

CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 2
Ombudsman Meeting #29
11 September 2017 @ 13:00 UTC

RAW CAPTIONING – NOT A TRANSCRIPT – A TRANSCRIPT WILL BE POSTED TO THE WIKI AS A SEPARATE DOCUMENT. THIS IS ONLY MEANT AS A QUICK REFERENCE UNTIL THE TRANSCRIPT IS POSTED AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED AUTHORITATIVE.

Testing testing.

>> Hello everybody. I would like test test if it's working.

>> BRENDA BREWER: Hi Sebastien, this is Brenda we hear you very well.

>> SEBASTIEN: Thank you.

>> SEBASTIEN: So this is Sebastien speaking its one minute past the hour and I suggest we start the call.

If your okay, can you start the recording please.

[This meeting is now being recorded] S>>: SEBASTIEN thank you help. And Sebastien speaking. Repertoire of the omsbud buds man office of subgroup Work Stream 2. Our today call is number 29. And you have all all received yesterday version, first version, of the draft report of our subgroup and we already have some comments on that. Before going to this part of this schedule I would like to know if there's in addition to the one on the connect there's just people on the phone.

Okay it seems that our colleague Roberto has trouble to get to Adobe Connect but he's on the call. Hopefully he can hear us.

I will suspend that I don't know how many we are.

To be counted but I'm not sure we are five people but I would like to suggest we go through the document as first reading because if not we will have trouble to be on time to deliver our document. My suggestion is that we do this discussion to be able to deliver a first draft to the plannary and the plenary sometime 27, I can't remember exactly. 27th of September and we need some time before to send them the document. If we can't have the first reading today and second reading with hopefully all of the people next week who are not participating today, that's good.

And we, for the 28th -- 27th we need to be ready for the 20 then. Our next goal, the 18 is the last one, if we want to deliver subject to the plenary but I think it's important to give that in September. But let's have a discussion on that. And what else? I did not prepare for point, but I would like suggest that we go through the document. And that way a few comments on the list and I would like to go through the comments and can a after that we go through more global discussion if needed. If you have some additional point. And if you are good with that.

Okay, thank you very much and thank you for your participation today. We have noted from he were and Avery. That's it.

Okay, let's go to the document. I hope that you found sometime to go through. In fact, it's, I would say, much lighter document if you take out the italics. It's like to the recommendation from the external review. And our proposal for comments. Sorry, proposal for the ICANN Ombuds office and recommendation.

As I will go through one by one. And if you have outside of the comments we already have, let's tell me. I don't know if you want me to read the one. We have already done such reading last time. And I don't think we need to read it all of them on the first recommendation about to be strategically focus any comments to this recommendation.

>> Sebastien I want to ask, is it possible to make it bigger. Whoever is in charge of the screen.

[Asha Hemrajani]

>> SEBASTIEN: Great I went to my own document to read it.

>> Thank you.

>> SEBASTIEN: You're welcome Asha definitely.

The second regularisation it's to include some passages. There was no comments on the list.

But if you have any, it's a good time.

>> Are you now on number 2?

>> SEBASTIEN: Klaus please.

>> SOs thank you I would mention a general observation about the whole document the specific documentations. When I read it last united I was specifically missing from time to time the why, explaining why we make such recommendation and secondly the how. Basically saying, what is the actionable item. What is the action to be taken. But this is a general observation to the whole document. And maybe I misunderstand the nature of the document and requirement of that document. But by reading as a general observation, the how and the why for me was missing, thank you

[Klaus Stoll]

>> SEBASTIEN: Thank you Klaus for your comment. Sebastien speaking.

I think one part of the reason you may have such feeling is that we didn't include the report from the external reviewer where a lot of explanations are embedded. And I was not sure we need to repeat it in our own part of the document. Maybe one think we need to add in the final document to the plenary that a lot of explanation are in the external review report that will be in the next B. But it was so heavy we decide we be able not to send it to you again. I hope that it's part of the answer at least.

And I see that Asha had some comments to make too. Please Avenue yeah, Asha, Sebastien one is what you just said, did you just say it will be in the next -- the -- you said that will be in the next version? Is that what you meant? It next next B. Did you mean next version?

>> SEBASTIEN: I was meaning in the version that we will send to the plenary. Because obviously they don't have at ends reports on the reviewer. But as once again, it's on every document, we decided not to include it in what we had sent now send to you yesterday.

But I suggest that anyhow, we will add link to the document that you can find it easily if needed.

>> Okay then the second, the question I had was on paragraph number 2.

That's what I was asking, are you on number 2 right now?

>> SEBASTIEN: Yes.

>> Okay, so on number 2, this is just something that popped into my head when I was looking at this, there's 3 different categories -- for complaints the government community corporation that's what the consultant has come up with. And I was thinking about, you know, what would had happen if it would be -- if there was particular type of had compliant that could not be classified into anyone of these three, could not easily be classified.

>> SEBASTIEN: Thank you Asha, I will try to answer, but I'm not sure I

have the right answer. But if you look from at least my answer will will be, look to the 11 recommendation number 11. Because I guess, if it's not included in those categories, it's will fall more into some [voices overlapping] outside of complaint work.

>> Okay. I'm just thinking out loud here that perhaps we might need to think about a situation where it is a complaint but does not easily fit into one of these three categories. I might be over pessimistic here and maybe quite easy to categorize any complaint relating to ICANN work into one of these three. But I'm just wondering about the possibility of something coming out if the blue that could not fit into these three. But anyway, maybe we could have a sort of -- maybe one possibility is to have a clause to look into the possibility of, I don't know, maybe some kind of -- may be the ombud buds person has the prerogative to force that category, force that complaint into one of these categories? We might, that's another option. Or the ombud buds man has the option of creating a general category. That might be another idea.

>> SEBASTIEN: Thank you Asha, Sebastien apt on speaking. Maybe let's keep that in mind but I think that can be added, not to be in the decision of the ICANN ombuds office but it's one point where the final [indiscernible] can add these difficulty to decide where it will fit better. And if it's not there, we will come back to this taking into consideration your question and comments.

If you agree Asha?

>> Yeah okay. It's not critical point. It's just something that might end up being a problem. All right thank you.

>> SEBASTIEN: Okay thank you Asha.

Okay, now, let's go to recommendation number three. It's a one to start soft relaunch of the function. Any comments or questions?

Okay, thank you. Let's go to 4.

The question about the time for all the ICANN part on answer any request or question or from the ICANN ombuds office.

Any comments?

Questions?

Thank you, if not, let's go to 5. It's about.

>> Sorry Sebastien, I have a question on number 4.

>> SEBASTIEN: Go ahead Asha go ahead, no problem.

>> Okay, thanks, for number 4 it kind of limits it to 90 days or 120 days with reason. I'm wondering whether we could consider the possibility of you know some kind of allowance of the board to extend that time. If it really is not feasible to provide a response in that 90 day or 120 day window?

>> SEBASTIEN: Well.

>> Asha because there may be some circumstances, some special circumstances, maybe the report is very complex or there are multiple reports that came at the same time that might create challenges in insuring a response within that period.

So, I'm not suggesting that the deadline or the time limit of 90 a days of 120 days should be removed rather there should be a possibility of having extension for special cases.

>> SEBASTIEN: Thank you Asha go feedback.

I think we need to have some, I would say, some rules even if it's not one that [indiscernible] it will not go through any [indiscernible] changes at least for the moment. But we may add something, a comment that if for any exception.

But at the same time we need to be sure that the exceptional don't become the rules. Because if not how solve and evolve a complaint if it take more than 120 days to answer that.

That's my feeling is that it's already a long time, 3 months or 4 months. But we can add something about, for exceptional cases. And if the body who can't sign 120 days, we will have already explained why they have -- sorry, they are requesting 120 day. And if they did more they will explain that and I guess everybody will understand.

But let's try to find a way to write something on that. Asha please then Klaus.

>> Asha: Sorry that's an old hand but just to follow up on what you were saying, I agree, I understand there's an exception are already from 90 to 120, but I think you -- you got my point completely. That this is meant to be very much an exception rather than a rule. But there has to be some kind of flexibility. Because there may be very, very special and complex cases that come up. And so if there was a possibility of applying for an extension for very special cases with good reasons given, I think that would be a good sort of flexibility to include.

I'll stop here S>>: SEBASTIEN thank you A Asha before giving the floor to Klaus I want to read the comments by Wayne. The present framework is 30 days and we already go by 3 or by 4 at the same time.

But, let's see what we can do. Please, Klaus.

>> SOs thank you this is Klaus for the record.

I think there's a straight forward compromise that what Asha said basically adding one sentence under exception and circumstances there should be a possibility to apply for extension, otherwise I think 90 days or even 120 days of really ample time and we have to think about these processes and basically you can kill processes by just setting them out. So I think the 19 or 120 days are really the maximum but the reason I seize upon what Asha makes I think the one sentence at the end of contribution. Thank you.

>> SEBASTIEN: Thank you Klaus.

Any other comment?

If not, we will add as an action item here, to add the sentence at the end taking into account the last sentence from Asha, last intervention please. Thank you.

Okay, now I guess Klaus it's your hand there before on the Adobe.

>> Klaus: Yes sorry.

>> SEBASTIEN: No worries.

Let's go to 5. That's about key can complaints behavior. Any comments, questions, proposing a?

Okay, thank you.

Now, let's go to 6. Is and it's about some formal mediation training and experience within the capabilities of the ICANN ombudsman's office. Any comments? Questions?

Okay.

Let's go to 7.

It's about some gender to have some gender evaluatey in the ombuds office and other diversity.

Asha please.

>> Asha: Thank you Sebastien. For number -- my font is so small I can barely -- number 7, yes, on the gender issue, I would just, from a personal perspective we use gender balance as opposed to gender diversity. Because women are not a diversity or minority we are more than half the

population. But the balance is still the correct term because balance means you are proportional representation. So not a very important critical point. But --

>> SEBASTIEN: No you're right a Asha, no with you the question here maybe it's, sorry this is Sebastien speaking. Is and it's not balance here. We don't -- we are looking for balance because the ICANN ombuds office it is, we will take an extreme case if 3 is woman and one is man it's okay. What we say here and what is important is specifically in the case of harassment, it was request -- suggested that the ombuds will be better, the ICANN ombuds office will be better fitted to take that into account, if there's at least 1 person for each two gender. I'm sorry for this short way to say.

And another question of balance, it's another question of diversity. When we may try to find a better wording. But I get your point Asha, I hope it's okay.

>> Asha: Can I quickly respond to that.

>> SEBASTIEN: Yes go ahead Asha.

>> Asha yeah r: Yeah thank you. I see your point now Sebastien on this. Then I misunderstand but then I think this sentence would be need to be reworded to reflect exactly what you just said. That the point is we want the office of the ombudsman to have, maybe diverse is the right word. But we want to have the ombudsman office to be populated with the thing, with members, I mean with -- we want the ombudsman office the populated as reflect Iive of the community. So there's a member of the community that does not look like or is not the same gender or is not from the same geoare graver on if the ombudsman she on or he would be comfortable going to the ombudsman office so there's someone similar to him or her. I think that's what you he are trying to say. So I think the sentence knees to be a bit changed so we are talking about being more representative and more reflective of the composition of the community.

>> SEBASTIEN: Thank you Asha. And we will take into account what -- but first, take the floor Herb it's your turn.

>> Thank you Sebastien I want to come back is it timeliness or timelines? And can we just have KPIs standing on their own instead of limiting it to issues of time [number a 5] because there may be also issues of appropriate response inclusive of information and stuff like that that needs to go out. I'm wondering if we should limit that to specifically timelines or timeliness I'm not sure which words it's supposed to be S>>: SEBASTIEN may I, if just to remove the word I guess it's okay if you want to write something differently, can you send us the list or add to the list, and another wording of number 5? And.

>> HERB: Wording is it timeliness or timelines, is that an actual type I can anyone answer that.

>> SEBASTIEN: It's timeliness I got from the pace of the report I don't think we have changed this one. We are not looking at changing the recommendation except when it gave us some trouble with the exchange of bylaws. But we will check and if you have specific comments or specific wish we can write that just send us a proposal and we will take that into account.

Thank you.

Asha please.

>> Asha Hemrajani: [Silence] S>>: SEBASTIEN you may be muted.

>> Asha sorry I was muted, can you hear me.

>> SEBASTIEN: Yes.

>> Asha: Thank you thanks. Going back to what Herb's point is. Herb I think it is timeliness. And I think sentence is just poorly worded. I think maybe there's grammatical improvement that can be made here. If I recall from what I remember from the report, it was related to timeliness. So basically, the ombudsman should handle complaints in a very timely fashion. And so I think it's just that the cents might be better worded. That might help.

But on your other point about other non timeliness related KPIs, I think that's also a valid point to make.

Which I'm not sure whether that's addressed in another point in this report.

I don't recall there being other mention of KPIs but we could do a search for it. If it isn't then I agree with you Herb that it might be of value to have the ombuds office establish other non time related KPIs such as sensitivity in handling complaints and so forth. And I'll stop here S>>: SEBASTIEN thank you Asha. Sebastien speaking. I want to remember to all of us, that it's announcement from the ground situation. The ICANN ombuds office is already to publish some reports and inside the report I am sure they already some KPIs but let's check and once again if you want to improve the writing of this recommendation, we will be happy to receive your proposal on the mailing list.

Okay now we have discussed this 6 and 7.

And I don't want to reopen too much of discussion but I want to be caution that we are not intending to have all the diversity of the community within the ombuds office. If not the community will be the ombuds office. But, what here we are suggesting is that yes, you need at least 12, one man and one woman in the ICANN ombudsman office. It will be better. It's ideally configured. And if it can be some other form of diversity, it will be even better. That's what it meant if say the better wording here also please send your suggestion and we will try to work on that prior to then on our next call.

Okay?

If we can go to number 8, and number 8 it's one -- sorry, number 8 is the one it's quite difficult because it's cut in two parts here. But the main question about sorry, let me try to stop at the right place.

The bigger discussion we had here is about add a add advice ore panel. And Klaus you made a suggestion and I thought it was an interesting one as all the comments of course. But I had trouble to understand how we can deal with that and with the rest of to the ICANN ombuds office and I stake the liberty to ask the, who made the report on the external review, what he was so and it is what we have embedded in the comments here.

But Klaus, of course you are welcome to take the floor now.

>> KLAUS STOLL: Thank you and I am sorry and apologize in advance because I'm coming so late as such a basic change.

Again, I was reading the report on the advisory panel and what pricked my ears was in another working group at least in one, basically the same, another advisory panel was suggest to make me thinks a what 1 glowing on here, and I understand after reading ph. Il's comments we have to make a decision do we want to add another layer of authority or solving legalistic, law tissuous problem solving? Or so that we think about actually going down the step and thinking about an advisory panel that is basically a more informal ethics panel of as it says here, wise women and men. And to give you an example of what I was thinking about, I was thinking about the cases, some of the cases which happened, basically if

somebody -- if the ombudsman or people have the complaints or where a complaint against could talk to them, talk to them people. And I think a lot of -- a lot of stream and a lot of problems could of been solved much, much earlier and much, much quicker and without a lot of damage. And I think with regard to the advisory panel, I think the important point is to listen here to Herb. What does he think is needed and what does he think is the most appropriate. But on the other hand, I think we it's vice council for the ombuds. What is vice counts for the ombuds and the rest of the community. I think that's the model of the ethics committee or whatever it's named is the effective one. Instead of saying advisory panel. And if you as a group actually like the idea, I'm quite happy to sit down during the sheet and to write a paragraph and to make that available. Thank.

S>>: SEBASTIEN okay thank you very much. Asha please.

>> Asha: Thank you can you hear me? S>>: SEBASTIEN yes very well.

>> Asha okay, all right. I its -- okay. I also had questions, commence on this a advisory panel. And I think Klaus put it really well. He asked do we really want to add another layer of authority. And from a personal perspective I'm not quite sure that would be the right away. I wanted to, because I had missed I think the last meeting and two meetings before that. So I may have missed a discussion around that. So if that's the case, I apologize and I wanted to ask some clarifying questions about this, about this advisory panel. And the first question is, is it meant to be replacing the reports roll in the ombudsman? Or is it meant to be in parallel with and in conjunction with?

And if it's meant to be in parallel with and in conjunction with, is question then is has the line been -- has -- does the -- do these recommendations draw the line very clearly as to who has the authority over the ombuds in terms of who is the ombuds accountable to. Who does the ombudsman report to. So this is really I wanted to clarify. I'm not asking from the perspective of saying that we objective to this, I'm trying to understand what was the recommendation from the consulting company on this particular point. So can you help me with that Sebastien? >> SEBASTIEN: Thank you Asha. Herb do you want the take the floor before I try to get some feedback to Asha? Or do you want me first to try to answer?

>> Had Herb: Yeah I can probably just mention to Herb Wayne for the record. Courthouse's meant and before having my input is important, I guess. But I just want to remind everybody that I'm more of an observer than an active participant as much as I, you know, would like to dive right in with you people and work on some of these issues with my wholeheartedly, it's the working group that is acting kind of independently of my office.

So as a comment regarding recommendation 8 in this advisory panel, I will punt it back to the comments made by the committee that are the group that did the review. And merely state that any changes to the standards operating procedures and the frameworks and values and so on of an ombuds office, should be seriously considered by the people that are looking to make changes. And by adding or subtracting from the informality and the standard way of operation of an ombuds office, it has to be taken seriously into consideration. So in adding a step, I'm not saying it's right or wrong to have an advisory panel, but it would need to be seriously considered -- considered very seriously by everybody that would be involved in this decision making process including the board and the

organization legal aspects, there's so many things that would be impacted by the addition of, I don't want to say outsiders, but I will say that by adding the more people you add to the process the more risk you have of breaching things like confidentiality, opening the office up to potential litigation, you know there's so many things that can be layered on top on a decision like this. So moving forward when these recommendations go to the board if this is included in it, this is something at this a point there will be a serious discussion between myself or whoever the ombuds will be at the time and the decision making people so all of these recommendations can be seriously looked at and look at the impact they have on the informant of the office. On the movement towards having a more formal process involving more and more people, you know, will the ombuds office have staff? We are talking about diversity. So if funding is not put forward to higher people and it continues at a single practitioner, then diversity is something that will have to be taken into consideration by people other than the ombuds when they go into the hiring process. So those are all things that will be looked at down the road. I will just restrict my input right now to saying that caution will have to be taken when these decisions are made, once the final report goes to the organization and the board. Thank you.

>> SEBASTIEN: Thank you importantly my Internet connection just stopped when you started to talk and I just get the end of your comments. But, for me last comments I will have some inputs. But first Klaus please.

>> Klaus: Thank you very much for your comments. My basic question, which I don't expect you to answer, is quite respectfully what do you think would be more useful for the office something more formal or like you suggested ombudsman panel or something more formerly like I suggested with the ethics committee. Which really convinced me that with the ethics committee really field comments which are requested to -- because he's going in, it looks like really it's going in the way of institutionizing something. And if I understand Herb right, but maybe I'm miss understood him, this whole thing will require a lot, lot more discussions and things like that. And maybe we shouldn't answer the question, should it be advisory panel ethics committee or XXX. But simply saying ICANN should establish advisory panel ethics committee and have a discussion afterwards and slug shrug it out on a much more basis and trying to get it. But at least that would indicate there's different options for this. Thank you very much S>>: SEBASTIEN thank you. Asha please. And we have less than 15 minutes to go.

Asha please.

>> Asha: Thank you Sebastien and Klaus I think you hit the nail on the head there very aptly with your comments. I think this does require and Herb also said the same thing. This particular point, number 8, is perhaps the one point in the whole report that does require significant amount of discussion. Because this will be the biggest change. And I think we should also consider the possibility of going with the -- and ethics committee that could be a possibility. It doesn't have to be an advisory panel. So I would like, I would from a personal perspective, not speaking as a member of the board, I would hope to see he that there's little bit flexibility here. And then, I will want to go back to my earlier question, which is I wanted to understand from Sebastien, if this, what was the original idea, original suggestion from the consulting company? What were they thinking about when they proposed this? Were they thinking about something that would replace the boards rule in terms

the of interfacing with the ombudsman? Or is this in parallel with? Because if that's the case, then I think then there needs to be further definition or explanation or discussion rather, about how these two functions will coexist? And I'll stop here, thank you.

>> SEBASTIEN: Okay Herb pl.

No more Herb? Okay.

First of all, you want to talk Herb?

>> Herb no thank you I put in my comments there, whether these members would be ICANN staff or members of the community? That's all.

>> SEBASTIEN: I will try to stay as a repertoire here. But please, read the report.

I guess, it's all explained into the report here we are just having a short recommendation. I will try to give what I understand in the report. And why I think it could be useful and the question of the name, it's not for me to main question. The main question is responsibility. And it's also why we are having a discussion on the notes here where it's written the responsibility for the ombuds office must remain with the board.

One of the question we raise since the beginning is how to announce the independence of the ICANN ombuds office. And one of them was to try to find a way to, I will say decrease or try to catch part of the board forward with maybe not enough -- power with maybe not enough, how I will say implication and it's why I guess external review of ICANN with the proposal of discern with the proposal about the composition with with add minimum two member with ombudsman experience and three, four member with expansive ICANN experience. We have already discussed that when we discussed the report of the external reviewer.

And now if I can give you my whole point of view and I take off my hat as a repertoire. Yes, we need to find a way to decrease the power of the board and this one. If you remember, I have wrote a paper that would of been one way to have the complaints office within the ICANN staff. And we can have the ombuds with the board and then what type of complaints office or complaints system within the community. It was not the path we choose to go through the. Then this one is an important proposal.

Now, what I suggest is that we stop this discussion here because I would like very much to go to the last comments. And then to finalize the first reading. I will be happy to receive by each of you a proposal to change this recommendation 8 if you wish so. But I guess it's recommendation taking into account what is on the report of the external reviewer. It's useful one to be discussed by this group and I don't think we need to wait for other people to discuss that before us. It will be discussed by the plenaries it will be discussed by the community, it will be discussed by the board and other body. But we need to finalize our own recommendation. And I would like very much to go to the final, the last comments we had from in the last 7 minutes.

But before we go through, I guess I have Asha to take the floor.

>> Asha yes you the Sebastien I'm not going to spend too long on this I know you want to move on to the next topic. I want to clarify one thing, is that I know that in terms of the question that Herb asked about how the committee should be populated, yes that is -- that question is addressed in the report. But what's not in the report or at least is not very clear to me, and I did read it, is that you know is this advisory roll meant to be separate from the board's role in considering the ombudsman reports and recommendations. And if it's meant to be separate, how is it meant to be

separate and how are they meant to work together. That part is not clear. So I'm not suggesting we discuss this now because we are running short of time. I'm just bringing up to the table that this is something that is not very clear and it would require further discussion. Thanks S>>:

SEBASTIEN thank you. Okay, let's move to the last the two comments. The one I have requested legal point of view about the discussion and it falls well with the discussion we have and that's the point. And I conduct to go to the recommendation of number 9. And recommendation number 9, it's a question of the employment contract and how it will be handled. And here we have a discussion about what is the independence of the ombuds, I can can ombuds office. I will read what he just won't this is what I don't agree with and I don't think we have give independence to the ombuds office with another contract. And yolk they're much to independence. Any questions or comments?

>> Klaus for the record. I think tars Hans' questions and your previous questions ends on and makes it absolutely clear that we should have one more meeting between ourselves as a group under the one topic, how with can we insure greater independence of the ombuds in general. I think this agrees, I think this is until now is not clear and is an absolute vital point we can't solve or problems by contractual arrangements or giving something a contract for 5 or 3 or 10 or 20 years if.

Even if the ombuds are ombuds for life it doesn't mean he's independent. I know I'm throwing a little bit of stones into the road, but I think it would really be advice for us to be clear and to discuss out the independence questions S>>: SEBASTIEN thank you Klaus. Asha please.

>> Asha thank you Sebastien just a related point to the point that Farzeneh made in terms of the 5 years term, the question I have and this is not meant to be criticism of the recommendation but rather is a question or the doubt I have is that if we are going the delibestablish a guaranteed 5 year contract with no accurate component, then there has to be some way of motivating the ombudsman. So there has to be, perhaps, we could consider the possibility of adding a termination for clause. Something to motivate, to the ombudsman to you know to do his or her job. Otherwise there's no incentive, if there's a 5 year guarantee job, well everybody would love to do that. 5 years guarantee job. Yeah.

>> SEBASTIEN: I know that we have too much to read. But it's just the next sentence. The ombuds should only be able to be terminated with cause.

>> Asha where do you see that?

>> SEBASTIEN: Just the second part.

>> Asha I don't see that.

>> SEBASTIEN: Recommendation number 9, we have cause.
Yes.

Okay, we have two minutes to go.

>> Asha I apologize then.

>> SEBASTIEN: That's okay, no worries.

I want to first to suggest that we will follow this discussion and we didn't take into account the comments made by Cheryl and she was suggesting to add one sentence about saying that it's just one part of the independence. But it was suggested by Klaus, we will re-discuss this. I will say overarching issue of this document. It's about the independence. What we mean by independence and ICANN can go to the independence. I suggest we discuss that during our next call. And I hope that we will be able to have, but I am doubting now, but we have a final

version next week, even with some, I think to tweak between the 18th and the 20, the due date we have document disciplinary. If not we will have to wait one more month. And is that, so be it.

And we will re-discuss the different part of these documents we discussed today. With a new version. Hopefully by next week.

And as it is the top of the hour, I will just ask if you have any other business?

And if you don't, I would like very much to thank you for your participation, inputs and your comments today. And talk to you next week.

Bye. The call is now adjourned.

.