a good one, we probably need to word it in some way they or the respondent, has ever been the target of an ombuds investigation complaint.

Sometimes, some of us are in charge of entities that are the target, as opposed to individuals who are being targeted. So, if you can find some way of discriminating that as well. I, for example, have chaired the ALAC, been in control and a primary respondent, because being the chair, when the ALAC was under ombuds review, and I've also been personally brought up to the ombudsman for potential case issues.

So, I would answer to both of those. But I think both are important.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you Cheryl for your inputs. Any other…? And good points. Any other comments to be taken for question one? Okay. Then feel that's good for the question two and [inaudible], now on the screen.

PHIL KHOURY: I don't think anyone had any comments that I saw about question two. It's really for us to get some sense of the level of awareness of the office. For question three, I will pick both Avri and Cheryl's comments about the complaint disputes, so that we're clarifying whether people had initiated or were subsequently part of the complaint.

We'll have to be careful with the wording to make sure that the subsequent question still makes sense in that split. We can do that.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Herb, please, you have comments, go ahead.

HERB WAYE: Merci, Sébastien. I just wanted to bring this into your, to everybody's attention. The little anti-harassment policy refers to the Office of the Ombudsman, which is the main in the bylaws, so the official name of the office is the Office of [inaudible]…

But when it refers to what we had kind of decided, where the individual would be referred to as the ombuds, in the harassment policy, ICANN is calling that person the ombuds person. So, we may want to maintain consistency with the organization in terminology. So, if we get into comments about whether people have spoken to the ombudsman, we kind of decided ombuds, but of course, our report hasn't made it to the organization, but the new policy says ombuds person. Thank you. Merci.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. We will discuss that later on the harassment policy. The limit of where, when the community is engaging, where work and when we have [inaudible] or make some, I would say, decision in the way to name something, it's not yet into the full ICANN.

But we will live with that for the moment. No worries. Okay, any other comment to the question two, three, four, five?

Avri, you want to speak? Or do you want me to read your comments to be recorded? It's up to you.

AVRI DORIA: I can speak. I thought writing them was simply sufficient. This is Avri. But if you feel the need to write them. If you would feel the need to speak them, then I'll speak them, but I don't see why writing isn't sufficient. But anyway, okay, so Cheryl already took care of the thing of having [inaudible].

There seemed to be confusion about how we would talk about this. One could specifically ask whether someone has been a party to ombuds action, and then ask them specifically, were the complainant? Were you the defendant, or were you a third party that was spoken to? And then the rest of the questions can, indeed, refer to party in a complaint, or party in an action, or whatever word we want to use to describe what it is an ombuds does, ombuds person, I guess, if that is what the organization has deemed what we should say.

It's always good to do what the organization tells us what we should do. You really shouldn't ask me to speak. So, and then basically, though, you can refer to party in the complaint, or whatever all the way through, and you can get rid of the ambiguity. The only thing I was thinking is then how do you correlate the answers of, oh, this is the way complaints see it, this is the way targets see it, and this is the way third parties that are pulled in for consultation see it.

But then, it could mean that some people, many people, may have been [inaudible], and so that wouldn't work. And so, if we want to have some knowledge with the survey of whether we're getting different answers from, with the, you know, the complainants, the targets, or the third parties, then you would really need to rethink, you know, the survey.

And I hope I didn't break any of our new manners rules. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Avri. I don't know if you break any rules, and I don't know if I would break any rules, but I like that you were asking the boss of the organization to know which word to use in our discussion. That's great. Thank you.

Any…? I guess, Phil, it's a good point to take into account, and maybe one of the difficulty you will face with this survey that you are some people within the, within ICANN who are part of ombuds complaint for different side, and that might be one of the tricky parts of how to honor that in a single simple study, survey.

PHIL KHOURY: That's… We have [inaudible] I have arranged [inaudible] the survey too long for people to tolerate, but I can see that… I mean, Avri is quite right, we would have to split the results at, you know, question five or six, and collect information from people who are…

You either have to force people to choose one, please give your responses as a select one. Well, let me give you a response for that, or

allow people to offer up multiple responses. We can do that, it just makes it more complicated, that's all.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, okay. Thank you, Phil. Any other comments, questions on these questions?

Okay, if not [CROSSTALK]… question six.

PHIL KHOURY: Yeah, for question six, we suggested, and I think it's fine to add a couple of dimensions to number six. One of which was suggested was confidentiality. Did you feel that the process was confidential and your input was kept confidential? That's a sensible suggestion, which I'm happy to add to it.

There is probably one another possible dimension, depending on the discussion later on that might creep back into this. But, this doesn't compliment the survey, it just makes it a little bit longer. So, I'm fine with that.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Then let's go to the next question. Any comments?

Okay. If not, I will move… Question 10.

PHIL KHOURY: Sébastien, I'll remove schemes that Lars had already picked that up for us, but somehow it slipped in again, so I apologize for that. I'll take that out.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: That's okay. If we have nothing to tell you, then why we will be useful for. I guess we already discussed what is in yellow, and okay. If there is any comments, globally, on the survey, any questions?

                          If not now, everything, Phil, is in your hands with Deborah and obviously Lars supporting you. And if you have any questions, feel free to ask us, and we'll try to answer as soon as possible. And as soon as it is published, we will try to reach out to our own network, to encourage people to answer to the survey.

PHIL KHOURY: Phil here. Thank you, Sébastien, and thank you everyone. I think we have a question from Asha.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, I really, Asha, ask your question. I will ask a general question on the distribution of the survey. How will this be distributed as widely as possible? Maybe Lars, you want to give us your feedback or point of view on that question?

LARS HOFFMAN;   This is Lars. Thank you, Sébastien. Yes, of course, no problem. So, what we usually will do is, first of all, we're going to have the survey also translated, so the translations might come online a few days after the English, [inaudible] for that obviously. But we will put this up on the ICANN website. I've also already reached out to the ICANN org people from the policy department, to send this out on various mailing lists within the AC and SOs.

And then we'll also publish it by the usual ICANN send and social media. We can also [inaudible] SOs and ACs. We put it in regional newsletters. I will also, and this kind of with respect to you, Sébastien. I will write a quick draft, that you can obviously expand or edit as you see fit, but I would highly recommend that all the members of this group write a personal note, either to their peers, or to their organizations, to ask them to participate as well, which is much more efficient than simply having us go out in a more generic fashion.

But we will make [inaudible] limited amount of time, and so we we'll certainly do our best to maximize the response rate. Thank you so much.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you Lars. Another question. We say that we will have two weeks of, for the survey. Even if we are not waiting for a big number of answers, we may, at least, wait for a certain number. And if so, what could be this number? Is it, I don't know, 50? Is it 100? Is it more? Because I think that if we are under one specific number, it would be

more difficult to get any, to end of life is the answer, if we don't have an end of.

But I guess you have already discussed that. Lars, please go ahead.

LARS HOFFMAN;   Thank you, Sébastien. I'm going to put my old professor hat on and say, the deadline has no impact on the amount of responses we get, because if we say five weeks from the outset, everybody will wait until the five. So, that's why we start off with the two weeks, but that's a loose-ish deadline, and you actually raise a good point.

We obviously need a certain amount of responses. Again [inaudible] we can't have the [inaudible] or the six months. I know that seems dramatic. But once said, when the two weeks come up, and we'll do a push over the last few days to get a response as high as possible, we'll check in with you and also with Phil and Deborah, and see [inaudible] are comfortable with in terms of response rate.

We will see what we have. And then maybe we can see where these people are coming from. You know, it's 50 people, it's a really good spread across the ACs and SOs, I think that could be good already. I think that's probably more valuable than a 100 people and they're all from the GNSO.

And so, I think we should… My reaction would be to play this by ear, and kind of make sure that when the survey closes, that we all agree that we either need to extend or can close right now, depending on the response that we have. The numbers, Sébastien, I can tell you from

previous reviews, kind of vary. It took, for example, much longer to get a response of 150 from the GNSO then it took for the At-Large review.

So, let's see where we stand in two weeks, and then go from there. I think that might be most beneficial.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Lars. And Asha made the following comments, we should aim for high response rate, get feedback from At-Large as soon as possible. And we will discuss, I guess, in two weeks' time, during our call where we are, and if we decide to use more time, or less time. I guess it would be, it will not be published tomorrow. We will see during the call in two weeks, where we are and what we suggest to do.

Okay. Thank you very much. Any last question, comments about the survey?

Asha, she's suggesting to have, to add that link to the survey in the ombuds blog. And Lars, just think about, if we want to publish a blog post on that, would be also possible idea. If you think it's feasible and useful. Herb, please go ahead.

HERB WAYE: Yes. Thank you, Sébastien. Yeah, definitely will be part of a blog post, it's [inaudible] it will also go on my Facebook and Twitter feed. And I also have lists of emails, email addresses for people who have been involved, mostly complainants who have complained to the office, that I can contact directly, and offer them to either conduct the survey, or contact Phil and Deborah independently.

So, I will be reaching out to as many people as I can conceivably do. We stopped doing surveys in the office back in, I think it was 2015, the annual report, simply because the response rate was abysmal. We would send two, three hundred emails out to people who have complained to the office over the year, got two responses.

So, we stopped doing it because it just wasn't working. But if I reach out to an individual with a personal email, hopefully I'll be able to garner a little bit more support. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Okay. Let's go back to the [inaudible]. And let's go to the… If there are no other last comments on the review of the ombuds office, the interview or the survey, let's go to the [inaudible] policy. It's more to confirm or to give you, in the slide, the different link. And I guess we get it from Asha email, and it was useful.

One of the reasons I put that again, not just only to give you the link, but it's also because we need to add that as a new task for the ICANN ombuds office. And we need to take that into account in our future recommendation.

As you'll remember, work stream one already gives some new task and responsibility for the ombuds office, and now we have this [inaudible]. That's first feedback, an element we need to take into account. Before going to some specific issue in that regarding this decision of the Board, do you have any questions, comments?

Okay. If not…

EN

I was [CROSSTALK]

PHIL KHOURY: …I'll excuse myself.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. Thank you very much, and talk to you hopefully next week, or two weeks, depending on when we will participate. But, thank you.

[CROSSTALK]

Any comments, questions about that? Okay, my concern, it's in the Board resolution where it says at the end, [inaudible] on screen I read the result. The last result, the Board Director, President, and CEO [inaudible] to ensure that the organization, that staff, continue to monitor whether there are office of the ombudsman is the appropriate place for community member to file a complaint under, and so on and so forth.

And I am concerned with this result, because the ombuds must be totally independent from the President, and the CEO, and from the staff. Anybody else would have been a good, and a good person to do that. And the other thing is to ensure that the organization continues to monitor…

Frankly, I don't think and for me, it's contrary to the bylaws, that the organization continue to monitor, it's not their job, I can do it obviously, if it's your secret. It's useful but from a [inaudible] perspective, I think it

must be done either the Board itself, or our group, and our group is not seated anywhere in the discussion.

And I think that the link between the rule of the ombuds and how it's done, must have been more carefully thought. And I think that we really need to include that in our work. Part of the answer is to say, but you are not ready, you didn't publish a report yet, and we need to go ahead with this [inaudible] policy.

It's a fair point, but now we know where we are, and I think that we need to take that into account and that will work and recommendation for the future. And just to take one example, about possible output is that when one of the questions, it's how female will make a complaint, if the ombuds is a man, it's something that we need to take into account.

I am not sure that the answer suggested today is our best one, but it's something we will discuss, and hopefully make a recommendation to be handled by the ombuds, if we think it's feasible.

Okay, there are some exchange… Maybe, I don't know, Avri, you want to talk?

AVRI DORIA: Okay, this is Avri speaking. I think what I was making more side point and questions, so I'm not sure that they may necessarily… This is Avri speaking. And basically, I was questioning in what way the organization was the right people to check whether something was working for the community. Since, you know, there is, at the moment at least, an un-

gulf-able separation between the two, or if it's gulf-able, it's only through the Board.

So, I'm wondering to what extent that is an adequate address for moderating its success. But when you mentioned our group as a possible way to do it, our group is very transitory, and in the best of all possible worlds, will be you know, blinking out of existence in the very near future, because it will be done with it's WS 2 work.

So, if we're thinking that there needs to be something that monitors this, other than the obviously the ombudsman is not the best for monitoring how well the ombudsman is working, we may need to think about some other mechanism for monitoring the performance of the ombudsman person function, in you know, in longer term.

And I'm not sure I have the suggestion for that yet, but you made a very good point when you said, you know, it's supposed to be separate from staff. Well, if staff is the one that is judging the performance, then it's obviously not separate. So, there is a confusion in there, and I was really making side comments trying to understand that issue. Thanks.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, thank you Avri for this. Sébastien Bachollet speaking. I agree with you, and it's why yes, obviously, our group is short group, and I hope that we will not go too long to finish our work, but I was thinking that the Board could ask us to review what they have done, and we need to find out [inaudible] the community will be involved, and that's a question we need to discuss, and not just for this specific policy.

EN

But I would have been more comfortable with the decision of the Board, asking whatever committee of the Board to take care of that, and not the staff and the CEO. That's my only point. The rest, we will need to discuss it here, and see, as you have said, what is your, what is our proposal for the review, and as a [inaudible] periodic reviews, but she has a hand up, and I will give Cheryl the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Sébastien. Cheryl for the record. Yeah, periodic reviews, or periodic independent reviews, seems to be a way forward in those terms, because yes, I agree, I certainly don't want to be in this work group ad nauseam and forever more. But indeed, if there was another independent periodic review [inaudible] I could very well put my hand up.

So, that's the sort of thing I think we should be enshrining. I just wanted to react to your concern, and it is a concern that will be raised by others, I am sure, about the gender of who you are complaining to, in terms of the ombuds person, in the matter of harassment of any form. It is a much more complicated scene, particularly when it's not of insignificant concern to the complainant.

I would warn us from going down that rabbit hole, if at all possible. And of course, you would have to be saying gender as opposed to man and female, [inaudible] ombuds officers who are, of course, of any gender in the future. We just happened to have [inaudible] to date.

But a well-trained, professional considerate and, how to put this politely? An ombuds who is looking after their own [inaudible] and

reputation, would put in place some mechanisms, some operational procedure, which would deal best with, or compensate for, some of these very possibly complicate and highly emotive reactions on gender.

It's called, for example, the use of another advocate. It would be all sorts of things. But it's a highly complicated thing, and in fact, it even goes beyond gender. It can go into age and all sorts of stuff. So, just would prefer us to give a light touch on that topic, and hope that the ombuds office will be smart and professional than dealing with these issues. Thanks.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. Sébastien speaking. Just before giving the floor to Herb. One of the reasons I am raising this issue, it's because Board resolution is talking about that and asking our suggestion, help from staff, if there is this, and it's why I agree with you. If we can be as light as possible, it would be great.

But now it's on the table. I will put the last resolve on this, and the last part of the sentence, it's really what we were talking about, but maybe Herb, have some more inputs on that. And thank you Cheryl for raising this issue again. Herb, please, go ahead.

HERB WAYE: Merci, Sébastien. Herb Waye for the record. My quick, immediate, best case scenario would be to have a female adjunct, but I'm heading to LA in about 10 days because there are, of course, contract issues that have to be looked at. Not just my contract, but there is some of the things

that we've talked about previously in this subgroup is the term of the ombuds contract.

And so, before I can move ahead with hiring this female adjunct who would be able to assist me with the harassment issues, I have to talk with ICANN Legal about where the office is going to be moving forward. So, that would be my ideal solution, somebody I could train up on, or would have training on harassment, dealing with harassment issues. I've looked at both involving community, and involving people from the ICANN corporation.

And I don't think either of those would be good solutions for two reasons. One is confidentiality of the office, and the other would be conflict of interest that may arise having some that's actively involved in either the community or the organization cooperation, assisting matters like that.

So, it's a work in progress, and I'm hoping to have a solid answer for this moving forward, very shortly. That's it, thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. And I think this discussion and exchange was very useful. We have just few minutes to go, and I suggest that we go to the next part, is to talk about the calendar, and I didn't change anything on the roadmap, but review, but we will have more idea when the survey will be done, and we will have to figure out the…

Then, when we can a first report, and because obviously, we're supposed to have an interim report by the end of this month, and it's

not that the case, and it's okay with us. I guess, but then we will have to figure out what will be the schedule.

And our next call, we will get back to our three hours change, with the summer hour in the northern hemisphere, and the summer hours in the other part of the world, I guess, but it will change for some of us. Slightly, the call, and then the next call will be the number 20, and it will be on Monday, [inaudible] and 17.

Any other business?

Okay. If not, I just want to remind all of you, if you have something specific to get back from the other subgroup, that to be taken care by our ombuds subgroup, just feel free to do it. And that's the last part of the presentation and documents. And I would like to thank you very much once again for your participation. And talk to you soon, during our next call at 7 PM UTC or 19:00 UTC, as you wish.

Have a good week, and once again, thank you very much. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]