Raw Captioning Notes:

CCWG_Ombudman Subgroup_ Meeting #26_ 19 July 2017.

MR. BACHOLLET: Check.

Can you hear me?

>> Yes, I can hear you. Are you able to see the Adobe room yet Sebastien?

>> I didn't hear you quite well. Can you repeat please snr.

>> I say, are you able to see the Adobe room at of yet?

>> No, I am oo on my Mobile for a moment. It will take 10, 15 minutes to walk home.

I was outside. I will be outside of a train. It will be okay for for sound but not tore the

Adobe Connect. But I'll manage.

>> All right. We'll do.

>> (indiscernible).

MR. BACHOLLET: Everyone on the. Line.

1234679 I am uncertain if you can hear me at this point.

MR. BACHOLLET: Yes, I can hear you, no problem. I don't know if you can hear me.

But I will mute my phone.

>> Very well. No problem.

It's one minute to the hour. I would suggest, we've already got our six participants,

so we're good. Let's give it a few more minutes. I'll come back on the line at about 3

in four minutes and then we'll get the call going; if that's okay with you?

MR. BACHOLLET: Yeah. No problem. It's great. Thank you.

>> Okay. So, everyone, we'll get going in about three minutes. Thank you.

>> All right, everyone, we've seemed to reach a stable number of participants. Saying

that, I will turn it over.

MR. BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. And the recording started? (this meeting is

now being recorded).

MR. BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Welcome to this 26th meeting of the I [-P]

ka*n Ombuds meeting of the accountability work extreme on.

Well take the participation from the list and in the connect room. Plus people like me

who are just on a phone, anybody else on the phone?

Okay. Thank you.

I guess you have reconnect for the PowerPoint I just sent. And if somebody could go

to the agenda for today. The theme of the agenda is to give our final words with the

reviewer about their review and we will have some homework to do, but that's the

main topic.

Then I would like to try to see what are our next steps and how we organize the work

to try to write the report from the subgroup, including the report from the reviewer,

and to be able to give that on time in the current schedule for the work extreme 2.

Any questions, comments?

.

>> Is he bass tun, it's fill Cory here, just joining.

MR. BACHOLLET: Thank you. Welcome. Sorry to have this call while we're calling

from the other side of the world for me. Very early in the morning. Thank you.

Okay. If no, I suggest that we go to the next slide, and again, I don't have all my mind,

but I guess if we go.

>> The next slide is participation and dashboard, Sebastien.

>> Okay. I guess we can go through that quickly. Just usual slides and the okay you

paetion, I tried to track who is participating and so on.

Let's go to the report and to the page with the recommendation. I put a

recommendation, the page with one recommendation on each page and the goal

will be not today, but to fulfill our comments specifically on that. And just to let you

know at the end of the 11th, the two or three slides and one is about overall

comments, if we have any on the report.

.

>> We are now on the slide that says recommendation 1.

MR. BACHOLLET: There. -- great. I don't know how the last one to proceed, but I guess let's go to each recommendation and if we have any comments to the reviewer, because we think if there is something they need to change, not the comments we want to make as a group to plan for the workstream 2 Working Group. It's the right time to do that.

And if you have nothing to say about the recommendation 1, let's go to next slide, recommendation 2. And I don't know if the sound will be very good, because I will go through my building to go to my apartment. Then sorry for that, but I will be home very soon.

Is there any comments on the recommendation 2? Let's go to the next one, recommendation 3.

Recommendation 4.

Recommendation 5.

Recommendation 6.

I will not have time to be back home and we will finish the call.

Recommendation 7.

8.

9.

10.

.

>> Hold on Sebastien, we have the host in the room presenting. Has her hand up.

MR. BACHOLLET: Okay, go ahead.

>> Hi, [A*ED] [A*ED] speaking. Thank you Sebastien. As I said in my email, I am not

quite sure about the recommendation to have the ombudsman five-year fixed term.

And I understand the merits behind it. I understand the rationale behind this because we want to give the openly Bud kind of like the convenience that they will be in this role for five years, and it is not temporary, so that they can focus on, on the tasks; and not be worried about months essentially.

But I don't think that's how we can solve the problem of putting the ombudsman in an economy vacuum.

As long as ombudsman, the Ombuds office is one person whose well being and worth of revenue depends on ICANN, and depends on this contract, it will not be feasible for them to, to just focus on the task and not have the economy incentive. And I am not suggest and this is all related to the design of the office; whether hard office is funded and how it is designed. Now I'm not saying that I can not be paying ombudsman. I'm saying that the design should be different. It will not solve the problem, but for long gaetion of the Ombuds contract and giving them five-year fixed term.

Thank you.

MR. BACHOLLET: Thank you for that. I may come to reconnect hopefully.

Any other comments on that?

>> Is bell Cheryl here.

>> Go ahead, Cheryl, thank you very much.

>> [TH*E] Sebastien.

I am not quite as convinced about a five year argument as I think others may be. I do infact see benefit in strengthening the independence of the Ombuds employment with some form of fixed term and extension predictability and I'm very comfortable with the proposal for discussion, the termination clause as to recommendation 9, but I'm very aware that we're having this conversation in the absolute absence of herb

being on this call.

I am aware and perhaps you all can help me. Phil, if you don't mind jumping in here. I have assumed that this recommendation is based in what would be known as an industrial best practice in the Ombuds world. And if that's the case, then I really would think that us as a working party suggesting a change to the recommendation isn't really a terribly good idea.

Phil, am I correct in that?

>> Yes. Thanks, Cheryl. That's pretty common practice in ombudsman's offices including parliament tree, government ombudsman and industry ombudsman, to provide the Ombuds with a fixed term employment contract. It's not perfect. probably near impossible to have a, any sort of remuneration framework for an ombudsman that completely eliminates in any thoughts of bias or economic pressure, but this is the best thing that people have come up with so far. And we put it in because it was raised by a number of stakeholders that they variously thought the previous ombudsman had not been as independent as they should be or at least seem as not independent dent at times when their contract was up or when they didn't have the certainty of fixed term, but I expect it is not perfect. I think it's just the best thing we were able to dig up for this sort of thing.

>> Thanks very much, fill. -- Phil. And I should just mention your comments. I'm clear that it's an office not an individual. You've got two hands up, Sebastien, you have (indiscernible).

>> Go ahead, please.

>> Thank you. This is a very, we have been reiterating this point that I can't see a very different organization than other the additions that are in the industry.

And when I say that Ombuds, at the moment as ICANN, Ombuds is just limited to one person. And it's internal Ombuds. I don't think this is working. And I don't think that,

I don't think that we can solve the independence problem by giving the Ombuds a fixed term, because of what I said, because, and you do, still the well being of the Ombuds is related, is reliant on that contract, and I have, trust me I have scheduled Ombuds functions before. I have studied dispute resolution. One of the solutions is to give them fixed term contracts, but where? And we have to consider the nature of the relations and transactions that go on, and the disputes that go on at ICANN. With a fixed term contract this will not, the indense problem will not be solved.

Anyway, I'm not going to argue over this. I just want my comments to be acknowledged. (indiscernible) for the good members or the brother community, then, then we can just take it there. I don't, I'm not saying that it should be changed, I just want my comments acknowledged.

MR. BACHOLLET: Thank you for that. (indiscernible) please.

>> Thank you, this is clause for the record. I fully understand where recommendation 9 comes from. And I know it fully, it goes very well with industry standard, but I have to support fast na*i in her point, I think she makes a valid point. And I think what, I would like to say here, is yes, this is one of the solutions, but we should be wear that there is, we should be able to do better. If we were able to do better in the short term, I don't know, but I think we should be aware that this is, it's a solution but it's not a very strong solution. Thank you.

>> Thank you kla*us. Sebastien speaking again. If you allow me, just, we talk about the independence, and remember that the previous recommendation is also about independence. And the recommendation 8, it's one where it will allow the Ombuds office to be less in the end of the board as currently.

So, second item in your comments related to that, the office of the ombudsman is just one person. I guess it's right and it's right now only, because before there were two, there were Ombuds and then adjunct Ombuds. And the fact that we are, with

this addition of just one. And I am not sure, I guess of the situation, but is because the board didn't want to take any further action before we as subgroup and then as workstream 2 group gave our report, and this is on taken by the (indiscernible) participating to this workstream 2.

And, other proposal here, it's not just to have one person, but to have a real office with some different skills and some differences in the people who are a member of this office.

And remember also that it's suggested that, and I don't know the number of the recommendation, but it is a review will be done in five years. And if we are smart enough, I we can organize the things to have a review before the term of the Ombuds and to see how we can either give an extension or change the people in charge of this ICANN Ombuds office.

But I guess also that all these questions, useful, and will be taken (indiscernible). I am not sure that we need to ask the reviewer to change their mind. What we need to do is what I suggest in recommendation 9 comments, and we need and I would like to ask you to write a short comment on [THAP] and on other, if you want, and we will have also, if Cheryl wants to make also an comment and other of course, to allow us to add comments on this, on each recommendation and to try to see what is the feeling of the Working Group.

That's where I think we are. Yes, fa*rs n*e, I see that you are also talking about the, the internal, external and the, that's something we will need to discuss also. But I don't think once again, as a goal for today, it's to say to the reviewer, yeah, go ahead, you have done your job. Maybe we can keep that in mind and have a discussion on that.

I have an opinion that I guess others have an opinion on that, but it's a fair points to be discussed by our group. I'm not sure that we need the reviewer. If the the

reviewer wants to give us the point of view on that also, they are more than welcome.

Okay, thank you. Last please, go ahead. If.

>> This is kla*us for the record. Yeah. I wanted to kind of (L A R S). I wanted to just cover something that you just said. Just kind of through my mind that everybody, I think the most effective time for this call and for the future to think about whether the recommendations made themselves are based on correct assumptions and correct test amount of the status quo. And I think as you said Sebastien we shouldn't, or you shouldn't, I'm not involved in your perception, but you shouldn't to try to maybe (indiscernible) that would change their recommendation, as an assessor. I think if you disagree with them, the ener probably best spent to then make your recommendation, the different recommendations to the board as part of the workstream 2 and then the board can take it from there.

Not for me to ascribe anything, but it seems the most effective way forward also the independence of camp Ron (indiscernible) adhere to.

And, that's all. I think we should talk about probably the, the way forward after the submission of the report later on the call, but I'll raise my hand again when we come to that. Thank you Sebastien.

MR. BACHOLLET: Thank you, la*rs. Just to summarize. We had a fuse full comment from fa*rs n*e, kla*us and Cheryl. We need to keep all that together and, sorry, yes, I didn't see your hand because I was down.

Go ahead, please. I will come back after. Go ahead, please Bernie.

>> Thank you. Can you hear me?

MR. BACHOLLET: Yes. Very well. Go ahead.

>> Okay. Thank you. Somewhat in line with what both yourself and la*rs.

MR. BACHOLLET: Sorry, is bern nard, you need to say your name.

>> Sorry, Bernard tour [KO*T]. Relative to what la*rs and Sebastien have said, it's almost as if (indiscernible) looking at this as the final report of this Working Group. And I don't see that at all. I think we've hired a consultant to help us do an evaluation based on industry best practices, and they've done that.

Now Twhat this group decides to do with it, is another story and once they, this group decides on its recommendations where this report will be annexed to those recommendations, it's got to go to the plenary. And the plenary has to go through them. And once the plenary is satisfied and we've reached an he can lib brum there, then it goes to public comment and people can comment and suggest things as they do and we've seen in the other public comments.

So, I don't see this as a very, as a terminal thing that we have to fix in this report.

Finally, just a personal comment from having followed this over the last few months, about the independence. Yes, I understand. I think I understand both sides in this, but as a person has said, yes, we keep saying, ICANN is a very special place. And it may be too absorbed to want to get someone who is too far removed from ICANN because this is such a special place.

Yes, I understand some of the problems that having someone more internal versus less external, but let's not forget the problems that having someone that is too far removed from ICANN can actually have. And that's purely a personal comment this this case.

Thank you.

MR. BACHOLLET: Thank you Bernie. And thank you for yowrp comments.

Looking as the final report, and yes we ask for comments. I would like to stress again that we are lookinging for comments and there are some I would say mistakes, but your comments will be taken into account in the next state of the work. No worry for all of you.

Can we go to, to the next recommendation, the recommendation 10. And if you have any dments on that -- comments on that.

Okay. If not, let's go to recommendation 11. And he ge -- and I guess this recommendation, it's one where we will have, I will say a lot of work from our subgroup to do, to do what is, how we want to on the, this policy for noncomplaints work, that some of the workstream 2 group wants to put inside the ombudsman office, or in other ways. And we will have to work on that.

Next slide, please. I guess we are at the end of the recommendations. There were 11 recommendations. Okay. I can't move myself. Okay. That's the comments. The next slide.

And we have other functions. If the Ombuds is not to be responsible, who will be in charge? Is it a staff function or community function? And you have on the blue frame two of the examples coming from the report.

The next slide so we have overall comments on the report. I will say in two ways; one, the one to finalize a rev report and then we will have to work on our own review, or comments, sorry, and our own report.

There is is a question from kla*us. Who is ICANN on recommendation. Let's go here on recommendation 11. And I guess ICANN here, but I will let the reviewer to say, but I guess it's all of us. It's ICANN. It's not the staff. It's not committees. It's all of us who will have to develop (indiscernible) and the first one to have to overcome that, will be our subgroup.

Do you before I give the floor to fa*rs n*e. Phil do you want to say something on that?

>> Look, I think that our answer was correct, I think, Bernard, so Bernard, and Sebastien.

MR. BACHOLLET: Sebastien.

>> The sblent was it was in the community, as I see it too.

MR. BACHOLLET: Okay. Thank you.

fa*rs n*e, please go ahead.

>> Thank you Sebastien. I think on the last slide, you asked for overall comments. I'm sorry, I'm being annoying today with many comments. I did not get to express nem in Jo hand necessary burg, I'm saying them now.

I like to know if the, in terms of neutrality and independence, what sorts of measures should be taken in terms of relationships and communication with the community? I have stated this before, but when the office becomes a person, then that person, well, hangs out with the crowd, with the community, makes friends. And I'm not talking about our blofd Ombuds now, east of course professional and diligent. I'm just talking generally.

So, when this person builds relations and friends ships and coral daylight with others, it is very hard to establish neutral. Very hard.

And, this is one of the problems that we face, because I don't honestly think that many Ombuds should go to the ICANN reception and mingle and hang out. But of course I'm not talking for a rule now.

The other point, I want to specify that this can actually hamper neutrality. And the other thing that I want to say is that we are, we shouldn't talk about Ombuds as a person, we should talk about Ombuds as an institution, as an organization.

What does, it's not about, it's of course an organization that does Ombuds for you. You can tell them what ICANN is about and through the time they can understand that as an organization, one person does not vo to -- have to know about ICANN. It could be an Ombuds office, an external Ombuds office that has been dealing with ICANN, not one Ombuds person.

And so, it's the matter of if Bernie is talking about, knowledge about ICANN. Yes, of

course, knowledge about ICANN is very important, but that can be calculated in in an O office or an organization. It does not have to be one person.

So, this is my other comment. I find the recommendations on neutrality and independence a little bit, because I think they were based on the surveys and probably we didn't communicate the comment as well. I find the neutrality and independence a little bit (indiscernible) considering those recommendations have to be as independence and neutrality. Thank you very much.

MR. BACHOLLET: Thank you fa*rs n*e.

Cheryl, go ahead.

>> Thank you, Sebastien. Cheryl, I'm very disagree with that, because I disagree with that again, with what fa*rs n*e just said.

I think her comments about the socialization aspect is (indiscernible) is a whole lot of kettle of fish. And I would certainly rather work with people who have an understanding of the community than none, ignorance or a pure consult taken see base, but that's a conversation for another time.

What I would like to do is suggest that rather than spend a lot more time litigating these points, it seems to me that these are points that really do need to be made, in whatever support they may have to the CCWG as a whole; because what fa*rs n*e said is the points that she would probably have liked to have made during your group meeting in J O H A N N E S B U R G, but she wasn't able to interject them at the time. And I really think that's the type of forum that this needs to be raising. Because right now we're, I think getting pearl lusly close to spending an awful lot of time on my opinion, this is your opinion, this is someone else's opinion conversation; rather than looking at the logistics of moving our work forward. And by forward, I mean to a plan where our recommendations and how we get our recommendations to CCWG, and then on to other the other next steps is dpon. -- done.

So, while I appreciate what may be a minority or indeed a majority view from fa*rs n*e, I'm not sure that Sebastien, I would encourage you to spend much more time going into this blow by blow if there is absolute era that we all agree with, and we all have this, oh my heavens yes, that's an oversight, silly little consultant, how did you get that so wrong, then yes, let's raise it. But if we're going to either sub part of ICANN or individual opinion, I would suggest it's dealt with in a short of shift as possible. Thank you.

MR. BACHOLLET: Thank you Cheryl. And thank you for the good advice.

I just wanted to ask you, when we talk about what is the definition. If you look at page 6 of the report, of course it's not on the PowerPoint, because I just took (indiscernible) but you have a definition of each group. Which the reviewer took a very time to write that and detail that issue, saying there is something missing in the definition and it's time to say. But I guess when you go with the definition, given by the reviewer at page 6 of the report, and you look to the recommendation. I guess that's clear.

And yes, fa*rs n*e, we will take all of that into comments from this group and we will see on Cheryl's say, how we will deal with that to take it to the plenary.

Right now, what I suggest, to go, I will say taking into account all your input, I don't see any who are, to say that the reviewer take wrong information, didn't get the right understanding of the current situation and make the right proposal. And as Bernie said, it was to compare with best practice, it's quite interesting, because it's a long discussion. But the good practice in the Ombuds office in other industry and government, and so on and so forth. And it's, I would like to say that, we don't have a subgroup problem with the report and I don't know what we have to do, but to say officially, you are done, and then thank you for your input. And maybe before we go to our next step for our Sub-Team, is there any of you who have objection to accept

this report as it is? As it was sent to us? And before we do our work. But any, any objection about the report?

Okay. Okay. Thank you very much.

Then last, please, I guess you will be able to tell us what we need to do. Go ahead, please. Thank you.

>> Sebastien, I wish that was true, this is kla*us for the record. I could tell you what to do. But I can suggest a couple of next steps.

So, a couple of things. I will reach out probably to Phil of this core, actually a big shoutout to Phil and Cheryl, to the very core to them today. (indiscernible).

And, we would expect them to, Phil and Deborah to submit the report, either final version later this week or early neection, -- next, depending on the time frame. And well communicate that to you as soon as possible.

Officially submit it to ICANN because of contractual obligation in both. But (indiscernible) we will send it to you and for you to use in your workstream 2 work. And my understanding is pretty much what bern nard poiptd out earlier. sowld use this report in your own workstream 2 work; annex or however you want to incorporate it into your report. Then it goes through the plenary. And through the motion it will end up obviously in front of the board.

So, it would be good to hear from you, really, if that, that's what you want to do and how you want to move forward. Also if you need anything else from, either from me or the MMSI team, that would we're dealing here with the assessment. But otherwise, I would consider our project having the independent assessment of the ombudsman office concluded. And then would hand it over to you, Sebastien, the group, to write your own report and using this assessment as you see fit. Thanks.

MR. BACHOLLET: Thank you, la*rs. This is Sebastien speaking. I guess we agree that, with your thanks for Phil and Deborah, the good work they have done. The report.

Again sent the version. I guess one and two will not be different from the one they send now. Is there any change, just tell, tell me like, I will not reprint all the pages, but except that I really think that we can thank you and, for your hard work and for the report you sent us or you will send to ICANN submission. And that's good.

I guess, and of course you are welcome, if you want sometime to appear in our subgroup just to help us to see the light, you are almost, yeah, you are welcome. And I know that at this time it would be too early for you, but maybe some others on our call will be, will be interesting for you, if you wish.

The next step, I suggest, and I suggest not to discuss it now, because we have just 15 minutes to go, but I took from the report and the recommendation what we will have to do, and I will read it to be sure that it's keep somewhere.

Prepare draft report answering at least the following topics. ICANN By-Laws of the Ombuds office's. As it's suggested that we need to change the By-Laws, I guess it's number 5, the article number 5. To replace framework by procedures, and how we do that, some work to be done.

Plan to be developed for soft relaunch. Framework to respond to formal request or report from the office of the Ombuds. The response should indicate the substantive response along with reasons. I guess that we need to slood that in the procedures, but it's something we need to take into account.

Framework to establish an Ombuds advisory panel. And framework to develop a policy for any Ombuds involvement in noncomplaints work.

We still need to follow coordination with the other sub groups. And I have written prepare a new schedule. In fact, we have the new schedule, because we have to follow the workstream 2 timing to be ready before the end of this fiscal year; hopefully before if we can.

I will try to prepare before the next meeting, I cross my fingers, taking into account

the first draft reports we have done and what is on the review, to try to combine the documents in one way or another, and so send it to you prior to the discussion. I will try to do that on the PowerPoint, because the report of the Ombuds reviewer is on the PowerPoint.

And of course, if you have other sorts, other ideas, comments on how to deal with that, I would be more than happy to receive your feedback.

I have keep this slide about the other sub groups, just to keep that in mind.

And let's go to -- no, first I need to ask you if you have any comments on this part of the discussion? Learn nard, do you want to talk, or writing where is the report? The report from the subgroup? fa*rs n*e.

>> Yes.

MR. BACHOLLET: Go ahead.

>> Yes, I'm just a little confused. Because they said that the pen holders will consider and make the report and I'm not sure who the pen holders are, and I currently at the moment don't have a pen holder.

So, well, I'm not going to volunteer here to be a holder of sorts; but I very much like to be involved with the process of drafting that [-P] and looking at it. And of course (indiscernible) my support from the group on my comments, I will, I will just, make a statement. But I would lining to, -- like to, I think we need to start seeing the reports and finalizing it probably like as volunteers.

Thank you.

MR. BACHOLLET: Thank you for that. I guess the only panel at the moment is me, but I am very happy if someone else wants to take it. We have a report draft, draft, draft report made in, I don't know, October or even before, last year I was asking for help with no, no feedback. And I understand, because the people in this group, we are a very small group of people and a lot of them are already very, very, very occupied

with other sub teams and I don't want to bother those people who are already doing a huge amount of work and very good work.

But what I will try to do in the next two, less tha weeks, is to give a new form of draft report. I can accomplish this review and coming to you with questions, proposals and so on. At least I will try.

And, Cheryl, please, go ahead, thank you.

>> Thank you Sebastien. Cheryl language done [O*R] for the record.

I think fa*rs n*e, we may have gotten a little confused because of us looking at the external exam of the external reviewers report. And I thought that we made it clear in this call, but maybe he didn't.

That is simply, hardly simply, sorry, Phil. That is thankfully very useful, but is material that we as the Sub-Team on this topic get to use in the creation of our report. So, like every other work team in the workstream 2, we have our prices, which you should be very familiar with I'm sure, to go through.

It's a little unusual, because we also had external or independent review process feed into our work, and so that is a wrecked up document that we are looking at and which is why Phil is on the call today. This is an opportunity, as if it was a normal component part of ICANN, independent review process for this Sub-Team to act in a similar way as a review working party would, and that is to interact with the external reviewer before this documentation goes inverted out public.

Now, unlike the normal external review process that goes on in all other kpoen nebt parts of ICANN, with the exce of the ga*k, we don't follow exactly the same rules and guidelines here, but there are certain par tea on some of the key points. And la*rs can correct me if I'm wrong on this. But to that end, we as the Sub-Team are now getting to use there resource with all its recommendations as a highly ininformed contribution -- informed contribution to our work, and that's what all of us working

with Sebastien who is currently holding the pen in palm reform will be doing. And that's pretty much taking us back to where other teams were back in September and October last year. Hopefully that's clear.

So, this is a report from the external reviewers. It's contributory to our process, vital to our process, I would say, but even, you know, the done deal it's about to go to the CCWG that we have only at the last moment to react and interact with. Hopefully that's helped.

MR. BACHOLLET: Thank you Cheryl. Definitely. And we put on all the web what we are doing in September, October, to have this external review. And now it's done, we will get back to this and as it's a long time ago, I will try to put them together and I will come back to this, to all of you to have your help and feedback and comments. And I would say we will start, restart our work as an enter market normal Sub-Team work.

And I guess it will be, I hope it will be feasible before our next call, that I will send you something. Hopeful will try my best.

And thank you for all your comments and your help. Let's go, if you allow me, to the calendar. The current Sub-Team, subgroup time slots. Today obviously, next meeting is 27th, will be on the 31st of July at 1 p.m. UTC. And then the 21 August. I know that it's not fair from our colleague from south hemisphere, we consider as we are in summer here, we need to do less, but yes, it's important like that.

And when we start to have meeting each week in September. And I have to add, I am done for today, but when is our next target date to give a report to other, for the workstream 2 and so on and so forth. But I will try to work on that also for the next meeting.

And I guess it's -- any other business? , Or comments on the calendar? Be free to do one or the other, if you wish.

Okay, thank you for your feedback. I would like to thank this people once again, and Deborah, for your hard work, and your report. And I would also like to thank, take this opportunity to thank la*rs and MMSI, I guess it's right acronym, team to help, to be liaison between our Sub-Team and Phil and Deborah. And to thank all of you who participated in this meeting, but also the previous meeting panned who give feedback, who answer questions, participate in the survey of the review done by Phil and Deborah.

And I hope that we will be able to restart our work on our own report, our next call at the end of July.

Is there no other comments? Thanks a lot. And the call is adjourned. And let's talk the 31 of July next time. everyone.

>> Thanks Sebastien. Bye-bye everyone.

(independent of call). -- end of call). 7-19-17. Captioner stand7-19-17. Captioner standing by. . MR. BACHOLLET: Check. Can you hear me? >> Yes, I can hear you. Are you able to see the Adobe room yet Sebastien? >> I didn't hear you quite well. Can you repeat please snr. >> I say, are you able to see the Adobe room at of yet? >> No, I am oo on my Mobile for a moment. It will take 10, 15 minutes to walk home. I was outside. I will be outside of a train. It will be okay for for sound but not tore the Adobe Connect. But I'll manage. >> All right. We'll do. >> (indiscernible). MR. BACHOLLET: Everyone on the. Line. 1234679 I am uncertain if you can hear me at this point. MR. BACHOLLET: Yes, I can hear you, no problem. I don't know if you can hear me. But I will mute my phone. >> Very well. No problem. It's one minute to the hour. I would suggest, we've already got our six participants, so we're good. Let's give it a few more minutes. I'll come back on the line at about 3 in four minutes and then we'll get the call going; if that's okay with you? MR. BACHOLLET: Yeah. No problem. It's great. Thank you. >> Okay. So, everyone, we'll get going in about three

minutes. Thank you. >> All right, everyone, we've seemed to reach a stable number of participants. Saying that, I will turn it over. MR. BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. And the recording started? (this meeting is now being recorded). MR. BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Welcome to this 26th meeting of the I [-P] ka*n Ombuds meeting of the accountability work extreme on. Well take the participation from the list and in the connect room. Plus people like me who are just on a phone, anybody else on the phone? Okay. Thank you. I guess you have reconnect for the PowerPoint I just sent. And if somebody could go to the agenda for today. The theme of the agenda is to give our final words with the reviewer about their review and we will have some homework to do, but that's the main topic. Then I would like to try to see what are our next steps and how we organize the work to try to write the report from the subgroup, including the report from the reviewer, and to be able to give that on time in the current schedule for the work extreme 2. Any questions, comments? . >> Is he bass tun, it's fill Cory here, just joining. MR. BACHOLLET: Thank you. Welcome. Sorry to have this call while we're calling from the other side of the world for me. Very early in the morning. Thank you. Okay. If no, I suggest that we go to the next slide, and again, I don't have all my mind, but I guess if we go. >> The next slide is participation and dashboard, Sebastien. >> Okay. I guess we can go through that quickly. Just usual slides and the okay you paetion, I tried to track who is participating and so on. Let's go to the report and to the page with the recommendation. I put a recommendation, the page with one recommendation on each page and the goal will be not today, but to fulfill our comments specifically on that. And just to let you know at the end of the 11th, the two or three slides and one is about overall comments, if we have any on the report. . >> We are now on the slide that says recommendation 1. MR. BACHOLLET: There. -- great. I don't know how the last one to proceed, but I guess let's go to each recommendation and if we have

any comments to the reviewer, because we think if there is something they need to change, not the comments we want to make as a group to plan for the workstream 2 Working Group. It's the right time to do that. And if you have nothing to say about the recommendation 1, let's go to next slide, recommendation 2. And I don't know if the sound will be very good, because I will go through my building to go to my apartment. Then sorry for that, but I will be home very soon. Is there any comments on the recommendation 2? Let's go to the next one, recommendation 3. Recommendation 4. Recommendation 5. Recommendation 6. I will not have time to be back home and we will finish the call. Recommendation 7. 8. 9. 10. . >> Hold on Sebastien, we have the host in the room presenting. Has her hand up. MR. BACHOLLET: Okay, go ahead. >> Hi, [A*ED] [A*ED] speaking. Thank you Sebastien. As I said in my email, I am not quite sure about the recommendation to have the ombudsman five-year fixed term. And I understand the merits behind it. I understand the rationale behind this because we want to give the openly Bud kind of like the convenience that they will be in this role for five years, and it is not temporary, so that they can focus on, on the tasks; and not be worried about months essentially. But I don't think that's how we can solve the problem of putting the ombudsman in an economy vacuum. As long as ombudsman, the Ombuds office is one person whose well being and worth of revenue depends on ICANN, and depends on this contract, it will not be feasible for them to, to just focus on the task and not have the economy incentive. And I am not suggest and this is all related to the design of the office; whether hard office is funded and how it is designed. Now I'm not saying that I can not be paying ombudsman. I'm saying that the design should be different. It will not solve the problem, but for long gaetion of the Ombuds contract and giving them five-year fixed term. Thank you. MR. BACHOLLET: Thank you for that. I may come to reconnect hopefully. Any other comments on that? >> Is bell

Cheryl here. >> Go ahead, Cheryl, thank you very much. >> [TH*E] Sebastien. I am not quite as convinced about a five year argument as I think others may be. I do infact see benefit in strengthening the independence of the Ombuds employment with some form of fixed term and extension predictability and I'm very comfortable with the proposal for discussion, the termination clause as to recommendation 9, but I'm very aware that we're having this conversation in the absolute absence of herb being on this call. I am aware and perhaps you all can help me. Phil, if you don't mind jumping in here. I have assumed that this recommendation is based in what would be known as an industrial best practice in the Ombuds world. And if that's the case, then I really would think that us as a working party suggesting a change to the recommendation isn't really a terribly good idea. Phil, am I correct in that? >> Yes. Thanks, Cheryl. That's pretty common practice in ombudsman's offices including parliament tree, government ombudsman and industry ombudsman, to provide the Ombuds with a fixed term employment contract. It's not perfect. probably near impossible to have a, any sort of remuneration framework for an ombudsman that completely eliminates in any thoughts of bias or economic pressure, but this is the best thing that people have come up with so far. And we put it in because it was raised by a number of stakeholders that they variously thought the previous ombudsman had not been as independent as they should be or at least seem as not independent dent at times when their contract was up or when they didn't have the certainty of fixed term, but I expect it is not perfect. I think it's just the best thing we were able to dig up for this sort of thing. >> Thanks very much, fill. -- Phil. And I should just mention your comments. I'm clear that it's an office not an individual. You've got two hands up, Sebastien, you have (indiscernible). >> Go ahead, please. >> Thank you. This is a very, we have been reiterating this point that I can't see a very different organization than other the additions that are in the industry. And

when I say that Ombuds, at the moment as ICANN, Ombuds is just limited to one person. And it's internal Ombuds. I don't think this is working. And I don't think that, I don't think that we can solve the independence problem by giving the Ombuds a fixed term, because of what I said, because, and you do, still the well being of the Ombuds is related, is reliant on that contract, and I have, trust me I have scheduled Ombuds functions before. I have studied dispute resolution. One of the solutions is to give them fixed term contracts, but where? And we have to consider the nature of the relations and transactions that go on, and the disputes that go on at ICANN. With a fixed term contract this will not, the indense problem will not be solved. Anyway, I'm not going to argue over this. I just want my comments to be acknowledged. (indiscernible) for the good members or the brother community, then, then we can just take it there. I don't, I'm not saying that it should be changed, I just want my comments acknowledged. MR. BACHOLLET: Thank you for that. (indiscernible) please. >> Thank you, this is clause for the record. I fully understand where recommendation 9 comes from. And I know it fully, it goes very well with industry standard, but I have to support fast na*i in her point, I think she makes a valid point. And I think what, I would like to say here, is yes, this is one of the solutions, but we should be wear that there is, we should be able to do better. If we were able to do better in the short term, I don't know, but I think we should be aware that this is, it's a solution but it's not a very strong solution. Thank you. >> Thank you kla*us. Sebastien speaking again. If you allow me, just, we talk about the independence, and remember that the previous recommendation is also about independence. And the recommendation 8, it's one where it will allow the Ombuds office to be less in the end of the board as currently. So, second item in your comments related to that, the office of the ombudsman is just one person. I guess it's right and it's right now only, because before there were two, there were Ombuds and then adjunct Ombuds. And

the fact that we are, with this addition of just one. And I am not sure, I guess of the situation, but is because the board didn't want to take any further action before we as subgroup and then as workstream 2 group gave our report, and this is on taken by the (indiscernible) participating to this workstream 2. And, other proposal here, it's not just to have one person, but to have a real office with some different skills and some differences in the people who are a member of this office. And remember also that it's suggested that, and I don't know the number of the recommendation, but it is a review will be done in five years. And if we are smart enough, I we can organize the things to have a review before the term of the Ombuds and to see how we can either give an extension or change the people in charge of this ICANN Ombuds office. But I guess also that all these questions, useful, and will be taken (indiscernible). I am not sure that we need to ask the reviewer to change their mind. What we need to do is what I suggest in recommendation 9 comments, and we need and I would like to ask you to write a short comment on [THAP] and on other, if you want, and we will have also, if Cheryl wants to make also an comment and other of course, to allow us to add comments on this, on each recommendation and to try to see what is the feeling of the Working Group. That's where I think we are. Yes, fa*rs n*e, I see that you are also talking about the, the internal, external and the, that's something we will need to discuss also. But I don't think once again, as a goal for today, it's to say to the reviewer, yeah, go ahead, you have done your job. Maybe we can keep that in mind and have a discussion on that. I have an opinion that I guess others have an opinion on that, but it's a fair points to be discussed by our group. I'm not sure that we need the reviewer. If the the reviewer wants to give us the point of view on that also, they are more than welcome. Okay, thank you. Last please, go ahead. If. >> This is kla*us for the record. Yeah. I wanted to kind of (L A R S). I wanted to just cover something that you just said. Just kind of through my mind that everybody, I think

the most effective time for this call and for the future to think about whether the recommendations made themselves are based on correct assumptions and correct test amount of the status quo. And I think as you said Sebastien we shouldn't, or you shouldn't, I'm not involved in your perception, but you shouldn't to try to maybe (indiscernible) that would change their recommendation, as an assessor. I think if you disagree with them, the ener probably best spent to then make your recommendation, the different recommendations to the board as part of the workstream 2 and then the board can take it from there. Not for me to ascribe anything, but it seems the most effective way forward also the independence of camp Ron (indiscernible) adhere to. And, that's all. I think we should talk about probably the, the way forward after the submission of the report later on the call, but I'll raise my hand again when we come to that. Thank you Sebastien. MR. BACHOLLET: Thank you, la*rs. Just to summarize. We had a fuse full comment from fa*rs n*e, kla*us and Cheryl. We need to keep all that together and, sorry, yes, I didn't see your hand because I was down. Go ahead, please. I will come back after. Go ahead, please Bernie. >> Thank you. Can you hear me? MR. BACHOLLET: Yes. Very well. Go ahead. >> Okay. Thank you. Somewhat in line with what both yourself and la*rs. MR. BACHOLLET: Sorry, is bern nard, you need to say your name. >> Sorry, Bernard tour [KO*T]. Relative to what la*rs and Sebastien have said, it's almost as if (indiscernible) looking at this as the final report of this Working Group. And I don't see that at all. I think we've hired a consultant to help us do an evaluation based on industry best practices, and they've done that. Now Twhat this group decides to do with it, is another story and once they, this group decides on its recommendations where this report will be annexed to those recommendations, it's got to go to the plenary. And the plenary has to go through them. And once the plenary is satisfied and we've reached an he can lib brum there, then it goes to public comment and

people can comment and suggest things as they do and we've seen in the other public comments. So, I don't see this as a very, as a terminal thing that we have to fix in this report. Finally, just a personal comment from having followed this over the last few months, about the independence. Yes, I understand. I think I understand both sides in this, but as a person has said, yes, we keep saying, ICANN is a very special place. And it may be too absorbed to want to get someone who is too far removed from ICANN because this is such a special place. Yes, I understand some of the problems that having someone more internal versus less external, but let's not forget the problems that having someone that is too far removed from ICANN can actually have. And that's purely a personal comment this this case. Thank you. MR. BACHOLLET: Thank you Bernie. And thank you for yowrp comments. Looking as the final report, and yes we ask for comments. I would like to stress again that we are lookinging for comments and there are some I would say mistakes, but your comments will be taken into account in the next state of the work. No worry for all of you. Can we go to, to the next recommendation, the recommendation 10. And if you have any dments on that -- comments on that. Okay. If not, let's go to recommendation 11. And he ge -- and I guess this recommendation, it's one where we will have, I will say a lot of work from our subgroup to do, to do what is, how we want to on the, this policy for noncomplaints work, that some of the workstream 2 group wants to put inside the ombudsman office, or in other ways. And we will have to work on that. Next slide, please. I guess we are at the end of the recommendations. There were 11 recommendations. Okay. I can't move myself. Okay. That's the comments. The next slide. And we have other functions. If the Ombuds is not to be responsible, who will be in charge? Is it a staff function or community function? And you have on the blue frame two of the examples coming from the report. The next slide so we have overall comments on the report. I will say

in two ways; one, the one to finalize a rev report and then we will have to work on our own review, or comments, sorry, and our own report. There is is a question from kla*us. Who is ICANN on recommendation. Let's go here on recommendation 11. And I guess ICANN here, but I will let the reviewer to say, but I guess it's all of us. It's ICANN. It's not the staff. It's not committees. It's all of us who will have to develop (indiscernible) and the first one to have to overcome that, will be our subgroup. Do you before I give the floor to fa*rs n*e. Phil do you want to say something on that? >> Look, I think that our answer was correct, I think, Bernard, so Bernard, and Sebastien. MR. BACHOLLET: Sebastien. >> The sblent was it was in the community, as I see it too. MR. BACHOLLET: Okay. Thank you. fa*rs n*e, please go ahead. >> Thank you Sebastien. I think on the last slide, you asked for overall comments. I'm sorry, I'm being annoying today with many comments. I did not get to express nem in Jo hand necessary burg, I'm saying them now. I like to know if the, in terms of neutrality and independence, what sorts of measures should be taken in terms of relationships and communication with the community? I have stated this before, but when the office becomes a person, then that person, well, hangs out with the crowd, with the community, makes friends. And I'm not talking about our blofd Ombuds now, east of course professional and diligent. I'm just talking generally. So, when this person builds relations and friends ships and coral daylight with others, it is very hard to establish neutral. Very hard. And, this is one of the problems that we face, because I don't honestly think that many Ombuds should go to the ICANN reception and mingle and hang out. But of course I'm not talking for a rule now. The other point, I want to specify that this can actually hamper neutrality. And the other thing that I want to say is that we are, we shouldn't talk about Ombuds as a person, we should talk about Ombuds as an institution, as an organization. What does, it's not about, it's of course an organization that does Ombuds for you. You can tell them what

ICANN is about and through the time they can understand that as an organization, one person does not vo to -- have to know about ICANN. It could be an Ombuds office, an external Ombuds office that has been dealing with ICANN, not one Ombuds person. And so, it's the matter of if Bernie is talking about, knowledge about ICANN. Yes, of course, knowledge about ICANN is very important, but that can be calculated in in an O office or an organization. It does not have to be one person. So, this is my other comment. I find the recommendations on neutrality and independence a little bit, because I think they were based on the surveys and probably we didn't communicate the comment as well. I find the neutrality and independence a little bit (indiscernible) considering those recommendations have to be as independence and neutrality. Thank you very much. MR. BACHOLLET: Thank you fa*rs n*e. Cheryl, go ahead. >> Thank you, Sebastien. Cheryl, I'm very disagree with that, because I disagree with that again, with what fa*rs n*e just said. I think her comments about the socialization aspect is (indiscernible) is a whole lot of kettle of fish. And I would certainly rather work with people who have an understanding of the community than none, ignorance or a pure consult taken see base, but that's a conversation for another time. What I would like to do is suggest that rather than spend a lot more time litigating these points, it seems to me that these are points that really do need to be made, in whatever support they may have to the CCWG as a whole; because what fa*rs n*e said is the points that she would probably have liked to have made during your group meeting in J O H A N N E S B U R G, but she wasn't able to interject them at the time. And I really think that's the type of forum that this needs to be raising. Because right now we're, I think getting pearl lusly close to spending an awful lot of time on my opinion, this is your opinion, this is someone else's opinion conversation; rather than looking at the logistics of moving our work forward. And by forward, I mean to a plan where our recommendations and how we

get our recommendations to CCWG, and then on to other the other next steps is dpon. -- done. So, while I appreciate what may be a minority or indeed a majority view from fa*rs n*e, I'm not sure that Sebastien, I would encourage you to spend much more time going into this blow by blow if there is absolute era that we all agree with, and we all have this, oh my heavens yes, that's an oversight, silly little consultant, how did you get that so wrong, then yes, let's raise it. But if we're going to either sub part of ICANN or individual opinion, I would suggest it's dealt with in a short of shift as possible. Thank you. MR. BACHOLLET: Thank you Cheryl. And thank you for the good advice. I just wanted to ask you, when we talk about what is the definition. If you look at page 6 of the report, of course it's not on the PowerPoint, because I just took (indiscernible) but you have a definition of each group. Which the reviewer took a very time to write that and detail that issue, saying there is something missing in the definition and it's time to say. But I guess when you go with the definition, given by the reviewer at page 6 of the report, and you look to the recommendation. I guess that's clear. And yes, fa*rs n*e, we will take all of that into comments from this group and we will see on Cheryl's say, how we will deal with that to take it to the plenary. Right now, what I suggest, to go, I will say taking into account all your input, I don't see any who are, to say that the reviewer take wrong information, didn't get the right understanding of the current situation and make the right proposal. And as Bernie said, it was to compare with best practice, it's quite interesting, because it's a long discussion. But the good practice in the Ombuds office in other industry and government, and so on and so forth. And it's, I would like to say that, we don't have a subgroup problem with the report and I don't know what we have to do, but to say officially, you are done, and then thank you for your input. And maybe before we go to our next step for our Sub-Team, is there any of you who have objection to accept this report as it is? As it was sent to us? And before we do our

work. But any, any objection about the report? Okay. Okay. Thank you very much. Then last, please, I guess you will be able to tell us what we need to do. Go ahead, please. Thank you. >> Sebastien, I wish that was true, this is kla*us for the record. I could tell you what to do. But I can suggest a couple of next steps. So, a couple of things. I will reach out probably to Phil of this core, actually a big shoutout to Phil and Cheryl, to the very core to them today. (indiscernible). And, we would expect them to, Phil and Deborah to submit the report, either final version later this week or early neection, -- next, depending on the time frame. And well communicate that to you as soon as possible. Officially submit it to ICANN because of contractual obligation in both. But (indiscernible) we will send it to you and for you to use in your workstream 2 work. And my understanding is pretty much what bern nard poiptd out earlier. sowld use this report in your own workstream 2 work; annex or however you want to incorporate it into your report. Then it goes through the plenary. And through the motion it will end up obviously in front of the board. So, it would be good to hear from you, really, if that, that's what you want to do and how you want to move forward. Also if you need anything else from, either from me or the MMSI team, that would we're dealing here with the assessment. But otherwise, I would consider our project having the independent assessment of the ombudsman office concluded. And then would hand it over to you, Sebastien, the group, to write your own report and using this assessment as you see fit. Thanks. MR. BACHOLLET: Thank you, la*rs. This is Sebastien speaking. I guess we agree that, with your thanks for Phil and Deborah, the good work they have done. The report. Again sent the version. I guess one and two will not be different from the one they send now. Is there any change, just tell, tell me like, I will not reprint all the pages, but except that I really think that we can thank you and, for your hard work and for the report you sent us or you will send to ICANN submission. And that's good. I guess, and of course you are

welcome, if you want sometime to appear in our subgroup just to help us to see the light, you are almost, yeah, you are welcome. And I know that at this time it would be too early for you, but maybe some others on our call will be, will be interesting for you, if you wish. The next step, I suggest, and I suggest not to discuss it now, because we have just 15 minutes to go, but I took from the report and the recommendation what we will have to do, and I will read it to be sure that it's keep somewhere. Prepare draft report answering at least the following topics. ICANN By-Laws of the Ombuds office's. As it's suggested that we need to change the By-Laws, I guess it's number 5, the article number 5. To replace framework by procedures, and how we do that, some work to be done. Plan to be developed for soft relaunch. Framework to respond to formal request or report from the office of the Ombuds. The response should indicate the substantive response along with reasons. I guess that we need to slood that in the procedures, but it's something we need to take into account. Framework to establish an Ombuds advisory panel. And framework to develop a policy for any Ombuds involvement in noncomplaints work. We still need to follow coordination with the other sub groups. And I have written prepare a new schedule. In fact, we have the new schedule, because we have to follow the workstream 2 timing to be ready before the end of this fiscal year; hopefully before if we can. I will try to prepare before the next meeting, I cross my fingers, taking into account the first draft reports we have done and what is on the review, to try to combine the documents in one way or another, and so send it to you prior to the discussion. I will try to do that on the PowerPoint, because the report of the Ombuds reviewer is on the PowerPoint. And of course, if you have other sorts, other ideas, comments on how to deal with that, I would be more than happy to receive your feedback. I have keep this slide about the other sub groups, just to keep that in mind. And let's go to -- no, first I need to ask you if you have any comments on this part of the discussion?

Learn nard, do you want to talk, or writing where is the report? The report from the subgroup? fa*rs n*e. >> Yes. MR. BACHOLLET: Go ahead. >> Yes, I'm just a little confused. Because they said that the pen holders will consider and make the report and I'm not sure who the pen holders are, and I currently at the moment don't have a pen holder. So, well, I'm not going to volunteer here to be a holder of sorts; but I very much like to be involved with the process of drafting that [-P] and looking at it. And of course (indiscernible) my support from the group on my comments, I will, I will just, make a statement. But I would lining to, -- like to, I think we need to start seeing the reports and finalizing it probably like as volunteers. Thank you. MR. BACHOLLET: Thank you for that. I guess the only panel at the moment is me, but I am very happy if someone else wants to take it. We have a report draft, draft, draft report made in, I don't know, October or even before, last year I was asking for help with no, no feedback. And I understand, because the people in this group, we are a very small group of people and a lot of them are already very, very, very occupied with other sub teams and I don't want to bother those people who are already doing a huge amount of work and very good work. But what I will try to do in the next two, less tha weeks, is to give a new form of draft report. I can accomplish this review and coming to you with questions, proposals and so on. At least I will try. And, Cheryl, please, go ahead, thank you. >> Thank you Sebastien. Cheryl language done [O*R] for the record. I think fa*rs n*e, we may have gotten a little confused because of us looking at the external exam of the external reviewers report. And I thought that we made it clear in this call, but maybe he didn't. That is simply, hardly simply, sorry, Phil. That is thankfully very useful, but is material that we as the Sub-Team on this topic get to use in the creation of our report. So, like every other work team in the workstream 2, we have our prices, which you should be very familiar with I'm sure, to go through. It's a little unusual, because we also had external or independent

review process feed into our work, and so that is a wrecked up document that we are looking at and which is why Phil is on the call today. This is an opportunity, as if it was a normal component part of ICANN, independent review process for this Sub-Team to act in a similar way as a review working party would, and that is to interact with the external reviewer before this documentation goes inverted out public. Now, unlike the normal external review process that goes on in all other kpoen nebt parts of ICANN, with the exce of the ga*k, we don't follow exactly the same rules and guidelines here, but there are certain par tea on some of the key points. And la*rs can correct me if I'm wrong on this. But to that end, we as the Sub-Team are now getting to use there resource with all its recommendations as a highly ininformed contribution -- informed contribution to our work, and that's what all of us working with Sebastien who is currently holding the pen in palm reform will be doing. And that's pretty much taking us back to where other teams were back in September and October last year. Hopefully that's clear. So, this is a report from the external reviewers. It's contributory to our process, vital to our process, I would say, but even, you know, the done deal it's about to go to the CCWG that we have only at the last moment to react and interact with. Hopefully that's helped. MR. BACHOLLET: Thank you Cheryl. Definitely. And we put on all the web what we are doing in September, October, to have this external review. And now it's done, we will get back to this and as it's a long time ago, I will try to put them together and I will come back to this, to all of you to have your help and feedback and comments. And I would say we will start, restart our work as an enter market normal Sub-Team work. And I guess it will be, I hope it will be feasible before our next call, that I will send you something. Hopeful will try my best. And thank you for all your comments and your help. Let's go, if you allow me, to the calendar. The current Sub-Team, subgroup time slots. Today obviously, next meeting is 27th, will be on the 31st of July at 1 p.m. UTC. And

then the 21 August. I know that it's not fair from our colleague from south hemisphere, we consider as we are in summer here, we need to do less, but yes, it's important like that. And when we start to have meeting each week in September. And I have to add, I am done for today, but when is our next target date to give a report to other, for the workstream 2 and so on and so forth. But I will try to work on that also for the next meeting. And I guess it's -- any other business? , Or comments on the calendar? Be free to do one or the other, if you wish. Okay, thank you for your feedback. I would like to thank this people once again, and Deborah, for your hard work, and your report. And I would also like to thank, take this opportunity to thank la*rs and MMSI, I guess it's right acronym, team to help, to be liaison between our Sub-Team and Phil and Deborah. And to thank all of you who participated in this meeting, but also the previous meeting panned who give feedback, who answer questions, participate in the survey of the review done by Phil and Deborah. And I hope that we will be able to restart our work on our own report, our next call at the end of July. Is there no other comments? Thanks a lot. And the call is adjourned. And let's talk the 31 of July next time. everyone. >> Thanks Sebastien. Bye-bye everyone. (independent of call). -- end of call).