ICANN

Moderator: Brenda Brewer
July 6, 2015
1:00 pm CT

Coordinator: Recordings have started. You may begin.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much. I'm having technical difficulties to log into the Adobe Connect room. But welcome to the Working Party 3, initial call. We are setting up Working Party 3 (unintelligible) of the first Community Working Group on enhancing ICANN community. And as soon as I am able to login to the Adobe Connect room, of course I will continue with the slides. But let's do it this way until I get into the Adobe Connect room.

And the roll call will be as usual, those that are in the Adobe Connect room. And for those who are in (unintelligible) bridge that are not in the Adobe Connect room, would you please state your name. (Unintelligible). I am not in the Adobe Connect room. Anyone else?

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...Leon.

Leon Sanchez: No. I am here. I'm just making sure that everyone has (unintelligible) bridge.

Alan Greenberg: Your voice is faded badly.

Leon Sanchez: Okay. Okay. Can you hear me now better?

Alan Greenberg: That's better for me anyway.

Leon Sanchez: Okay. Thank you. Okay. Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Leon Sanchez: ...comment period we'll repeat some comments from different people, which of course raised new issues concerning our work in enhancing ICANN accountability. And some of the documents indeed in this respect are staff accountability, SO and AC accountability and of course as (unintelligible) diversity with the different solutions that we might come up.

And the purpose of this call now is to divide the work. We have too little time. Deliver our first (unintelligible) issue. We need to provide a draft document by July 14 so we can further work on it in our Paris meeting.

And my suggestion would be to divide the work in subgroups of this Working Party. And so we can of course take the task of assuming at least three subgroups, one taking care of staff accountability, one taking care of SO/AC accountability and the other one taking care of how to address the diversity issues that we might of course face when trying to fill our next draft proposal for public comment.

So I still don't see the Adobe Connect room. Could someone please help me handling the queue if there's any queue already formed? And of course I

would like to open the floor for comments from this approach or to check and see if anyone else has another way of trying to get this done. Your comments are very welcome.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Leon, I'm - Cheryl here. I'm happy to help you man the queue. At the moment you've got the first slide up, which is Work Party 3 and mission and proposed work plan. I suspect you probably want to be on another slide so you might want to just let staff know where they should scroll to. And you have first of all Alan Greenberg and then Malcolm Hutty. So I should say over to you Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. The slides when we see them may answer what I was going to suggest. But I think we need to - we have a lot of people on this call who haven't been necessarily very active in the CCWG. And I think we need a level set of what the items mean. You know, what does staff accountability mean? What does - what are we talking about when we say diversity? What do we mean by Board duties?

As I said, the slides may be directing that but I haven't seen them yet. I think we can now slide - do them ourselves.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. We apparently do have slide control. So if you're in the Adobe Connect room -- this is Cheryl for the record -- perhaps going to Slide 2 in the set, which outlines the prior issues. First of all, the deliverable date, which falls here horrifyingly only nine days away of 14th of July.

And in the third slide there is just the proposed set of calls and times. So having drawn your attention to that, let's first go to Malcolm Hutty and then Alan come back to you to see whether or not having scrolled through any of that if some of your questions need to be looked at too deeply. Malcolm.

Malcolm Hutty: Thank you. Firstly I'd like to say that it's important not to broaden out the scope any wider than we need to. Remember we have Workstream 2 as well. Then Workstream 1 is only supposed to be those matters that must be done in order to show a minimum baseline of accountability such that we can ensure that we can make further improvements later. And everything else is supposed to be in Workstream 2.

For that reason I would actually like to suggest that the objective of improving the diversity and outreach of ICANN, important as it is, it can be considered a Workstream 2 item and shouldn't be allowed to get on the critical path for transition.

The other thing I - the thing I would say does need to be on the critical path is issues that arise from review of the stress tests. Now I know that the Stress Tests Working Party had originally planned to meet last week and to review the stress tests in the light of the current proposal.

That's now scheduled for tomorrow, which is possibly unfortunate timing. But it's the Stress Tests Working Party identifies any issue where stress tests were being filed or not completely delivered by the current proposal then that needs to be acted upon and I would say that is what we should take at the (unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Thanks Malcolm. And as the Rapporteur for the Stress Tests Working Party, I can assure you that if we had highly ringing alarm bells in our systems, we would certainly have already passed that on. So I think that particularly since a good deal of our additional testing will be able to run in a post-Paris environment.

For the very early deadline that's probably not going to be an issue although the work possibly will go in that direction depending on the deliberations in the face-to-face meeting. Alan, is that an old hand or a follow up?

Alan Greenberg: No. That's an old hand. But I'll put it up again for a follow up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Well in that case I'm going to jump to Jan. Jan, if you'd like to take the floor now and then we'll go back to Alan as a newly lined up hand. We (refer) to you Jan. (Unintelligible) Jan to see if we can fix those audio problems. And I'll go back to Alan. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thanks. Thank you Cheryl. The slides certainly don't address what I was mentioning because they don't talk at all about trying to define the terms. And although I might not disagree with Malcolm as to some things that can be deferred to Workstream 2, I think we need all the people on this call and in this Work Party to understand the terms before we can make that decision.

So I think my statement stands that we need someone to define the - all of the terms we're talking about so we have a common understanding. And from the point of view of what we can defer and what we can't, one of the things I think we cannot defer is accountability of the AC/SOs.

You know, if we're going to be giving power to them in Workstream 1, then we have to talk about them then being accountable. And I presume Jan would be talking about that if he can ever talk.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed. Cheryl for the record. And have we fixed up your audio problems Jan? Back to you. Not hearing anything. Let's hope (Kimberly) and the team can sort that out. And perhaps Jan if you could at least give us an executive

overview of the issues you'd like to contribute to this part of the conversation in chat. That would be very, very helpful.

Alan Greenberg: Or at least confirm you're still alive.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, I - that - well, yes hopefully. I'd hate to have a plague - fatalities on these calls would be a little bit depressing. So okay. Alan's put something on the title then for our discussion. And in the absence of Leon yelling at me until he gets into the room, I'm taking it in a different direction with the some 24 or 25 non-staff members on this call.

And as Alan noted, I mix all old hands in this workspace and slightly newer, not in terms of working together but in terms of on this topic people. It's a very wise move I think to look to some definitions.

Malcolm's put to us that the diversity issue whilst worthy should definitely not get the high priority. And let's go with that question first. So perhaps if anyone would like to argue against the proposal from Malcolm that the diversity aspect of our work be put to the secondary part and not given out high priority. This is your speak now or forever hold your peace moment.

Jan Aart Scholte: Cheryl, can you hear me now?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's Jan, I'd be delighted.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...came up. So I've got Avri in the queue and the microphone is yours Jan.

Jan Aart Scholte: Okay. Yes. I did want to just qualify Malcolm's point. I think in general on this diversity issue deferring things to Workstream 2 is fine. But there's several diversity issues, which come up in relation to the actual empowerment mechanisms, which are being proposed as part of the IANA transition.

And I think when diversity issues are relevant to the immediate proposals of the IANA transition, then they should be still considered in balance. So it seems to me that diversity issues in relation to the independent review panel are relevant and diversity issues in relation to the SO/AC accountability empowerment mechanism that's relevant.

So when diversity is related to wider issues along with (unintelligible) issues then that will be fine in Workstream 2. But it its part of the actual mechanisms that are being proposed for the IANA transition itself, then I think we should still keep them in mind.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Jan. Cheryl for the record. I'm coming to you next Avri but I wanted to note some relevant conversation out of the chat to what Jan was just raising and that includes that (Corwin)'s mentioning - he would suggest that staff accountability is a Workstream 1 issue at least to the extent that there should be community mechanisms when staff negotiates contracts that arguably intrude into the realm of consensus policy.

And that Paul Twomey notes that he's a strong advocate of the need for the SO/ACs to improve diversity. So I believe that's almost an addition to what Jan was just outlining in terms of the need of the diversity at some point still needing to be a Workstream 1 matter. So there's clear subsets where diversity is going to be still an issue.

Jeff Neuman also agrees that the staff accountability is a Workstream 1 but has some variance with - still on the matter of contracts. And it seems to me by the conversation running in chat that Jan your proposal has got reasonable courage and support at least by those who are chatting at the moment.

And just to close off before we go to Avri, Malcolm is stating that nobody disagrees with diversity being important or suggesting it is a secondary or not a high priority. The question is whether it qualifies under the definition of Workstream 1 and of course we have gone through that definition when he made his intervention earlier.

No Avri, don't just use typing. I just didn't want to lose the pieces of conversation that were needing to be inserted between what Jan was having an intervention and moving to you. So over to you Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I was going to basically - Avri speaking. I was basically going to endorse what Jan said. I probably could have put my name - my hand down as soon as he started speaking on it.

Though I guess I can disagree with one point. I think it's premature to move anything to do with diversity to one and two until we have figured out what portion of the diversity issue pertains to Workstream 1. I think there's just too little recognition of how critical the first is in even understanding what the expertise set and point of new combinations need to be. And we can't just dump that on the future. We really need to make sure that it's included.

I do also agree with people talking about staff accountability. I think that is a more difficult issue. And I'm not sure one that we can resolve certainly in any depth in Workstream 1. So probably most of it should go to Workstream 2.

But like diversity there may be aspects of it that are reasonable to deal with in Workstream 1. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Avri. And just before I go to Sebastien - this is Cheryl speaking. Popping back to the chat again noting that Keith Drasek is asking which - Paul Twomey which of the SOs and ACs does he think needs the additional diversity and then how we define diversity. So Paul, it might fingers to the keyboard on that one.

And Jonathan is raising the point on our longstanding definition that Workstream 1 with the powers necessary to make sure communities can have Workstream - make Workstream 2 happen is only supporting that question. And also seems that people are arguing on Workstream 1 issues they feel are important but we need a common definition.

Without continuing to read everything in the chat before I got to Sebastien, I'm just quickly scanning down. I think we're okay to go now to Sebastien and I'll come back to some of the chat in a moment.

Jeff Neuman: Cheryl. Cheryl, could I please be put in the queue?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You certainly may my dear. You can be immediately after Sebastien. Over to you Sebastien.

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you Cheryl. And I think the discussion about what will go into Workstream 1 and Workstream 2 it's a very important discussion. But we - I don't think we need - we can't start by this discussion. We need to first to define what is the topics we are talking about, what are the sub topics and the - after that we will decide it's to Workstream 1 and Workstream 2.

And the question of diversity it's from my point of view very important and I agree with what Jan said and also Paul and Avri. I really think that we need to find a way (unintelligible) diversity included in what we want to do. If it's not done - for example, if the community defined by us at the end is not diverse, we will not have any gain in moving in some directions.

And I really think that the diversity should be one hour thinking and elaborating the composition of the body. We want to build in the first - in Work Party1 and in IANA transition also. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Sebastien. Cheryl again for the record. We now will be going to Leon, our leader, followed by Jeff Neuman. But I would like to draw everyone's attention but also mention to Leon as he's not as yet in the Adobe room that the one pager - or it's only one page that I can see called diversity within ICANN is now a document showing in the new shared screen space. So to you Leon and then to Jeff.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Cheryl. And I apologize for not being in the Adobe Connect room. I have some technical difficulties right there. Maybe one step forward or maybe step, step - a step back on this is to see which are the mechanisms for the matches that are already weighed into the different documents that we have within the ICANN structure.

And for that that has set up (very neat) with some documents have been made through the years. And maybe the first step even before itemizing everything into Workstream 1 or Workstream 2 could be to see which mechanisms we do have late already. And those mechanisms do need to our expectations on our need for accountability that need to be enhanced with regards to the SO/AC and diversity.

And from there we can of course then the second step itemize, which could be dealt with in Workstream 1. And then the other one in Workstream 2. And once we have that, we can of course provide a draft solution for - to be taken into consideration by the larger group when we meet in Paris.

So I would say that we could definitely go just making this inventory of current mechanisms like for example like (unintelligible) we have the ATRT 1 and 2 recommendations. We also have the Affirmation of Commitments.

We have of course the public comments too, which the community has provided feedback. And we also have the One World Trust report. And I think that there we can at least start the discussion by identifying, as I said, what we have in place now.

And after identifying and making this inventory we can then identify which of these mechanisms need accounting and which are mechanisms that are - need to be created. And from there then we can itemize Workstream 1 or Workstream 2. Thanks Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Leon. And Cheryl for the record again. Understand a lot of proposals in what you just said. So perhaps we can just put a pin in some of those things and come back to that as a discussion point once Jeff has made his intervention. Jeff Neuman, over to you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thank. So there was some discussion on the chat from Jonathan Zuck and Steve DelBianco, which I think I would actually like to hear more about and that was what the original intention was of what Workstream 1 and Workstream 2 are meant to cover. Because I think that we're equating importance with priority. And so I think just a little bit of background. I'd like to actually hear them take it from the chat to just talking about it now.

On the accountability issue of staff, I don't know where the discussion papers came from. But I would like to see as a Workstream 1 item with regard to staff accountability is. And I said this on the chat but want to say it again. It's really defining what is the role of ICANN staff.

And I've seen people describe them as everything from coordinators or implementers and in some cases and even in the CCWG discussions I've seen them say that they're a stakeholder group in of themselves, which I don't necessarily agree with. But I'd like to see the Workstream 1 item the definition of the role of ICANN staff and then maybe some of the details behind that pushed into Workstream 2. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Jeff. I think that's a solid proposal. Cheryl Langdon-Orr will note that in the discussion notes and hopefully come back to specifically define that final proposal.

But let's ask for - in fact perfect timing. Steve, I was just about to ask you to take the microphone and respond to Jeff's request to bring some of what was in the chat about the definitions and roles, things that were in Workstream 1 versus Workstream 2 to the audio record I believe. Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Cheryl. It's Steve DelBianco. Jeff, I pasted in the chat verbatim from December of 2014 when we were working out Workstream 1 and 2. And the key to Workstream 1 was to have the powers necessary to be able to overcome resistance if we tried to implement things in Workstream 2.

So your idea of a definition of that strikes me as something that Workstream 1 power would be adequate to overcome resistance if the community had

consensus around withstanding some of our challenge mechanisms to cover action staff or inaction staff.

So I don't think we would have to add even a stub definition of staff in Workstream 1if Workstream 1 gave us the power to challenge and even overcome Board resistance if we should speak to expand powers to overcome inaction or action by the staff. So by that definition, no need to cover that in Workstream 1. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Steve. Did you want to take that further and - Jeff and react back to Steve?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks. Yes, Steve, I think that could make sense. I'm just not - it would be good to hear some more from you about which mechanisms you would expand to cover staff action or inaction. I think independent review and other aspects might be a little costly and time consuming to challenge a staff action. But I certainly would love to hear more about it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Jeff. Steve, did you want to respond very briefly?

Steve DelBianco: Well you got the five community powers that enjoyed broad support during our first comment period. They included things like detailing a budget, operating plan or strat plan. And that could well involve elements to where staff had put meat on the bones of a spending requirement.

So that would be a power that would cover whatever budget or strats might offer and being approved by the Board even though staff had a role in drafting.

Another one would be a bylaws change that comes from ATRT. It's a bylaws change that could force the Board to take action on formal advice of an AC or an SO. Take formal action. And by having the Board take formal action that was supposed to trigger the ability for us to challenge the Board with a reconsideration or IRP.

As an example, it might be that we would look for a bylaws change in Workstream 2 to suggest that actions of staff at interpreting policy and turning it into implementation should be challengeable.

And if the community had consensus around that, we would make that as a recommendation. If the Board chose not to adopt that bylaw, we would be able to challenge that as an IRP or reconsideration.

But as yet until we come up with a structure like for instance members who have a statutory right to propose bylaws changes, there isn't yet a mechanism by which the community even with a consensus can draft a bylaws change and compel the Board to take action on it. And that's something that we may have to consider for Workstream 1. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Steve. And I noticed Jeff you popped your hand back up again; so back to you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks. Steve, I think those - that I'm familiar with the five community powers. But I guess I was looking more in terms of accountability in terms of if there's a thing like a security breach. So it's not really a Board action or inaction. But it's a staff action that should normally have certain consequences to them yet don't - staff doesn't take reasonable steps to address that type of security breach.

There are lots of smaller items that I just don't think rise to the level of independent review or any of the other challenge mechanisms that we've thought of that I would like to see addressed but maybe in a Workstream 2 item.

But I do want to see what the definition of ICANN staff is - what the role of ICANN staff is because members of the community ask ICANN staff to do a lot of things, some of which people argue are outside the mandate of ICANN and others argue no, that's squarely within the mandate of ICANN and the staff.

So I think having a definition of the role of ICANN staff would be extremely beneficial for the community and for the powers that you're talking about - the powers that everyone agreed upon.

If we can't have a definition of what the role is of ICANN staff, then having mechanisms to address what some believe are failures, which may or may not fit within their role, just doesn't to me sound very useful. But thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Jeff. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record again. And I note particularly for those who may not be in the Adobe Connect room that we've just had the staff accountability discussion - that staff document put up on the screen.

And it might be I think quite timely now to just go over that in some small detail. It's a very short half page, not even a one pager. And some need - there we go it's back again. It was disappearing on me as soon as I went to zoom into it.

So if you will indulge me while there is no hands up just to take the staff accountability issue a little bit further and then we might go back to some of the other issues that have been very well discussed in this slide in chat.

There's a description that follows. Several commenters in the public comment period requested that the CCWG consider how to enhance ICANN staff and management accountability as stretched out by the center for instance. The goal would be to create a culture of accountability.

In general, management and staff should be accountable to working for the benefit of the purpose of ICANN -- and its mission I assume that should read -- while they report to the Board President and CEO or the President and CEO in brackets management and staff.

The purpose of the accountability is the same as the organization and that is listed as following. Comply with ICANN's rules and processes. Comply with applicable legislation. Achieve certain levels of performance as well as security. Decisions for the benefit of the public, not in the interest of a particular set of stakeholders or ICANN the organization.

And then the President and CEO, management and ultimately the ICANN Board they're expected to promote the set of behaviors that will create the culture of accountability across staff.

ICANN has already set up some mechanisms such as the ombudsman or a whistle blower part of the CCWG recommendations; either Workstream 1 or Workstream 2 could address this issue.

Potential concrete steps listed for the CCWG are as follows. The following idea is for recommendations of the CCWG could be explored. One, establish an inventory of existing policies and procedures for ICANN staff.

Two, assess enhancing reconsideration and review process to staff action. Three, consider a code of conduct to clarify expected accountability behaviors from staff and management. Four, transparency regarding interaction between management and government officials.

Five, regulate independent and then in comma - in brackets, internal and community, close brackets, survey/audit to track progress and identify areas of improvement. And finally, appropriate processes to escalate issues enabling both community members and staff to raise issues.

So having read that for the record, I don't see any hands up on that. But we certainly have a conversation starter for staff accountability as a topic. We have the conversation or discussion starter, which was previously displayed for the AC/SO diversity issues as well.

And just on that I note Jon has put into chat regarding the accountability - staff accountability matters the following. How is staff accountability of Workstream 1 issue? What needs to be done on this count for the purpose of the IANA transition? And that's in upper case.

I see clear places where diversity and SO/AC accountability are Workstream 1. That's not clear how specific measures for increased staff accountability is Workstream 1. So Jon, I don't know whether we could get you back on audio to take that a little further. Jon, are you able to connect your microphone again?

Jonathan Zuck: Yes. Can you hear me now?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Perfectly. Please go ahead.

Jonathan Zuck: Hello.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, go ahead.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. No. It's not the - a challenge as such. It's just a clarification. My understanding was that Workstream 1 were those accountability measures that were needed to be able to justify the transition - the IANA transition.

And as far as I can tell, these issues about staff accountability sounds like longstanding general concerns, which are not related to the specific mechanisms related to the IANA transition, in which case they sound like Workstream 2 to me. But maybe I'm misunderstanding.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Jon. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record again and trying very hard remembering I'm a member, not the actual Chair of this Working Party to act in a very neutral management of the flow of discussion roll. I'm going to put my hand up and hop in the queue quickly to say Jon, that is my understanding and I agree certainly from my perspective it would be totally.

The intervention on chat by Steve DelBianco; if I could ask you Steve to perhaps take the microphone and react now to Jon for the audio record as well.

Steve DelBianco: Jon, Steve. As I put into the chat, I won't read it out again. But the Workstream 1 and 2 distinction did not constrain themselves with the IANA

transition. Again, CCWG we're concerning ourselves with accountability, not the IANA transition per se.

And when it came to accountability, we looked at Workstream 1 as the only leverage opportunity because Workstream 1 would be there before transition. So any accountability improvements we needed had to be in Workstream 1 or we would lose the leverage to get them done in Workstream 2.

And that is why Workstream 1 has to contain the powers necessary to overcome resistance after the transition when we would no longer have any leverage. So I don't think your definition squares with what we have in our proposals or what the CCWG came up with.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Steve. Cheryl for the record. Whilst it may not square as an exact match, of course the transition accountability matters (I agree) certainly within the Workstream 1 if not the commitment to make sure that they can be followed up in Workstream 2 were a part of the established definition.

And I must say whilst the discussions in today's call on Workstream 1 and Workstream 2 are not only worthy but very, very robust and interesting. We do have to remember that we have a very short deadline for at least some of the product of our Work Party. And we're talking less than nine day now to put out some pre-Paris meeting documentation.

And I'd just like to remind you all that there was at the beginning of this call a proposal to slice up the work into at least - I believe at least three strings. And some of those strings have been - gosh I shouldn't be using the word string. Three parts.

And some of those parts have been I think given a good starting discussion both in the audio record of today's call and in the discussion starter documents were displayed. But also, I would suggest in particular within the chat just before we come back to - in the last few minutes of the call perhaps getting some of the administrivia organized for our own galley working in this Working Party.

I just wanted to note the excellent discussion on AC/SO diversity and its partitioning into the wider issues of the ICANN definitions and utilization of geographic diversity. Whilst I think most of us recognize that the component parts of the community ICANN have fairly broad ranging criteria if not intentions and certainly outcomes in being (unintelligible) balanced and diverse.

We have some parts of the organization which are mandatorily aligned very, very closely with the ICANN geographic regional balance. And we have other parts of ICANN, which are more aspirationally aligned along those and not necessarily as actually aligned as others into even the existing geographic nomenclature of the five regions.

Paul Twomey has raised the very important issue from the region that as a member of the CCWG I am supposed to be acting in the best interest of and I certainly wanted to come in behind Paul and say that yes, I agree for a whole bunch of reasons that the - a re-discussion of how one recognizes the population densities as well as the geographic diversity needs to be looked at. But I also agree with him probably not as a matter of immediate urgency.

I would like to also remind and raise for the record that the Cross Community Working Group - very early Cross Community Working Group on the geographic diversity of ICANN and its geo regions work was conducted over

about a 3-1/2 to four year period and then went into a sort of talker state for a bunch of reasons under the auspices of the ccNSO.

That work has languished somewhat administerially up until recent times where it has in fact after quite extensive community review and interaction and if memory serves me three if not four public comment periods on this work has now been taken to the point where I trust we will be putting that geographic diversity review as an ICANN wide document to its final resting place in front of the ICANN Board for its recommendations.

It certainly is an important document. And I would suggest should be added to the reading list for (unintelligible) that are going to be looking at the AC/SO and other diversity issues out of our work product so that staff would take an action item to get from (Bart) and Rob Hoggarth the most recent copy of that documentation.

And also that our staff to track the final process of that community supported work, which I think will act as a good foundational piece of some of what we're doing.

That said, the work has taken so darn long to put to bed. It's actually ready for another review. So the joys of the ongoing turn of review processes in ICANN. We would probably be able to use that as a basic piece to take and accept in a Workstream 2 issue. And I suspect Paul you'd be very keen to pursue that looking at your well-founded concerns on population and geographic diversity certainly within the age of specific regions.

What I'd like to do with Leon's permission now is note that it would take us far too long for the remainder of this call, which I do believe that staff can

(unintelligible) 60 minutes to go through much of the record of interchange in the chat.

So perhaps it should be listed as an action item on all of us to take the chat transcript, which will be linked to today's meeting notes but also will be placed I trust as a PDF document in our Wiki page for the Work Party and review it very, very closely because there has been some hugely valuable interchanges and information that will act as a baseline for what I trust we'll be doing shortly after we go to Sebastien, which is starting to carve our work product up. Sebastien, over to you.

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you Cheryl. I just wanted to add that I tried to start the definition of what are the various possibility for diversity. And in my contribution to this group, I am writing it within the French version and an English version so (it'll be part) of the comment period.

Maybe it could be one way to start some discussion on that issue or to add that to the paper that we receive from - to start the meeting today. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much Sebastien. Cheryl for the record again. And I would just ask staff to double check that those reference pieces Sebastien just referred to are in fact properly integrated and added into the discussion starter, which I know are in need a display but which was displayed earlier on in our call.

And my pause was because our fearless leader Leon who battled with the technology gremlins has finally managed to get into the Adobe Connect room. So I got to see if I can channel Leon for just a moment longer and ask staff to put up the PowerPoint for today's call and probably go to Page 2 if not Page 3.

And at this point, which is not how I planned my last 50 minutes, I'm going to hand the call back to Leon. Leon, the call is yours.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Cheryl. I finally made it into the Adobe Connect room. And if we could please display Slide 3 of the slide deck that we have on our screen and (unintelligible). We have a very real short timeframe to deliver our first document so we can have it ready for our Paris meeting.

And these are difficult to scroll. Beginning Wednesday, July 8 from 7:00 to 12:00 (unintelligible) and another one on Friday. Then on Monday and then on Tuesday, July the 14th to have our last call.

Of course these calls (unintelligible) depending on progress. If we do take that forward with our work, we could cancel maybe one or two of the calls that are proposed here.

And I would like to go for maybe subs of these calls. I know (unintelligible) sort of working very little time but unfortunately that's the tasks that we have been tasked with.

So if there are no objections at this point, I would - staff can give the calendar advice to everyone in this Working Party to attend the calls. And I see (unintelligible).

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes. Just to be clear that we (unintelligible) to discuss this issue but the number of calls and what times the call are. Just to tell you that two of them I will be on the plane and it will be difficult to participate. But if we start discussing that here, we will never end. And let's take those as a done deal and I will catch up after. I'm sorry to miss some of those calls. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Sebastien. I agree with you. And next in queue I have Cheryl. Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. I'm finally acting as a member. Happy with the calls although I too will be traveling on at least one of those but life is life back when the world is round and travel times can be long.

I just wondered Leon your original proposal and I think it did get some carriage and support during the early part of the call or at least not too much was different suggestion to carve out our mission into slices.

Whilst that makes great sense, I also somewhat fear for those parts all to be done to any extent in the near term certainly under this proposed set of calls. I just wanted to know from you how you envisage this initial set of four calls. Is there a single band or two bands of our work that you want to address? I just want to hear a little bit more about that. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: That you very much. What I have in mind, and of course this is always open for comments and suggestions, would be to divide the working group with subgroups and have one of the groups review those mechanisms that we already have in place in the Affirmation of Commitments. And then another group maybe review the ATRT 1 recommendations; then another one the ATRT 2 recommendations.

And of course we could also have One World Trust report, which I think it's - I think it's not really what we're looking for so far as I can tell the One World Trust report. But I will definitely take a look into at least the Affirmation of Commitments, the ATRT 1 and ATRT 2 with regards of course to these area because we've already done this in our Work Party - our Working Party or

working area of what - I'm sorry. There's just so many working areas and parties and streams.

But I'm pretty sure that we already made this in our work at the early - at the early stage of this working group. So we should repeat these documents and see what are mechanisms that are already in place with regard to these emerging issues, which are of course the SO/AC accountability, staff accountability and diversity requirements.

So it would be my first pick. I would kindly ask us for volunteers for each of the subgroups. And the Subgroup 1, as I said, would be focusing on the Affirmation of Commitments; the second one on ATRT 1; third one on ATRT 2.

And also one thing that I see Cheryl's hand is up. Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Leon. With the time pressures you're under, I'm going to respectfully disagree with you on at least one point. And that is I don't necessarily think we need to split ATRT 1 and ATRT 2 up. I think you do have active members and participants of those processes within this Working Party.

And that perhaps by prevailing upon for example Avri who is in fact acting as a specific liaison in this area and perhaps Alan to name but two to act as co-Managers of this particular subgroup and band of work that you could probably take us down to two primary bands. And that might expedite things. So that would be I would suggest friendly amendment to your proposal. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: That definitely works for me Cheryl. Thank you for suggesting it. And things that are (unintelligible) we would definitely take that step as you suggested. Next in the queue I have Alan. Alan, please take the floor.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Jeff in the chat was channeling the - I don't understand these sub bands or subgroups overlapping the three main topics. Maybe I'm missing something here but I really don't understand where we went with that or where we're going with that.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Alan. The reason to split the work into two different work bands is to expedite our work and have one working - one subgroup to look at the Affirmation of Commitments and the other one take a look at ATRT 1 and 2 with regards to the mechanisms that are already in place in those documents in relation to this, you know, (arising) issues.

                  So I think if we do split the work in these two subgroups we can have better product in less time than if we do an overall approach by the full working group conversation. I don't know if that answers your question.

Alan Greenberg: Not really. I don't understand in - at the level you're talking what the relevance is of the ATRT 1, ATRT 2 and AOC is on for instance accountability of the community. Maybe I'm...

Leon Sanchez: Well...

Alan Greenberg: ...missing a major thing here.

Jan Aart Scholte: Can I chime in?

Leon Sanchez: Yes of course, please do.

Jan Aart Scholte: Leon, I'm just standing in with Alan. I - if I understand it, the issues that are at hand are staff accountability, SO/AC accountability and diversity. And those are the three issues.

Leon Sanchez: Exactly.

Jan Aart Scholte: And presumably those are - yes, but then shouldn't the - doesn't it make more sense to have subgroups on each of those respective issues and then task each of those subgroups to look at and refer to the ATRT, et cetera, documentation as it relates to their specific issue?

Leon Sanchez: Okay. That's what I proposed initially but then we have (unintelligible) from Cheryl, which I think are good. And I would say that either way works for the working group just how we - how do we feel more comfortable working with. So I think, as I said, would be to divide the work into three subgroups, one dealing with each new arising issue and have them look into the (unintelligible) documents.

So I see that Cheryl's hand is up. Maybe she wants to react to this and I (unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Thank you Leon. It's - thank you; Leon; Cheryl -- at the top of the hour and I'm very aware of our time pressures and some of us have another call we need to get to anyway.

My point was to not split up ATRT 1 and 2 and if need be the Affirmation of Commitments. That was when the slicing of the work seemed to be going into a baseline review progress piece of work into two if not three bands.

If we're going to stick with, and I'm perfectly happy with sticking with the matters at hand, things liking to SO/AC accountability, ICANN staff management accountability and a third one of diversity, then each of those needs to look to all of those (bases) and would have to look at existing mechanisms and recommendations from ATRT 1 and 2 and the AOC.

So it's simply a different way of carving it up. If you're doing it in the latter, then I would suggest that we might need to note from the beginning of the call that there will be diversity aspects in at least topic one as well as a standalone matter of diversity, which I believe the chat at least was suggesting could be to some extent addressed in later work and I've probably badly paraphrased some of what Jan's intervention was saying. I'm putting my hand down and note Alan's is up.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Cheryl. And next in the queue I have Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Thank you very much. I guess my concern - why I raised the question of AOC, ATRT 1, ATRT 2 is particularly on the issue of community accountability. I don't think those ever looked at before in any great detail.

So I don't think there's a lot of reference work we - I think we need to start. That's why I was strongly questioning the relevance of those documents at least in that area. Maybe some of the other areas, certainly diversity, has been mentioned before and certainly staff accountability it has been.

Leon Sanchez: I do agree with you that the points that have not been addressed in these documents. And as far as we can certify that there are no references to these documents, then we need to come with creating (unintelligible) issue. And next I have Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Being very aware of the time, of course, thanks for that Alan. But some of those things are not going to be done between now and the 14th. So we do need to recognize work to be done immediately as well as work that obviously has to be done. And so I just think we need to get a little bit of the administration sorted post haste.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Cheryl. So while I'm mindful of time at least (regards to) the call, Alan, could you please make a quick point please?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Just a very short one. I agree with Cheryl. We're not going to come up all the answers. I'd like to by the time we get in Paris at least understand what the questions are or at least identify carefully what it is we're trying to do even if we don't have the answers. Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Alan. And well, I will call now. I would call for volunteers for each of the three subgroups. And we'll take a look at the different documents with regard to each of the issues. And of course continue (unintelligible). And I would also kindly ask for some volunteers that are also volunteers for other working parties to organize your schedule so you don't distract their resources into the different working group sources.

I mean I just don't want to take all of the volunteers from other working parties into these working parties and become an obstacle to other working parties. So with this, I thank everyone for attending the call. And I now call for staff to (unintelligible) these action items and (unintelligible) call. Thank you everyone for your time and talk to you soon. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye.

END