RAW FILE

ICANN
JUNE 15, 2017
8:00 A.M. CST
OMBUDSMAN SUBGROUP MEETING

***
***

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Just a reminder, everyone, if you're not speaking, please put yourself on mute. I'm certainly hearing a TV in the background there somewhere. Thank you.

>>SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Hello, everybody. This is Sebastien speaking to check if my audio is working and if you can hear me okay?

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: We hear you loud and clear, Sebastien. Thank you.

>>SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Bernie. Okay. Don't know if we will have more people coming.

Okay. If you agree, we will start the call. I know that there is a rule that we are supposed to be five, but I think it's our last call before the face-to-face meeting. Let's start the recording please.

>> This meeting is now being recorded.

>>SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Sebastien Bachollet speaking, Rapporteur of this subgroup on the ICANN Ombuds' Office, and welcome to all the participants. Thank you for this -- for coming here.

As you have seen, it's a new date. We were supposed to meet on Monday, but the fact that the document, we are not always send on Monday or maybe Tuesday, but I would not allow us to have any discussion on that.

Now, we can do that and it's our last call before the face-to-face meeting and so the goal of this call, it's really to go through your comments on the second draft version of the report from our reviewer.

And thank you, Phil, to be with us today. It's -- it will be the main part of our discussions, and we will take, I guess, something like 10 minutes about -- when we will get the final report,

what we will get as the plenary and any other meetings we would like to have or will try to have in Johanesburg.

I don't think that we will go through a presentation of the document. It's a second version. We already discussed this Version 2, I don't know, 10 days ago, and what I would like very much is maybe for you just to give us a little sense of what are the most important change.

I guess, for example, now you have a recommendation with a number of recommendations, and I think it's a main change but maybe you have others and just to tell us about that. And then I would like very much that the participants, if they wish so, give us feedback on the document.

As I was very vocal during the last call, I will try to be as much as possible, not entering into any detail on the document from my side, but I hope that you will do it.

I see that you may not have received the second draft version? It was sent on Tuesday. I guess, from my side it was for the (?). I don't know the path, but Monday or Tuesday or something like that. We'll check. Okay.

Phil, may I give you the floor and just if you want to give you a short summary of what you have -- what are the main changes from the first version and we can start with that. Thank you.

 >> PHIL KHOURY: Okay. Thanks, Sebastien. I think there is a number of detail changes throughout the document trying to clear up the language and remove, you know, any confusions due to my sloppy

use of the English language, so there are dozens and dozens of fixes through there. Lots of Sebastien's feedback that helped a great deal in that space.

We have added an executive summary, and now added, as Sebastien mentions, explicit recommendations in the recommendations area rather than discussing the directions, it now discusses and adds a specific recommendation.

Look, I think the main things, there is a couple of places where we've been asked to be, perhaps, are a little more specific, give a few more examples, and so we flushed things out in a couple of places like that, but they're the main -- the main changes really about clarity and completing sections that were just waiting on an initial approval and some more examples and some more specific information supporting the recommendations. I think that's all really by way of summary, Sebastien.

>>SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Phil. But first, I want to clear out -- I didn't send the new report to the full group, and I now I must admit that I didn't check that, and I would like to apologize for that because it's my mistake. I think you don't have the second draft.

If someone from staff can send it straight on, and once again really, I apologize if I have done -- if I have forgotten about that.

My suggestion is that we take the new second draft and we go through the recommendation. I guess it will be the best use of our time if we can have that done. It would be great. And once again, I apologize for not taking care of that to send you this second draft version. I don't know if -- who will be able to switch the PowerPoint to the PDF or PowerPoint sent by Phil?

(silence).

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: So, you want us to put up the document from Phil? We can do that. That just take a minute.

>>SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Please.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. Give us a minute and we'll get that up. Thank you.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: The time to come on that, I guess we can go when we have it, and I will start by reading some recommendation. It's number one up to, I guess, nine. We have nine recommendations, and I would like us to go through these nine recommendations. If I make me mistake or if I forget something, just tell me I am wrong, and I will read the first one just to allow time for finding the right version.

The Recommendation One is a statement in Article 5 of the ICANN Ombuds' Charter, should be changed to give the most strategic focus. Maybe I can try to do that -- to simplify your life here. Okay. Now you have the Recommendation 1 on the chat and you'll soon have it on the larger screen.

Any comments on that? If you are looking to page -- it will

be Page 37. Maybe, Phil, you can give us two or three words or five on that. What are the main reasons for having this recommendation and the main issue and work we're left to do on that?

>> PHIL KHOURY: Look, I don't think it's -- thanks, Sebastien. It's not -- this is not a crucial recommendation, but we think there is value if there is going to be a sort of relaunch of the Ombuds' function for ICANN to re-express the purpose of the function in the bylaws, so this is not a radical change really, but it's really trying to set out how we think the role has and should evolve for, say, the next 5 to 10-year period and just make it clearer, firstly, that the role of the ombudsman is all about confidence in fairness and then just set out some points that describe it a bit more in a bit more practical terms than the current bylaws.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. 37, it's a little -- two or three pages before, a little bit before. It's here.

I think it's an important point for our subgroup work because here you can see that there is a proposal to make a change into the bylaws and we have to look into the bylaw how we can change it and what we can propose as a new bylaw text. I think we need to take that and involve it in the next part of our work.

Okay. Let's go to Recommendation Number 2. Okay. Recommendation Number 2 is on Page 38, and I will read it to be sure that everybody knows what we're talking about.

The ombudsman framework should be replaced by procedures that -- first bullet point -- distinguish between different categories of complaints and explain how each will be handled.

Second bullet point, set out the kinds of matters where the Ombuds will usually not intervene, and where these matters are likely to be referred with the complainant's permission.

And thirdly, provide illustrative examples to deepen the understanding of the Ombuds' approach. And, I guess the second recommendation is a little bit linked to the diagram on the next page.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Phil, you will explain a little bit, but I have Bernie with, and please Bernie if you want to.

>> PHIL KHOURY: Okay. Just a couple of words. We found and probably labored it in the report that there were -- there are sort of a number of different environments and different types of complaints operating within the ICANN ecosystem, and that a single universal approach by the Ombuds' function isn't appropriate to all of those different types of complaints in different communities.

And, I think this is practical this is actually what happens in the Ombuds' world. This is what Herb is doing every day, is deciding the right approach to take depending on the type of

complaint it is; but we found that stakeholders within the community, the ecosystem if you like, didn't sort of understand the differences and that's sort of the part of the way in which we think we can manage expectations better is to make it more explicit that there are different paths that are appropriate for different complaints and that the ombudsman will have different capacity to intervene or to help or will use different procedures for different styles of complaints.

Again, it's not rocket science, but I think we think if it's clearer to people that that's how it works, you will have -- you will minimize the degree of, you know, disappointment or people not -- you know, the Ombuds' function not meeting their expectations.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Phil. Sebastien speaking. Bernie, please?

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. Two points. The first one is with respect to Recommendation 1. I've been working with the co-chairs and other staff and we'll be producing -- we have produced the first draft of Best Practices for Recommendations and just a note that in there we're saying that if you're recommending -- you should avoid if at all possible requesting changes to the bylaws unless it's absolutely and critically needed, so just fair warning on that.

The second thing is, on this second recommendation that seems to simply provide an observation, that seems to dovetail nicely with some of the work being done in the Staff Accountability Group. Thank you.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Bernie. Good inputs, and we will have to take that into consideration. Phil, I don't think that it may change your proposal. It will be our work to see how we on the, if any proposal, to change the bylaw, but I understand both point of views. The one that we must not change at all, and people who suggest to make changes and we will have to take that into account, but I don't think that it's for you to change anything in your recommendation. And thank you for the -- we will need to discuss with the subgroup on the stuff contributed.

Okay. If no more hands up, I suggest to go to Recommendation 3, and it's on Page 41 -- no. 40. Sorry.

Recommendation 3, once ICANN has agreed to revise the configuration of the Office of the Ombuds, a plan should be developed for soft relaunch of the function which should incorporate action to emphasize the importance of the Ombuds' function by all relevant parts of ICANN, including the Board, CEO, WS2 Subgroup, Complaints Officer, et cetera. Phil, if you want to say a few words on that recommendation?

>> PHIL KHOURY: Look, I don't think I need to add anything. I think the profile of the Ombuds' function is dictated by a large

extent by the way the rest of the organization talks about it and treats it and the importance that accords it, and we're really just reminding ICANN here that there is an opportunity if the recommendations are accepted, and there is a -- a relaunch of the Ombuds' function, if there is an opportunity to remind everyone of its presence and, you know, where it sits in the system.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Thank you, Phil. Sebastien speaking. Any comments, questions? Bernie, you have your hand raised.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sebastien. Simply a timeline note. I note that in this recommendation you have the Work Stream 2 Subgroup by the time the CCWG-Accountability makes the recommendations and they'll approved it and will be all but disbanded, so I'm not sure if it's applicable to have Work Stream 2 Subgroup in there. Thank you.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Maybe if we can suggest something, it's to put something like -- I guess the subgroup came from the Work Stream 2 of the (?). And these came from -- so I see we'll create this cross-community working group, and if you wish to change something, and I think Bernie is right on that, it's to talk about the community in a broader sense, but I concur with what Bernie just said. Okay.

>> PHIL KHOURY: Okay. I'll talk about that -- we'll talk about words offline. Yeah. Okay.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:Okay.   Let's go to the next recommendation. It's Recommendation 4.Recommendation 4, the ICANN bylaws should be amended to oblige all relevant parts of ICANN and should include the cooperation or board of committee and anybody or group with democratic or designated authority to respond within 90 days or 120 days with reason to a formal report or report to the Office of the Ombuds. The response should indicate the substantive response along with reasons. Bernie, go ahead, please.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. I won't repeat my previous comment on changing the bylaws. However, I will note that if you're trying to change -- the SOs and ACs are constituted in the ICANN bylaws, and if we're trying to change something in the SO/ACs fundamental mode of operation, in some cases, those SO/ACs must run through their process to approve such changes. And so basically, this recommendation, if it's making that requirement, it's essentially gone from being a very big project in changing bylaws to increasing it possibly by an order of magnitude. Thank you.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Bernie. Very useful comment. May I ask that when we finish this call, this -- the comments and specifically the one made by Bernie on each of the recommendations be extracted from the captioning or transcript or whatever and put it through one page for each recommendation in maybe a Wiki or something like that. It would be very useful.

And once again, for Phil, I don't think that it is for you to change that, but we, as a subgroup, will have to take that into account and, yes, it's very important what Bernie told us now.

>> PHIL KHOURY: This is Phil here, Sebastien. I'm completely comfortable with that. This was exactly what we hoped to do, is flush out what are the practical reasons or ways in which you might achieve something like this. Completely in your hands on this.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. Okay. Thank you. If there are no other comments, then let's go to the next recommendation. Recommendation 5, the Office of the Ombuds should be configured so that it has formal mediation training and experience within its capabilities.

From our last discussion, it was recommended that the Ombuds could have this mediation training and experience, and after discussion, we feel that what is important. It's not that the Ombuds itself or the Ombuds' person, but the head of the office or whatever you want to call him, but it's that within the office, if there are more than one people, someone with this specific skill.

Okay. If no comments or questions, let's go to Number 6, Recommendation Number 6. I guess it's Page 43. I will read Recommendation 6. ICANN should establish an Ombuds Adversary Panel made up of five or six members to act as advisor, supporter, wise counsel, and an accountability mechanism for the Ombuds. The panel should be made up with two members with ombudsman experience and two to three members with extensive ICANN experience.

Phil, if you want to give us your thought about that.

>> PHIL KHOURY: The first thing I should say is that we will -- for the next version of this, we will next week, we'll expand this, the commentary around this documentation a little bit and make it sort of clearer or more exactly what we're talking about.

It's really most ombudsman schemes that we're aware of operate with an independent board of some kind. In the ICANN setting, that's not really a doable thing, but the Board serves an important function for the ombudsman in providing a sounding board, some wise counsel, holding them accountable for performance, that kind of thing.

And, this idea is really to create a less formal mechanism than a proper independent board, but something that can make or assist the Ombuds function to operate over time. So again, this is something we think would be very useful for people to test in discussions.

>> ASHA: Sorry. This is Asha. Could you come closer to the microphone. I'm having trouble hearing you.

>> PHIL KHOURY: Having trouble with the handset on the phone. Asha, I'll try that again.

>> ASHA: This is much better, whatever you're doing now is

good. Yes, yes, thank you. Thank you.

>> PHIL KHOURY: Yeah. So, this is really a way of building a support mechanism for the Ombuds' function that can still fit into the ICANN governance schema, but be more dedicated to what's involved, and so that's what the suggestion is for and it's something that we think would be good to test with people but we will put some more details into the proposal for a version for you to take to ICANN 59.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Good. Thank you, Phil. Sebastien speaking. Any comments, questions?

Okay. Now, we need to stay on the same page, please, because there is another recommendation on the same page. It's Recommendation Number 7. The bylaw and the Ombuds' employment contract should be revised to strengthen independence by allowing for a 5-year fixed term, including a 12-month probationary period, and permitting only one extension of up to 3 years.The Ombuds should only be able to be terminated with cause. Phil, do you want to say a few words on that?

>> PHIL KHOURY: Look, I think it speaks for itself. We did receive quite a bit of feedback where stakeholders felt that the previous ombudsman's independence was compromised in the period that he wasn't sure he was going to have his contract extended, and I think that's an optical thing that you want to do the best that you can to avoid.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Thank you. Any comments? Yes, Bernie, go ahead.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Just a thought, as I read Recommendation 5 and 6 as a question to Phil, could the question of independence be linked in a way to the establishment of the advisory panel?

>> PHIL KHOURY: Definitely. Yeah. Definitely.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you.

>> PHIL KHOURY: Quite a bit of the feedback -- again, depending where the feedback came from, felt that the Ombudsman Office as it stands, seemed to be too close to the Board and to the Corporation and the panel would be a way of helping to, I suppose, show a little bit of independence in the oversight. Thanks.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Thank you, Phil. Thank you, Bernie. Any other comments?

If not, Recommendation Number 8, it's the next page, end of the page. I'll read it through. Recommendation 8, the Ombuds, should have as part of the business plan, the obligation to report annually, to publish reports on activity and to collect and publish statistics and complaint trend information and to publicize systemic improvements arising from the Ombuds' work. Phil, do you want to say anything?

>> PHIL KHOURY: No. Only that this is not a significant

change. Herb is planning to restore most of this, but there was a period where the reporting and evidence of activity dropped away under the previous Ombudsman and that was commented on by people, and I think this is a recommendation to just aim at making sure that it's understood what the obligation is on the ombudsman to publicize their work.

There is a philosophical fine point in this because at one level, people want some complaints to be dealt with in a very confidential way and to make the least amount of fuss about it. But in other ways, it allows you to promote confidence in the fairness of the ICANN ecosystem and the fairness of the organization. You need to make sure people understand what is going on in the work that is done, so it's not always straightforward, but I think it's important to make it clear that there is value and importance in that public information.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Phil. Sebastien speaking. Any other comments? I see in the chats, Herb says the Ombuds' annual report will be published shortly after Johanesburg. I think that's the first step, but we need to have that -- I would say, an obligation of annual reports would be great.

Okay. Thank you for your comments, and now let's go to the last recommendation. I think it's Recommendation 9 with input from across the community. ICANN should develop a policy for any Ombuds'' involvement in complaints work that addresses value added. For example, whether the ombudsman is likely to have sufficient content do understand and evaluate transactions, if the Ombuds is uniquely placed to add genuine value by way of comment.

Reporting, like where there is a proposed function report to ICANN management and there is a risk that the role will be seen as answerable to and part of management. If the purpose, function of the reports to the Board or Committee whether that will be sufficiently seen as independent.

And the third one, reviewable, whether it's likely the Ombuds will be expected to review a matter in the Ombuds' function had been involved in originally, or whether the involvement will be a substantive and/or perceived conflict of interest.

Okay. Any -- Phil, you want to say something on that?

>> PHIL KHOURY: Look, it's just --

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Phil. It seems that it has three, but we have a follow-up on this because there are, four, five, six, seven, eight, are also embedded on Recommendation 9 on the next page, or am I wrong?

>> PHIL KHOURY: No. No. That's true. It's not really in a very good form as a recommendation, but it was trying to illustrate the kind of issues that need to be tested when you give functions to an Ombuds' person or the function.

So, the first three are the tests, the initial tests that

should be sort of considered in deciding whether you choose to have the Ombuds Office do some additional function, and that just goes on with four, five, six, seven, and eight are other headings that you would test in terms of whether the Ombuds could add value to a non-complaint function. That would help -- help I think decide whether to do it. And if you decided to do it, how to design the process and how to design the Ombuds participation in the issue.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Thank you. Bernie, please?

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sebastien. A question for Phil. I'm understanding most of these or the general intent. I'm having problems with the first one on value-add. Could you talk a bit more about that?

>> PHIL KHOURY: Look, the -- I guess the question is whether the ombudsman can -- either has the skills necessarily -- the Ombuds Office has the skills to understand and evaluate transactions. For example, Herb's office is now involved in, you know, sort of formal review function, which is probably going to be outsourced for the sort of legal content. So, we would ask the question, is there enough content expertise in here to sort of really understand and evaluate what's going on? Is the ombudsman uniquely placed for that?

It's really saying, yes, the ombudsman might be seen as a fair and honest broker, but when you look at the actual work that's being expected to go through in the Ombuds Office, will the ombudsman have enough understanding of the issue and the technical aspects of it, small t, technical aspects of it, to really add any value to it.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. That helps, but I'm still struggling with the word transaction.

>> PHIL KHOURY: Oh, okay. Yeah. We used the term transaction earlier on the page where we described three ways in which the matters might involve the Ombuds function, so transactional is where a particular type of matter or, you know, a request for a particular review or a freedom of information request, it's where the Ombuds is being expected to process routinely each matter that comes up under that sort of heading.

So, shorthand is using the term transactional for that, as opposed to being responsible for the policy for some oversight or design function. It's actually doing the task.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you.

>> PHIL KHOURY: I don't know if that helps, Bernie, but I'll take another look at the language.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: I think, great. Thank you.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Other comments? Do you want me to finish to read the recommendation? Yeah, we'll do that. The next page it says a follow-up on the Recommendation Number 9, and it reads like this. For implementation monitoring of a fairness

policy -- and Number 4 is -- the function is primarily management whether there is sufficient separation of the Ombuds role. Five, where the Ombuds is being asked to manage implementation, is there sufficient discretion for the Ombuds' operator to add their own work. The Ombuds function should not become -- sorry, should not become overwhelmed with routine work and lose the ability to follow its own priorities for complaints. And six, for Ombuds involvement with the line of new or revised policy or process, there should be an avoidance of any impression of a seal of approval. Inputs should take the form of a fairness risk assessment.

Number 7, the Ombuds' input is not seen as the (?) thing for full stakeholder consultation.

And 8, the Ombuds' ability to review matters that have been through the process or where the policy applies for not being compromised, the (?) will not be compromised. Sorry.

We have 15 minutes to go before the end of this call. I guess, Bernie, it's a new --

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Oh --

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Phil, you want to add something on that?

>> PHIL KHOURY: Yes. Looking at this now, I think I'll rewrite the recommendation just to simplify it and pull the examples out of the recommendations because it's become far too long to follow properly.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Yes, it's a good idea.

On this page where we talk about other functions, we will not discuss it now but I think it's important to have that discussed by (?) or when we have our face-to-face meeting. But the two examples are taken through the request from other subgroups. One about the IDP and the policy about the documentation possibility to access, and the second it's about the proposal from the diversity subgroup of the office of diversity.

It came to me after reading all of that, that if, as it is suggested here, it's not within the Ombuds' function that we think that it's a good idea to have that. We will have not as a subgroup, but I guess the Work Stream 2, in general, we will have to discuss about where it could go.

And, it's raised the question of the document I made before and I present during the face-to-face meeting, during the live ICANN meeting about the creation of the Office of Complaints, knowing that today we have the complaints office, we have the Ombuds, I would say we've brought -- with taking some carefully -- carefully saying that, but it's the case today. And having a third one dealing directly with the community.

But at the same time, this report came with a proposal to have this panel who will decrease the link between the Ombuds function with the Board, and maybe my idea about three offices, it's not

anymore, a good idea. But, whatever we decide in that direction, we would have to figure out how we can have these, at least two, additional functions to be on there somewhere within the ICANN ecosystem. And that's something I would like you to think about and we can discuss during next call. Bernie, please, go ahead.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sebastien. If we're going to discuss an updated version of this document in Johanesburg, I would need it as I posted last night, by end of business on Monday so that it can be distributed to the group. Thank you.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, thank you. I guess, Phil, you're aware of that and you will take care, I guess, that the next version -- I will be happy to go through the changes, but as soon as it's done, we will send it to -- Bernie will get it and then we can send it to the full participants of the Work Stream 2.

>> PHIL KHOURY: Yep. Okay.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. I don't think we have many additional things to discuss here. I just want to tell you that I asked Phil also to have one or two pages as an addendum with just a recommendation to be an easier to discuss documents and to refer to.

And as it is on Monday, if you -- and once again I'm really sorry that I didn't send you the document prior to this call, but now that you have it if you can take the next two days to review it and send your comments on the List, it will be very useful if it you have something to add, to comment, or a question because that document on Monday will be then even more accurate.

And with all of that, we will have a document on Monday and then the goal is to have it discussed -- to have some discussion on that in Johanesburg.

Maybe I can ask Lars if you agree to tell us what is your -- your thinking about the next step and things that we can organize ourselves. We have 10 minutes to go, and I think it's good timing.

>> LARS HOFFMANN: Thank you, Sebastien. This is Lars. I'll take the floor, if I may. Can you hear me okay?

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. Go ahead.

>> LARS HOFFMANN: Okay. Great. Yes, the next steps, so I suppose it can be answered in two ways. The next steps, I think for the group in looking ahead for Phil and Debra to conclude their work. I think the ideas at the moment to give you some time to discuss this in Johanesburg, and then provide a final round of feedback by the 7th of July, which is the Friday after the end of the ICANN meeting. Ideally on List, we could start a call on that Friday as well, but obviously that didn't really sit with the usual timing of this call, so that's up to you how you want to organize that.

And then Phil and Debra have agreed to, obviously, subject

to the amount of feedback that they receive, for them to make their final, final report as it were, on the 14th of July, which is also a Friday or shortly thereafter.

And so, for the meetings, for the team members if you can hold a meeting on Thursday to consolidate the meeting to ensure everything is in place before to Phil and Debra, that might be useful. Otherwise, we can do that maybe on List, and I would suggest a call maybe the next one after that, the 14th -- on Monday, the 17th of July, but that's up to you, Sebastien. By that time, I should have the final report in your hands and that leads me nicely to the second point about process and what happens when Phil and Debra submit the report. What happens to the report? That was something that was discussed last week, and I kind of gave an answer but I wasn't entirely sure.

My understanding is that the report will go to you, the Subteam and then feed into, obviously, the work of Work Stream 2 and be part of any recommendations or conclusions that come out of that, and will which then undergo the approval process, public comments, Board resolution, et cetera at the end of that.

It will also go to the Board and that's where the confusion was last time. What can the Board do? The Board will not act on this in any way. I've been informed. Before Work Stream 2 has made a recommendation, and before the Board hasn't reacted to or approved of the Work Stream 2 outcome and is also, to my understanding, no reason to believe that the Board would recommend anything different to what the Work Stream 2 comes up with, at least that's the viewpoint at this moment. I hope this is helpful. Sebastien, any follow-up questions for now?

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, one. Thank you, Lars. Just to be sure, can you tell again when you think that it will be useful to have a call of this group? I heard you talking about the 3rd of July, the 7th of July, the 17 of July, both of them, some of them, and can you tell us again when you want -- when you think it will be useful for our group to meet?

>> LARS HOFFMANN: Thanks, Sebastien. I'm sorry for not being as clear as I would have liked to be. So, the current deadlines for work, that's what I'm going to start with, are the 7th of July, a Friday for feedback, and then the 14th of July for Phil and Debra to submit the final report.

Based on that, I would suggest that you could have a call on Thursday, the 6th of July, the day before the feedback is due, to make sure that perhaps if that call would be to consolidate feedback received from during Johanesburg and then pass it on to Phil and Debra. And then I would recommend, the next call after that to be back on the usual Monday slot, on the 17th of July, which is when you will have received the final report that Phil and Debra have concluded their work, and then it will be up to you to incorporate

the outcome of this into your own Work Stream 2 work.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Thank you very much. And, you suggest the 6th of July. Maybe I will -- okay. We'll check with the timing, but I think if we want to be sure that Phil and Debra take on board everything we say, maybe we need to give them 48 hours and not just 24 hours, and I would suggest maybe the 5th of July. But we will check on that and come back to you, and then some time on the 17th of July, it will start to become difficult. Some people will be on holiday, I may be traveling to Africa; I don't know yet, but we'll manage that and see how we can do that.

Thank you, Lars, for your comments and inputs. Bernie, please? We have 3 minutes to go.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sebastien. Simply a note. Let's not forget that a lot of our staff support is based in the U.S. and that the 4th of July is a very large and important holiday for that segment, and so the 4th and 5th may be difficult. We can make arrangements, of course, if we know ahead of time, but this is my plea to you that the 6th would be -- would probably be better and the sooner the better if we know exactly when you want to hold those meetings. Thank you.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. I understand, and I just -- just to be open with you, the 6th of July I have a full day of the committee searching for the new CEO of (?), so I might be a little bit busy, but I will check to see if we can do that at the last slot of the day.

And, I know that some of you are not very happy with this, but I will not be able to do anything on 6th, but let's check and I will come back to you Bernie and see what are the different possibilities.

My last point, and I would like very much you to think about that and maybe we can have some exchange on mail of what we want to achieve during Johanesburg. If we want to have comments, of course, we will make a presentation on the plenary. But, do we want to send a short document to have some feedback? It's not a comment period, it's not something I will say, but also to have some feedback from SO and ACs? I know that normally we're supposed to go first to plenary, but if we want to take into account Johanesburg, maybe we can ask the subgroup that if they make some reporting to their SO/AC constituency and so on and give us feedback. It's at least my suggestion, but I would like you to think about and to tell me if you agree with that. Bernie, please.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Just a note. An official request to SOs and ACs during a policy forum, and I started requesting some of these more than a month ago for other groups, were met with death silence. If you're not on the schedule for an official presentation to SOs or ACs in Johanesburg, I don't think anything is going to work. If people are asked about it, that's great.

The second point I'll make is that, I don't think it's very practical, just from obtaining comments and working in the results of that, to go to both the community and the plenary. The plenary is looking forward to this report. There will be sufficient time to discuss it and gather input, and let's not forget that the members and the participants in the plenary do represent all of the SOs and ACs. Thank you.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Bernie. I agree with you, that's why I was most thinking about us as a member of the Subgroup, to take on any of that discussion in our SO or AC or Subgroup of the community. But thank you very much, and now we are one minute late and you may have some other calls starting at 2:00 p.m. UTC.

Thank you very much for your participation. If you have any comments, additional questions, feel free to send that to the List. It will be very useful, and thank you for your participation, and see you in Johanesburg for the ones traveling, and keep in touch for the others.

Phil, thank you very much for your participation and your document, and talk to you soon. Bye-bye. The call is adjourned. Bye.

>> Bye.
>> Bye.
(call completed at 9:02 a.m. CST)

Services provided by:
        Caption First, Inc.
        P.O. Box 3066
        Monument, CO 80132
        800-825-5234
        www.captionfirst.com

***
This text is being provided in a realtime format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.
***