

FINISHED FILE
ICANN
MAY 31, 2017
12:00 A.M. CST

Services Provided By:

Caption First, Inc.
P.O Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-481-9835
Www.Captionfirst.com

This is being provided in a rough-draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hello.

>> YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Hi there, Cheryl.

>> AVRI DORIA: Hi Avri joining. We have hit the hour but we will wait a couple more minutes to see if we can get a couple more people. But welcome. Give it another minute or so.

Pam, does that mean that are we all satisfied with contracted parties? Cool. Okay. It is three minutes after. I don't know if we are going to get more people here. I don't know if we meet our five by five, but I really would like to go through the recommendations. Does anybody object to us carrying forward even though we may not strictly although since Patrick is listed among participants and not hosts, we may be able to say that we have met our requirement? If no one objects let's start the recording, please.

>> This meeting is now being recorded.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you, Yvette, for that. And thank you all for being here. This is Thursday 31 May at 5 UTC. On the agenda today we basically have the initial stuff. Then basically in the substantive issues part, basically want to discuss the proposed recommendations and if there is time

basically take another look at the report.

This version came out too late, plus there is some incompleteness about it. You don't think that I can call it a first reading though I would dearly love to but it is nearly that and as much as we can get set in the right direction today would be good.

The documents update we have got basically these two documents going now. This report. And the response to the staff questions. We'll have to get back to the staff questions. But really want to try and get this report through its first and second reading before we do that. So we had action items. We had one from me to produce the third draft. And we had one for others to review the report make recommendations, edits and suggests. And not too much of that happened but I did. The schedule update, we'll look at that if we have time to see where we are at and then basically there should be the list of other meetings. And then any other business. Any changes to the agenda or comments?

Great. Then let's start and let's pull up the -- if we pull up the report, version 3. So I have taken my once co-Chair, now -- once co-Rapporteur now co-Chair's recommendation to basically make this as short and to the point as possible with most of the background information and discussions limited to the addenda. The recommendations which were initially put in before the last meeting by Jordan, I think we talked about them a little but didn't go through them in detail. I have done a little bit of editing on them since then. I would like to walk through those one by one and that's on page 4.

So there is the issues. We did talk through those previously. And then there is the recommendations. And I have got the copy in the screen open and I see that there is a couple of people in it also.

So okay. So recommendations, the first one was continue developing, publicizing the publications document so it evolves in to a concise statement of the allocation of roles and responsibilities between board and staff in the ICANN organization. Anybody have any comments on that one? Is that one okay as it is? Or does it need to be adjusted in some way? So I see no objections to -- I see a check. And I see no objections to leaving that. I see Jordan is typing. I see a check.

Okay. Great. So let's move on to the next one. This one is one of the ones that I stuck in. There had been a put something here remark previously and the reason my changes don't show is because I moved things around in the change bar and got too confusing and I decided accepting what I sent out.

>> PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Avri. I was going to make a

comment about recommendation 1. I have no objection -- thank you. I'm okay with that recommendation. I would like to go on further to say, perhaps ask something along the lines about the organizational chart or the management chart that ICANN published at the beginning of each month. I found the chart with regard to certain departments. For example, the compliance department basically had Jamie Helens and (inaudible) and that's it. As opposed to other departments that have very detailed further down the level in terms of staffing. I really like to see a more complete organizational chart, especially in relation to compliance or registry service or registrar service departments because it is under the functions that impact contracted parties like myself as representative of a contracted party registry or registrar greatly. And I do not find the transparency level or information level adequate as currently published. That's all I have to say.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thanks. Can I ask you one clarifying question and then I will go to Klaus? Would you see that in that same bullet or would that be actually a standalone point asking for the regular publication of complete organizational charts or some such wording?

>> PAM LITTLE: I think it is related because you do see the organizational chart, you can see kind of the chain of command in each department. And then you know when you have a matter you need to escalate then you know who to go to up to the next level. So either way is okay by me, but something I want to bring out to this group's attention and perhaps add it as a recommendation. Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you. Happy to hear other people on it. And Klaus.

>> KLAUS STOLL: Klaus for the record. I have a comment to recommendation No. 2. I support the idea of a paragraph and I see the reason for it. Paragraph 2 not too undefined. What are the powers of this panel? How does it operate? Does it meet more than four persons? For me the reason for the panel is clear but I'm missing some rationale, the modis operandi of that.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I am not quite sure where to go with the level of definitions that we would need but I see your point about saying something. I don't -- I guess I question whether we need to define the specifics of how it meets and such or how it collects, but we probably need to say something about its working methodology. Does anyone else have something to add on Klaus' suggestion? Yes, Pam.

>> PAM LITTLE: Hi Avri. Thank you. I personally am not so sure about this recommendation. I thought staff accountability basically ultimately lies with the CEO. And with

the Ombudsman role as currently it goes, it is pretty much limited to the issue of fairness and does not deal with staff issues. And I believe -- the complaint officer, the recently created office is solely designed or designed solely to deal with that compliance -- sorry, complaints relating to staff performance issues. Or how staff interacted with the community. So I'm not sure whether creating another panel, another layer of potentially something quite bureaucratic and may be out of Ombudsman remit would be really appropriate. Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thanks. This was written in response to an issue and it was basically saying that by bringing all four of the types together it could sort of look at problems that sort of fell in middle spaces. But we will have to speak about this one some more. Jordan, please.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Avri, can you hear me?

>> AVRI DORIA: Now I can.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Yeah. Sorry, I had a miscellaneous malfunction. Jordan Carter here. I was going to talk about the recommendation that you already achieved, but you already explained how it is connected. I think it is a little difficult to the Ombudsman to do this. And so I kind of envision seeing what other people's feedback model is about this recommendation in the public comment process. But I think in the detailed section there is a bit more clarity about kind of purpose and nature and the things that it won't do. And then it might be something that attracts -- that is automatic.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thanks. In fact, it was I believe the Ombudsman who first suggested an idea of a three-person panel and in the discussions it evolved to the four. The section that's missing, that comes after this one is a discussion of the recommendations. So yeah, that would be good. So I probably should indicate that there is a question about its inclusion and such, but we could talk about it again for the readings. Pam, you are okay if we leave it in for now and go for more comments on it and more description? Yes, Pam, your hand is up.

>> PAM LITTLE: Yes. Okay. I'm okay with it, Avri. Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you. Okay. Anybody else? I'm -- have I lost the scribe? Actually it doesn't matter. Yes, I have. Going on to the -- oh, and thank you, Jordan, for writing in to the file the second -- the possible second recommendation.

Okay. The next one is develop appropriate internal processes for ICANN staff to raise any issue they might resolve in working with community applicants. That was a response to the point that we started talking about community issues with

organizational staff and ended up saying yeah, what about the issues we sometimes have. It seemed appropriate to make that recommendation. Is there any other comment on it or question, edit? It will be open for editing even after the meeting. So if you think of something it needs, please feel free to add it.

Okay. Going to the next one, I see a couple of people typing. Perhaps I should wait a second. Okay. From Jordan, it seems straightforward and puts the responsibility where it belongs to develop that process. And I think it is more that we clarify that the complaints office is the vehicle for the staff. Patrick, where does that go? So we are basically on this one that I just read is basically on developing the internal process. It is a complaints officer?

>> PATRICK DODSON: Yes. This is Patrick for the record. Yeah, that is the mechanism of the complaints office covers the -- covers that or will cover that. So I think it is less about developing it and more of clarifying it and much in the same way that we talk about the developing and prophesizing the developments document.

>> AVRI DORIA: I guess I missed that part of the explanation when we had the discussion. Thanks. Okay. Anything else on that point? Okay. Enhance, enhance current community evaluation step in the HR process related to staff performance for managers. Staff performance. Okay. I miswrote. Let me continue reading it. Enhance community current evaluation step in the HR process related to staff performance for managers to seek input from relevant community members during annual reviews. As you will probably remember from having looked at the performance slides that we were given, it basically talks about the second stage. It actually lists community input as part of the body of material that a manager consults in doing their evaluation. So basically it just -- it seems like it is in there. I'm not sure how many of us have seen it happen. So perhaps this is just a bullet to indicate that, you know, that there should be a certain amount of focus on that particular step. Any comments on that one? And I might have to deal with the grammar a little. Staff performance for managers, yeah, the punctuation is not right because it looks like I am doing staff performance of managers or at least leaves that ambiguous and that's not what I mean.

>> PAM LITTLE: What is the current community evaluation step? I am not sure we have any community role in the current evaluation step or is there such evaluation step currently?

>> AVRI DORIA: According to the slides that we received from staff, I don't know if I still have it up on my screen somewhere, but -- and we received those and they are listed in our community -- in our document list. But on one of the

slides, oh, I should have had the reference ready, give me a second. I actually have it open somewhere. But where. But where. But where. Okay. There it is. It is -- so it is performance management overview and it is the slide that we do have it in our -- in our kit but here it is. Let me put it in. It is that. And on page -- it is actually quite an informative document but anyhow, on page 10, at the end of each review period three steps occur. The first step, staff gets an opportunity to self-evaluate. Managers evaluate their staff by taking in to account staff self-evaluation and providing overall feedback. Feedback could have been collected over a six-month period via a variety of channels solicited or unsolicited. And managers observation of staff performance, cross-functional feedback, community feedback. So looking at this it is at least part of the formula. Now as I said I have never seen it but, of course, I only see one little piece of the whole thing. So maybe it does happen in places I'm not in or perhaps it is informal. So I think that the recommendation is kind of let's say a little bit more focused. May be a little more formalization of that process as kind of -- so Patrick says it is practiced by some managers but could be emphasized more in manager guidelines. Thanks. That's kind of what I was thinking. Since they have it in their template, taking the approach of saying this is in your template but could we see a little bit more of it or could we see a formalization of it. Yes, Pam, your hand is up.

>> PAM LITTLE: Thank you for that explanation. So I think in that context maybe it is appropriate to say the enhanced current evaluation steps. But having said that as a community member I feel it will be more helpful if the community is made aware of what the metrics or performance metrics of each department, not each individual staff member perhaps, but each department are subject to in that evaluation period. So I could actually measure the staff performance against those metrics or targets to provide more informed feedback. Otherwise it is like everyone has different standards how staff could perform. In other words, I would like to see ICANN publish each department's goals every six months or 12 months. And when I perform those evaluations I can say hey, do they really need those goals.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Any comments on that or any objection to adding that to the recommendation? Yes, Jordan.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Yes. Avri Jordan. Am I a little bit louder this time? I turned my microphone up.

>> AVRI DORIA: Yes, you are a little bit louder this time.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thanks. I was going to say I don't have a problem with it if it isn't already done. I have a feeling that some of the info that Pam mentioned it is already in the

operating plan. We should check we are not recommending something that is already being done before we recommend it. That's all.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay. I have got Patrick typing. Pam, your hand is still up. Okay. Hand is down. And Pam says Jordan, I am not sure if those goals are actually clear and measurable. And especially if you look at those goals that are in the operational plan and try to map them against the goals or the types of goals that are listed in the performance evaluation, you actually might find that it is hard to make the match as to what maps in to what. Because also in that performance document that we have got, starting on page goal rating scales and descriptions, which is starting on page 14, you know, they start getting definitions about them. They talk about the various things they rate in terms of goals and behaviors. Then they get in to specific staff competencies that are indeed measured against. And then manager behaviors that are measured against. And even in executive behavior that is measured against. So they do give us some of that in the general aspect on behaviors. It is the goals that would vary with the operational stuff and I'm not sure that we could necessarily pick it out. But I'll definitely check and perhaps other people can check.

I see Patrick wrote this might be part of the reporting metrics that the org posts regularly as tracking against the Strategic Plan. And -- okay. So we should look for that and just to say taking Jordan's caution in mind that it makes sense to ask for it as Pam indicated. Perhaps those it is not clear from the operational how we do it. So there may be need to be an extra refinement step. Pam, I see you put a website in. Progress, press on that. That's the KPI. So -- Pam, are you saying that's sufficient? Or are you -- would you indicate that that's not sufficient? So those look very general to you. So you want something more specific than what's in the KPI indicators? Okay. Thanks. So you wrote -- Pam wrote it is not sufficient or specifically linked to each function or staff. Then Jordan, in terms of staff accountability I guess more specificity and clarity about what teams do is helpful. It leads a little in to organizational performance. I'm not sure I understand what you mean there.

Yes, please, Jordan.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Avri. Just what I mean there, very general organizational performance, it is quite high level goals that are clear and they get followed. Because ICANN is relatively large, at least by my standards to be able to be sort of focused on the staff accountability you need a bit more specificity. So I'm just saying that it is on the boundary of

staff accountability and organizational performance. And so we might get a little -- people might say why are you worried about but I think there is a clear answer to that.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you. Okay.

Anything -- Patrick, I think it may be helpful if the operating plan more clearly maps to the services and functions that the organization provides to the community. So that may be another way to specify it.

Okay. Jordan, is that a new hand? Nope. Okay. Great.

Okay. So now we are at instigate, I guess we go to the next one. Yeah, we are at instigate and information acquisition program, surveys, focus groups, complaints office. So allow ICANN organization to better understand its overall performance for and accountability to relevant stakeholders. So this is sort of in the metrics and information. Any comments on this one?

Give it a second. Okay. Seeing no comments I guess I can move on to the next one.

That's continue to develop the organization's culture as a high performing, transparent, open and accountable organization. Any comments on that? I might want to add the word multi-stakeholder and bottom-up there somewhere. Any objection to getting those words in to the sentence? I mean we have got them -- we have got them in our corporate documents. So I wouldn't mind repeating them here. Yes, Klaus.

>> KLAUS STOLL: Klaus for the record. I have no objections about editing but reading that, isn't that basically stating the obvious again and again? It doesn't make good reading.

>> AVRI DORIA: I don't understand. It is boring?

>> KLAUS STOLL: I think that point is a natural point. This is a recommendation. I mean that should be -- it is overriding everything and should be there anyway. I don't think it has to be set. But maybe it should.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you. If it goes without saying it goes without saying. After 15 years I have never been sure it went without saying. But okay. Yeah, Patrick says he agrees this is more of a goal. So maybe it is not written correctly. What we have been trying to respond to is the problem -- the issue we had about culture. And about it not being clear always that the organization and members within the organization had the same view of the bottom-up multi-stakeholder culture that the bylaws and such expected. And so there was this whole issue and I believe that this point was trying to respond to that. So if it reads as a goal it needs to be rewritten in terms of that. So I think continuing to develop is already indicating an action. It is not saying

continue to wish. But it is saying but perhaps it needs to be a little bit more definitive in terms of the action. I don't know.

Yes. Jordan said we should be able to take it for granted, Klaus. Yes, I wondered about that and I drafted it. And as I said I have known it is the case for a long time. I also know how hard it was to get it in to the incorporation statement and the bylaws. So yes, it goes without saying but it also needs to be said. And then we have Patrick. So it might be more that we continue to focus on the org as an effective support system for the multi-stakeholder bottom-up model. Actually weaving that could probably help in terms of making this more to the point. Either I or someone else can try to weave that in over the next couple of days. And Cheryl said yes, nice words, Patrick. Yes. Thank you, Patrick. That would be a good way to recast this particular comment. Any comments on recasting it that way?

Next one improve the visibility and transparency of systems and processes related to staff accountability and performance. That's a very general statement. It kind of builds in with the rest. And any comments on that one? When I look at this one, the only thing that I would look to add to it is some notion of this being an ongoing process. And again that may go without saying but we don't want to suggest that we make one improvement now and we are done. But rather would like to put in some notion of, you know, make ongoing improvement or something like that to the visibility and transparency.

Okay. So then what Patrick, we are championing a culture that supports high performance, transparency, openness and accountability. It sounds like a good sentence. We need to get it in. Yes, Pam.

>> PAM LITTLE: Hi Avri. I have a question about -- to this group about service level or service agreement type of thing to make it in one of the -- potentially one of the recommendations. Again I'm coming from the contracted party. My experience seems to suggest it is all one way. When the contracted party have to do something, perform certain obligations there is a timeline, a deadline. And -- but if we were asking something of ICANN making it a priority there is never a commitment to timeline. So the matter can drag on for days without a word from ICANN. For example, I have a case in -- it was last year went by staff, 21 days ago. And there is no mechanism in the contract for me to say hey, you need a response to me or progress to the next stage within a certain time. How could we build in something like that so that -- so that the commitments to excellence, to accountability is actually reciprocal rather than as a contract party. I feel it is very much one way. So it is a question to this group to see

whether we can build something in to this and what is appropriate. Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you. Anybody have a thought? This isn't one of the ones that we actually listed as an issue. Though it is related to them. But it would look like it would need to be a new recommendation. It doesn't fit in to the one, any of them. So it basically be -- words aren't coming to me at the moment. There is Patrick says read Pam's comment. Is this more about contracts language rather than staff accountability. And Pam says not really.

>> PAM LITTLE: Could I respond to that?

>> AVRI DORIA: Sure. It is a small group. So please discuss.

>> PAM LITTLE: Okay. So I don't think it is a contract language issue. The contract that ICANN has with registries and registrars, if you look at them there is nothing about ICANN obligations. Many of those are obligations on the part of registries and registrars. Would you as a contracted party relying on ICANN services like registrar service, registry service and have to deal with contractual compliance services or those functions. So, for example, to give you a clear example ICANN compliance can send me a note and say I have to respond within seven days. But when I have a clarifying question, I ask them it is never a timeline. I have cases that went and lost. Something like that I feel this group feels it appropriate we can do something and I am sure you might have heard something from the contracted party about lack of response or --

>> AVRI DORIA: Yes.

>> PAM LITTLE: Or it is a question. I would like to see how this group can build something in, in relation to dealing with contracted parties or even other noncontracted parties. There is some sort of commitment in terms of response time. Each party has to have certain timelines to respond or provide certain service. Otherwise there is consequences. But in the ICANN sense there is no such consequence. The matter can go on forever, for a very long time and there is no predictability for certainty for contracted party.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Patrick wrote something that is a suggestion but perhaps it will work. Perhaps the recommendation could request that ICANN evaluates its SLAs to ensure they have clear accountability mechanisms like response times, et cetera. And Jordan says I like that rec as -- he is referring to a previous statement. And so yeah, put it in as a -- now that's a -- Jordan, I was being confused. Okay. So Pam, does that -- does what Patrick suggested, does that begin to say it for you?

>> PAM LITTLE: Yes, sort of in some way. I am happy to

suggest some language for the group to consider.

>> AVRI DORIA: Please do. Please suggest it right in the document or you can send it to me and I will put it in the document. Whichever way you want to do it. If you want to write it as a suggestion right in to the document that would be great. Or we can take what Patrick wrote and you can -- yes, please. I have been very much hoping for people to add things and edit. If we put this one I would not put it as last but perhaps as next-to-last but that's a small point. Let's read some other stuff. The underlining point seems as from Jordan, the underlying point seems to be -- and then it scrolled off the screen. Mutuality. Jordan says ICANN expects people to meet reasonable times. People should expect ICANN to meet reasonable times. And Jordan says people equals contracted parties and community participant, et cetera, et cetera. And Pam says at Jordan, that's the gist of it. I would appreciate it if you could get something in and that would be good and that would add one more recommendation. And you are right, it does come against the issues that the registries put up about responsiveness. So okay. Are there other recommendations that belong there based on our discussions to date? Okay. So as I said, so that covers the recommendations. Please ask people to go through them, read them. I will ask people in this next week if they can really do an edit and comment pass through this document. What I would really like to do and I know a lot of this relies on me getting my work done, and after my last push to get collectible hours by midnight tomorrow because for me it is not -- midnight today, I'll have more time to spend on it. Otherwise I won't get paid enough for the month and I won't have finished all my obligations for the month. I will probably get to it on Thursday, Friday. And if other people can get to it. What I would really like to do is get to the first reading of it next week. I know we are still running a bit late. We are not going to make delivering it by the end of May, but I still want to keep moving forward as quickly as we can, if we can.

So but I basically like to check. As I said I took Jordan's recommendation in terms of keeping the front matter of the report fairly short. Without having yet written the discussion of recommendations a lot of which I'll take from this discussion and from other material. Basically we will come out to basically a five or six page report that's got a much longer addenda. And -- so, you know, and whether we have that in a single document or split it in to two makes absolutely no difference to me. Okay. Jordan says do you want/we need more discussion of the recommendations. What do you mean, please? Speak, please.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Avri, I think you already answered this

question. But what I was trying to get at like what do you need for us, if anything, from that section or was I right that you are basically going to write that up based on the conversation we just had.

>> AVRI DORIA: Yes. I'm going to write that up based on the conversation we had but I do ask people to read it, review it, suggest changes, write comments, you know, et cetera. And then, you know, I'll edit it in to a whole. So yes, I plan to use the discussion today and discussions in the past as the basis for that. But to anybody that wants to add anything, please. I have shown that I am not great at getting a lot of writing time in from week to week. So anybody that takes a pass, and Jordan, you have taken so many passes and written so much of it, I'm happy for you to write more.

But anyhow, I will sketch it out. I will probably do that on Thursday, Friday. And so, do we have the right sections in the document? Is there anything now in these first five, six pages including the discussions that's missing, that needs to be there? Okay. I'll take it as we are heading in the right direction.

Then in the addenda I know that I received some advice from Jordan at a point that perhaps I was putting too much information there. What I'm trying to do is basically do a show your work, you know, archive historical collection that basically when people go back to this trying to figure out how we got to where we got, that the background information still exists. I don't feel a need to necessarily, you know, have it in the single document and happy to take people's viewpoints on whether this is one (inaudible) page document or 20 pager or 25 pager. I would like to keep a collection. And I want to make sure we have all the right stuff in the collection. That there is nothing that's missing. And that there is nothing that's too much. So comments on that as you are reading through and reviewing would be appreciated. If you know of anything now that's missing or anything that's too much, please speak up.

Okay. So Patrick, if I understand you are recommending it to be two documents and the addenda be a separate document that people go to if they wish. Okay. Great. Thanks. It is late and I'm repeating things to make sure I understand.

Yeah, as I said I'm quite happy with that. And we'll take care of that once we are ready to send it on. I'll leave them as one document now just for ease of use. But before we send it on to the full group, I'll break it in to two and indicate that the first document is the one that gets included in their compendium and that the second one is not necessarily included. And Jordan says it makes it easier to read and feel less hard even though there is the same amount of material. It is funny

like that.

Anything else to say? I think we are getting close. Obviously we have yet to finish. And we have to give it more review, et cetera. But I think that we are getting somewhere. Anybody else have anything else? A relatively quiet meeting except for me talking too much.

So okay. Now let's look at -- okay. So if there is nothing else on the document going back to the agenda just quickly, so obviously the action item for me is produce draft 4 including all the other stuff I just said. And action item for everyone else remains the same, review and make comments, edit, suggest with a goal to having a first reading at least of the first five pages. We are obviously not doing reading of the addenda but of the five pages at our next reading. I will have to adjust document for Plenary readings. End of May we did not make it. It is now I guess mid June is the earliest we can make. And then we will have to see how that works in scheduling, talking to the co-Chairs.

I would love to get this to the Plenary at the face to face says Jordan. And also says I. What are the absolute requirements? I think June 7th is the last full CCWG before that. So to get this to the Plenary means we have to have finished -- we have to decide we can deliver by when? Yeah. Do we have to have -- does it have to have been read in the CCWG before the face to face? Or can the face to face be the first reading? Okay. So I'll have to take a look at the schedule to see how we can get that in. So basically end of May is now also crossed out. And it is now basically -- so if -- as I remember our rules we have to do two readings here before we can send it on to the Plenary. So that means -- right.

So our next two meetings will be the first and second reading. And then we send it on to the Plenary. I don't know that we will make the document deadline by then. I'll have to check. Yes, we should -- we need to commit to do that but that also means that everybody has to put in a little bit of time on it to make that happen.

So Jordan says all that needs to happen then is this group has two meetings in time for the Plenary which we do. I think 13 June thing would be okay. But will confirm. Thanks. And we make sure it is on the face to face agenda. Great.

So Patrick, you say you will circle with co-Chairs to make sure we are on a schedule and can make the deadline and we have one of the co-Chairs here. So that double-check will probably help.

Yvette, yes. I saw you were typing. I thought -- okay. We have got some typing going on. So this is 3 June. Okay. So -- oh, okay. Thank you Yvette. And -- okay. So basically

our first reading for the Plenary is the face to face. And in terms of our meetings, 7 June is our first reading. 13 June is our second reading. And I have written that in to the file. I guess we are also scheduled one for 20 June. But when does the meeting start? 25 June. So I guess we have one last meeting, if we need it, but hopefully we can either cancel that one or we can use that one to go back to the response to staff document. But I really want to get this one finished before we -- not finished but ready for Plenary before. Okay. Does anybody else have anything else? In which case -- so there is no other business. With five minutes to go, I call this meeting adjourned. Thank you so much.

>> Thank you so much.

>> AVRI DORIA: Bye for now.

This is being provided in rough-draft format.
Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.
