
ICANN Transcription

Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement

Wednesday, 01 December 2021 at 13:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/UwO7Cg>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

JULIE BISLAND:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement call taking place on Wednesday the 1st of December 2021 at 13:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there'll be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. And for today, we have apologies from Sebastien Ducos and Flip Petillion. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. Seeing no hands, if you do need help updating your statements of interest, please e-mail the GNSO secretariat. All documentation and information can be found on the Wiki space. Recordings will be posted on the public Wiki space shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

before speaking. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. Thank you, and over to our chair, Olga Cavalli. Please begin.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much. Good morning from Buenos Aires, Argentina, good afternoon, good evening for everyone, and thanks for joining this today. And in our call, after two weeks, we had some time to review the documents and hope that those of you who had holidays for Thanksgiving had a nice time.

We have some documents to review. We will review them and see which are the next steps. Just as a general comment, next week is the Internet Governance Forum and I have to participate in some activities. Let's see if some of us are also engaged in activities next week and see how we plan the next steps for the next meeting.

Any comments about the agenda that was shared by Marika days ago? Any updates? Are we okay with that? Okay, I take silence as a yes. The first thing we have in point two, working group self-assessment, we must remember that we have been collecting some input from yourselves. We have a document that is quite reviewed and we could say that it's done. Thank you, Thomas, for your comments and also for comments from everyone. They're the comments in the right side. I know Thomas, you're driving and you can't see the screen, but we are reviewing the document where you put your comments in.

Do we need to go through the content? We have reviewed this document several times. I think it's done, we have enough time to review it and we can agree that this is the version that we will keep as a final document. Any comments, Marika, or something we should have in mind about this document?

MARIKA KONINGS:

Thanks, Olga. The input that we received, we only got specific responses from Thomas and Sebastien who expressed support largely for the responses provided. We'd just maybe like to highlight, I think there was one specific suggestion from Thomas to maybe also look at questions that would focus on the staff support provided. So that may be something that the group may want to think about as well, as you look at both the end survey as well as the periodic survey that we're focusing on now. There are some questions in the end survey that I think do go to staff support provided, administrative support, the technical tools available, the materials that are provided, which are of course typically roles that are performed by staff. So the group may want to think about which of those questions should also appear in the periodic survey or potentially in a different kind of format as you kind of look at that. So I just wanted to call that out as a potentially a new suggestion that the group may want to factor in.

And we discussed with Olga, I think as Olga noted, everyone should have had sufficient time to review this document. Based on the input that has been provided, we assume there's general agreement with the direction that has been suggested for these different aspects, so we're going to move forward on that notion. We of course will keep this document for the record, so the

comments that have been made will remain visible and we'll make sure as well to include this link on the Wiki page so that if anyone wants to go back to this, you can do so because again, this also provides a bit of a record for once the group kind of finalizes its work and its recommendations, that anyone interested can see how the group got there and what it considered, how it thought about these questions. And of course, this is the one document that kind of explains the evolution of thinking that will eventually lead to final recommendations on what a periodic survey as well as the end-of-life survey should look like.

And of course, if I miss anything—I know Thomas is driving, if there's anything he would like to call out or if there's anyone else that maybe didn't have a chance to put it into the document but wants to make any kind of observations, now is probably the moment. We probably won't come back to this specific document apart from looking at what was agreed as kind of the basis for moving forward after this meeting.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Marika. Any comments? I know there are some new members in the group. If you need some further explanation or comment, now would be the moment. I see no comments in the chat, no hands. Okay, I think we are okay with this document and with this version, we can keep it for background information. Thank you very much for that. It took some time, but that's fantastic.

So that's point A and B of number two. Number three, working group self-assessment test working group self-assessment

survey. As you might recall, we have been sharing with all of you this survey and we have not many comments, inputs. Can we check the document please? Thank you, Sebastien—who's not in the call—for sending your comments, and also Juan Manuel, because you also put your inputs in the survey. We still have some time. Well, we don't have time because it has been going on for some weeks, but as we do have some flexibility, maybe we can give the group one week more to put your inputs. I didn't put them just not to bias—and I'm just a NomCom appointee, I don't belong to any stakeholder group, so just wanted to [put them at the end] and not to bias any other comments when you see the document.

Thanks, Sebastien and Juan Manuel for your input, and maybe Marika, you can help us go through the document, which are the questions that we are asking and what are the inputs that we are requesting from colleagues in the group. And my suggestion would be that we give it a little bit more time in spite of the fact that we had already some weeks to do it. Can you help us go through the document, Marika?

MARIKA KONINGS:

Of course, Olga. And I also note for the record that we have a fairly limited group of members joining the call today, so following this meeting, it may be worth for you to reach out to the membership and see if people are still interested in participating in this effort. I know that most were appointed by their respective groups, but as you note, there has been quite some time to complete this homework and we've seen very little responses.

Of course, thanks to those that did complete the homework and took the effort of providing their input and taking the test survey, but we really need everyone to kind of step up and help out here, because it is important that we hear from everyone, even if you want to agree with what others have said or if you don't have any specific comments but we just want to know that you did take the survey and you think the questions are good. That's fine too.

But as said, at the moment we're having very limited responses to the homework that's assigned which makes it difficult to move forward on these topics. And of course, at the end of the day, it'll drag out the work over a longer time scale than potentially necessary if everyone would participate in a timely manner.

So having said that, for this assignment, we've asked everyone to take the self-assessment, and the link is provided here in the document and also circulated on the e-mail, so you can firsthand see what the current survey looks like that is taken at the end of a working group's lifecycle.

So the idea is to go through that and firsthand try and see what the survey looks like and whether you think, is that fit for purpose? So try to do that as well after you've taken the survey to ask some specific questions that, again, are intended to help inform the next steps and kind of moving towards recommendations for changes that may need to be made.

I think we already kind of agreed or settled on the fact that in addition to this end-of-life survey, to also have a periodic survey. So considering that a periodic survey is going to be added, the question is, what should be still kept in this survey that's now

taking place at the end of life? Are all the questions still relevant? Are there certain things that should no longer be asked at the end because they're already asked at a previous stage? So it's really trying to focus on that, of the survey, what should remain. And again, a response might be everything is relevant, it should stay as is, we focus just on the questions that should go in the periodic survey.

It's asking as well what should be changed. If you're saying, well, we want to keep certain things but there are also certain things that we may want to change that maybe are not fit for purpose as they are. So it's all fair game as part of this conversation. Are there questions that are not being asked at the end? Are there questions that should be more specific or edited in a certain way? So again, also asking for input on that.

What is missing? Are the questions that are not being put forward at the moment or topics that are not covered that are important to be covered at that end-of-life survey? And then indeed, asking the questions, which part of the existing survey should move to the periodic survey or be duplicated? Because again, there might also be certain questions that you want to ask the same question at multiple time intervals to see, is there a certain trend or if something was identified as being very low in the rating, did it end up in a higher rating at a later stage so that course corrections were made that did make a difference?

So we're really looking for that kind of input to facilitate kind of the conversation around, okay, there's going to be a periodic survey. There's some questions, of course, in relation to what that will look like. But as we already have an end-of-life survey, look at that in

itself, is it still fit for purpose, are there any things that need to be changed, is there anything missing? But also asking, what of that should move or should also be asked in the periodic survey?

So that's basically what we're looking for here. We also of course have an "other comments" section, so if there's anything else that you observe or you think the group should factor in and you see here, these are the comments that Sebastien shared on the mailing list that are, I think, very practical aspects to what a survey could look like or would make it easier for respondents, of course, those types of comments are also very welcome. So with that, I think hopefully that's sufficient information. I know that I think Desiree had her hand up at some point. I don't know if her question was already answered, but I'll stop here.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Marika. Desiree, do you have a specific question or the comments made by Marika—

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Thank you, Olga. I believe Marika answered some of it while she was speaking. I was adding a bit of text in the document whilst we were reviewing it. One thing that I've noticed in the working group self-assessment survey is for example when you want to start the survey and you want to identify yourself, for example, you, Olga, cannot identify yourself as—

OLGA CAVALLI: No, I never can.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: of GNSO unless you belong to a certain stakeholder group. And you have to put individual or other, which is not accurate. You're actually a GNSO member and you don't belong, as far as I know, to any registrar or other stakeholder group. So I think that's just a minor tweak, it's not a big thing. But I think it could be added, just a member of GNSO. Unless this survey is not intended for the members of the GNSO only. So that's what I found interesting. But overall, yes, I wanted to run a few times through the survey myself, and I wonder whether it's possible to delete an entry and then start again just to see how the process is run. That was my question.

OLGA CAVALLI: I have a comment about what you mentioned. It's not only in this form. If you register to the ICANN meeting in general and you go to GNSO, we NomCom appointees don't exist, so you have registries, registrars, IPC, etc. but not NomCom appointees. So I did this comment to some member of the staff, I don't remember who, when I registered for the meeting. So that's a fair point, and I think it happens in several places in the ICANN sphere in relation to GNSO appointees. So that's something that we should talk about or fix.

And about the tool, maybe staff can help us understand if Desiree can [restart or delete her comments.] Desiree.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Yeah, I just wonder how many times you can do the survey, or can you delete the entry and start again?

OLGA CAVALLI: Maybe staff can help us answer that question. I don't know how to respond. Marika, go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS: I can try, although I think Emily may be better positioned to answer this question. I think in the current survey tool, it's not possible to save and go back. I think in previous tools—and I know that for example if you use Google forms, there are options to save and return to the survey. So if that is an important feature, I think it's definitely something the group may want to call out because that may help inform if there's a need to potentially move this somewhere else. Of course, moving it somewhere else may create other limitations because each tool has its own functionality. So I think we do need to look at, and I think similarly, Sebastien identified some features that he thinks might be helpful. So I think as part of this exercise, maybe we want to look at some of these requirements that the ideal tool would have, and then we can see how does it align with the tools that we have currently access to and then see what is most important if certain aspects are not available. But I'll stop here because I see Emily has her hand up and she's much more knowledgeable about our survey tool than I am.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Marika. Emily, welcome.

EMILY BARABAS: Thank you. Sorry, Desiree, did you want to speak first?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Yeah, just I know that I've completed the survey at some point in time and then I couldn't find what I did. So I'm actually not sure if that's been recorded or if I ever completed the survey, or do I need to do it again? That was the origin of my question. Thank you.

EMILY BARABAS: A good and important question. So I think for this survey tool that we are currently using, it is not possible to save results and come back or view the results of an entry that you've already entered. It is possible for the administrator to delete your entry and it's currently set up so that you can do multiple sets of responses to the survey. So I believe that if you wanted to go back and go through it again, you shouldn't get an error in doing that. But going back and seeing what you've done before or continuing where you left off is not possible with this particular tool.

So as Marika noted, if that feels like something that would be important to you in being a respondent to this type of survey, it's good to note that and we can certainly put that in the list of potential requirements for the future. Thanks.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Thank you, Emily.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Emily, and I want to welcome a new member of this group, Manju Chen. Welcome, Manju. Please let us know if you need any help in going through the documents or putting you up to date. I hope we can take some time in the next week to review the documents. And a warm welcome to this small but very active and nice working group.

Okay, so please take your time—welcome—review, and as Marika rightly mentioned, if you agree, just say it's okay, yes, or no, I don't like it, or add comments in the right side. That's also very helpful when preparing the final version. Maybe I will reach out to each one of you so you can give us your input.

So this self-assessment survey input form—Manju, welcome. The floor is yours.

MANJU CHEN: Hi. Sorry for joining late. I did the survey but I didn't put any comments in this document because I was quite late. But I was going to ... I don't know what kind of comments you have been through, but I was thinking maybe you can add questions in the first sets of questions regarding for example how did you appreciate the leadership of the working group, how they function as shepherding the work of the working group, did you find that satisfactory or effective? Those kind of questions. But then I'm not sure if that's going to be too personal because it's very directed to the leadership. But I think that's a valid question for evaluating a working group too. Just my two cents. Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Manju. Let me understand your comment. You would like to add new questions to the survey, is that what you're asking?

MANJU CHEN: Yeah, because I didn't see that kind of question in the survey, so I thought we should ask.

OLGA CAVALLI: We had some thoughts about that, asking specifically about the leadership. And maybe Marika can explain that. The floor is yours.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Olga. To that point—and I think it is also coming back in the next agenda item, that indeed, the group is specifically looking at this question of should questions in relation to the functioning and performance of leadership be included, either in the periodic survey as it might also be an indication to Council if there are issues or problems, or in the end survey? And of course, it can be both as well. So if you think that's helpful to be included in the end survey, do make note of that because I think that's something the group will want to look at. And for the next agenda item, there is a set of questions that was developed as part of the PDP 3.0 effort, and we'll go through those in a second. But again, the group may want to look at those and kind of indicate if there are any questions that you believe are kind of fit for purpose for the end-of-life survey and should be considered to be included there.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Marika. So yes I'd suggest, Manju, that we go through the next document and then we see if you still want to propose changes to the structure. So as final documents for this survey, take your time. I will reach out to each of you in the next days and see if you have inputs, at least to say yes, I agree, or no, or comments. That will be very helpful. Also, working groups are such an important part of the work, the general GNSO and ICANN work, so I think it's worth taking a moment to send comments. You're welcome, Manju, and welcome to the group.

Any other comments about agenda item three? So next steps, please, if you didn't, do the survey. I will comment about Desiree's comment. I would send an e-mail to staff and to our chair about this, that NomCom appointees of the GNSO don't show up anywhere. So maybe it's a new category to be included in the general structure of the meetings and documents. Any other comments on point three? OKAY, I take silence as everything is fine.

Number four is the review of the PDP 3.0, develop working group leadership survey questions. These are more focused on leadership, what Manju just mentioned. Could be perhaps addressed in this agenda item. And maybe we can review this document. It's the same link but in the lower part. So we didn't have much comments in this one again. Emily, the floor is yours. Thank you.

EMILY BARABAS:

Thanks, Olga. I'm just going to do a brief overview of what this improvement was about, where it came from, because as Marika mentioned, this is the next homework assignment, is to take a look at this and do some reflecting on it.

So as we previously discussed, as part of the PDP 3.0 effort, there were a number of improvements on very specific elements of potentially adjusting processes related to the PDP. And one of them was a suggestion to potentially look at leadership performance periodically within the PDP and ask members to provide feedback on that.

A small group of councilors did some thinking about this and proposed a survey with some specific questions. It's never been used. Some concerns have been raised after it was developed that perhaps it would chill volunteers who might be potentially interested in leadership roles, that maybe this needed some more thinking.

So what we're looking for is a fresh set of eyes on this. I guess they developed it maybe around two years ago. It eventually got into the final report in early 2020. So fresh eyes to look at these survey questions, the purpose and some of the guidance here.

This first chunk of text explains what their thinking was in terms of why the survey would be used, what it would look like in terms of how it would be deployed, and also, two of the other PDP 3.0 improvements that are related to it. Marika, do you have handy—otherwise I can share it—the PDP 3.0 final report?

MARIKA KONINGS: I don't have it handy, so if you want to share.

EMILY BARABAS: Yeah. So the basis of the survey questions was actually another PDP 3.0 improvement which was number six which focused on the necessary skills for working group leadership. So there's a long list of bullets here starting on page 40 that explain all the things that one would expect a chair and vice chair to be able to do as part of working group leadership. So this was really the basis of the survey questions that were developed. The small group looked at these points, they wanted the survey tool to be as short as possible and focus on areas where there could actually be improvement. So something like the chair really should have a lot of history and background knowledge with the subject matter, that's great, but if you already have a chair who's been serving for a year, that's something that the Council is not necessarily going to be able to change in a chair, whereas something like their neutrality may be something where there can be some mid-course correction because it's more of a behavior than a base knowledge set. So they were looking for places where you can kind of gauge performance and also where there's possibly room for improvement midstream for a PDP.

So it may be helpful as background to take a look at this final report and this longer list of desired skills for PDP leadership because that gives context for where this came from.

Shifting back to the survey itself that they developed, it's a set of eight questions, so relatively short. The idea is that this would be done periodically, either at the end of each phase of a PDP or at

regular intervals. They weren't exactly sure, just as we've discussed for PDP evaluation midstream. They weren't exactly sure how they wanted to do it. But the questions focus on a few things.

One is about facilitating the meetings themselves and getting things moving in the meeting, making sure that behaviors are managed appropriately. The second set of questions is about managing the process more broadly. The next category was about neutrality, just one question there, and then the last part is about finding a diversity of views in the working group and then driving towards consensus and getting to recommendations that follow the operating procedures and working group guidelines.

So those were the areas they felt were most important to focus on, and I guess what we're looking for here is, do you all agree that those are good areas of focus, that those are appropriate things to ask working group members about? Are there things that are missing, especially looking at this skillset for leadership that I previously mentioned?

So what we're asking folks to do as the homework assignment is similar to the previous table, simply to provide input on whether the survey should be potentially integrated into a broader periodic survey about the PDP or potentially serve as a standalone survey or not be used at all.

Are the questions the right ones to use? Should all of them stay as part of a periodic or standalone survey? Should any be removed? Is there anything missing, and anything else you want to provide input on? Those are the things we're asking folks to do, and I think

either Olga or Marika can provide the timing of the homework assignment, but that's, I think, the main background that I wanted to provide. Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Emily. Very clear. And also Manju, perhaps this addresses some of your comments or concerns about how to evaluate leadership of a working group. I think this survey is more focused on leadership. And yes, we need your input. No, that's okay, Manju, you're new to the group, so getting acquainted with these documents.

So yes, we need your input. We have perhaps next week—as I said, it's the IGF. I might have some conflicts on Wednesday. We may do the meeting another day or time or the same day at other time. Maybe I can review that with our staff. And please, let us know your comments. Leadership of a working group, at least from my experience, is a very important issue within the ICANN work because working groups are the basis of, the start of document and then that feeds other activities in the SOs and ACs within ICANN.

Marika is asking, is anyone else on the call affected by the IGF? I know that GNSO is not a community very much engaged with IGF, but maybe some of you, maybe Desiree. But the IGF goes through most of the week, but I'm personally chairing some workshops during—Desiree would be attending. So I may take some calls, but Wednesday is precisely a complicated day for me. And she's attending every day. I will be attending every day but I

can skip some sessions and participate in GNSO calls. Maybe Thursday but not Wednesday.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Later in the evening, it might be easier. Most of the sessions would finish by 5:00 PM.

OLGA CAVALLI: Yeah. It's Poland time, European time in general. It's UTC+1, right?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Correct.

OLGA CAVALLI: So in the afternoon or evening, for me, that would be much easier. I don't know if other colleagues, it may be too late for Europeans. For Americans, it's okay. It's still daytime. Maybe we can comment about this in the list because there are few colleagues today in the call. But that would be something to have in mind for the next week. Let me check the chat. Thank you, Philippe, for your comment. Marika, you have the floor.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Olga. Just wondering as well if participation in the IGF may not only affect the ability to attend the call but also to do the homework, because we do still have some assignments that need to get done. So I'm just wondering if it makes sense to not do the

meeting next week but plan for the meeting the week after if everyone can commit to completing the homework. I think that's really important. If we indeed miss next week's meeting, of course, we push things out a week. But if it means that everyone does participate and completes the homework, it means that for the week after, we would be in a good position to move forward on the conversation.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Manju is asking if we could do a Doodle. That's also possible. I'm okay doing next week. I have to participate in IGF, but as Desiree rightly pointed out, [meetings end at noon] time so I have my afternoon to participate in other activities.

My suggestion would be that we can ask this in the e-mail list and see reactions from colleagues. Maybe we can skip next week, but I would like to keep momentum because then we have a time that many people would take days for holidays after the 15th of December, at least in Latin America. After half December, people start to disappear and they come back in March. But this is southern hemisphere. I know northern hemisphere is different.

So let's think about it, let's ask colleagues in the e-mail list or what staff think. Marika.

MARIKA KONINGS:

As said, my main concern is that people are busy next week, that it will also prevent them from doing the assignments. So I think that's mainly a question. I know that Desiree indicated that she's participating. I think Philippe said the same thing. I think we

probably do need to do some individual follow-up because as said, there are quite a few members missing from today's call and that did not either do any of the homework in advance—so I think we do need to figure that out. If anything, if you want to look at an alternative, the easiest would potentially be moving it to Thursday and that would give everyone one day more. But as said, I don't have any insight into [inaudible] schedule.

OLGA CAVALLI:

We have the same problem. IGF runs until the 10th I think. Let's not have the meeting next week and comment this in the e-mail list and see reactions from colleagues. So if we hear nothing, we will take silence as a yes. Or if someone is very eager to have the meeting, we can find another time. Is that a fair proposal? Okay, I see no comments. Manju, go ahead, the floor is yours.

MANJU CHEN:

If we're not doing the meeting next week, the week after next week is like two days before Christmas Eve, so I don't think people are going to show up as much. I don't know. I don't do Christmas because I'm from Taiwan, but o see we have a lot of people who are from [inaudible] who do Christmas, so I'm not sure if delaying the meeting for another week, then the next week ... I'm not sure if the attendance will be better than if we did the meeting next week. So just curious how this is going to be.

OLGA CAVALLI:

The next meeting would be on the 15th of December, which, we still have some days before Christmas, so Christmas is 22 or 25.

What do others think? Because then we will have to go to January. That will [inaudible] too much. We will lose momentum.

I would suggest that let's postpone next week, let's propose 15th of December and see reactions in the—but your point is well taken, Manju, maybe we can ask if people are starting to get holidays.

Well, yeah, then we have to think about the December, early January calendar. Let's ask colleagues in the e-mail list. But thank you for your comments. [Very adequate.]

Okay, so next week, we will not have the meeting, we will ask colleagues in the—yeah, we are on a weekly schedule. We skipped some weeks because there was Thanksgiving and other activities. The idea is to meet weekly, but we have been adjusting our meetings in relation with other activities going in parallel. Marika, go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS:

I just wanted to respond to Desiree's question in the chat. So yes, you're assessing the survey, but as part of that, you can take the survey. So there is a test survey, so you can click around, fill in random responses. We're not going to use the responses in any shape or form, it's really there for you to kind of do a test run, which then hopefully inspires the responses to the Google doc and the table that we shared with you earlier today. So hopefully, that makes sense.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Okay. Any to her comments about this point of the agenda and next meeting and all that? I see no hands, no comments in the chat. What else do we have in the agenda? Next steps, we have talked about next meeting, I will reach out to members in the group and see if we can have more comments and responses. We have more time now. If we skip next week, we have two weeks, so that would be okay.

Manju said something in the chat that I didn't see. Okay, Manju, let's see how things move and what other colleagues respond in the e-mail list. I think we are done with the agenda. Any other comments? We're very efficient with time, we still have 15 minutes. Okay, 23rd of December is scheduled. Let's see. I'm available. My only concern is that one meeting that I'm chairing does overlap with this one in the IGF. And once you propose things in the IGF, they say yes but then they'll tell you the date and the time. You cannot manage that and cannot change, so it's not much flexibility in the agenda, which is once a year.

More comments in the chat. Let me check them. This is Marika. Okay, any other comments? I think we are finalizing the meeting. Any comment from Marika, [inaudible], Emily? No? Okay, let's do the following. So we will share this news about the next meeting date and time. I will reach out individually to some members that have not responded and to those of you in the call, [inaudible] that you would be reviewing this recording afterwards. Please take a moment. It should not take a long time. You can also review the comments made by other colleagues that would inspire you—maybe you can agree with that or just take some ideas from there.

So if there are no other comments or questions, we can finish this meeting. Thank you for your time and have a nice rest of the day and week. Thank you to staff for all the hard work. Always very good.

JULIE BISLAND: Thank you so much, Olga. Thanks, everyone, for joining. This meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]