ICANN

Moderator: Brenda Brewer
July 14, 2015
1:00 pm CT

Coordinator: Recording has started sir.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much operator. Welcome to his call Number 5 on the 14th of July of Working Party 3 with regards to emerging issues from public comment.

And the aim of this call I'm sorry for not having sent an agenda earlier but as many of us I'm pretty sure that mostly every one of us was at these meetings and calls so I really didn't have time to look into the agenda.

But I may suggest that for the agenda of this call we of course the roll call as usual. Then we get to look into the three papers that have been worked by the subgroups.

We have the paper on SO and AC accountability, the one on staff accountability and the one prepared by Sebastien with regards to diversity.

Of course the aim of the call would be to have finalized versions of these three documents. I believe that we are pretty close to having final versions as the

many comments and contributions for each member have already been approved by either myself. And I think Sebastien has also his part on the diversity paper.

And with that then we would close with any business and adjourn the call. So are there any object is to this agenda?

No, okay. No objections, excellent. So the roll call as usual...

((Crosstalk))

Sebastien Bachollet: Leon sorry it's Sebastien. No objection but maybe we a few minutes to talk about past meetings what we want to achieve as a Work Party 3 where we need to do something and if we can have this short discussion could be useful. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Excellent. So I will ask - please at that point to the agenda is point Number 5 but then just have any other businesses point Number 6 in the agenda. Thank you very much.

Kavouss Arasteh: Could you show the agenda please? I don't see an agenda on the page on the screen? Could it be yes, so I took the agenda...

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: ...nothing is being shown shared.

Leon Sanchez: As you can see it's in the right column where the notes are being taken Kavouss but our last...

Kavouss Arasteh: In the right column is nothing - discussion notes is nothing.

Man: You have to scroll up.

Sebastien Bachollet: Scroll up.

Leon Sanchez: You might have to scroll up and but anyways staff could you please queue up very quick copy paste so we can display this on the...

Sebastien Bachollet: Okay welcome call yes, I found it. Welcome call I guess - oh, yes.

Leon Sanchez: Okay.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes.

Leon Sanchez: Excellent. So then the roll call would be those of course present on the Adobe Connect Room. Is there anyone that is attending the call over the phone bridge that is not on the Adobe Connect room?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I am not there yet but I will be Cheryl.

Leon Sanchez: Okay Cheryl. Thank you very much. So Cheryl could you please - could - perhaps could you please add Cheryl to the roll call?

                  And with no further delay and as we have very little time I'd like to go through the SO AC accountability draft paper.

                  The last version is the one that is in the Google Docs. I haven't sent this version to staff so most likely they won't be able to display it in the center in the central pain of the Adobe Connect room.

But I am pasting the link to the chat box so you can all go into the document and we can have the final review on-the-fly.

And so far the different comments that were made by many people including Dan-Jan, Avri, Sebastien and I remember also Jim and I believe that made some comments. And this article comes that have been already incorporated into the document.

There is only one outstanding comment by Sebastien which is highlighted on paragraphs two with regards to the word created and SOs and ACs commenting on - already made public.

And I didn't quite understand what you referred - with that Sebastien I'd like to ask you if you could please explain what you mean by being made public because I mean we can amend this paragraph by saying for example the comment made by center recommended and accountability literacy culture and attitude is created and made public by establishing (trade name).

I don't know if that would be an amendment that's captured your comment Sebastien.

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you Leon. It's Sebastien Bachollet. The question is I am not sure that we know all the establishing - yet established training and program on the (unintelligible).

And I am sure that there is and I can tell you that for example there are some training about how you call that harassments, it may be even sexual harassments who is existing and that was also a need for the board member to follow this trainings.

And I am not sure that there is nothing. And I just want to be sure that we don't say that we are the ones we will create everything because there is nothing.

I would like to be sure that we first say just tell us what is existing and if not we need to add some new items and create them. That was my point on that issue.

And maybe I saw that who is on then? Is that Samantha is online. Maybe she can say something about that if you wish because I am almost sure that there at least few elements already existing. Thank you.

I hope it's clear what I am trying to tell you. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Okay. So I've amended the document with a quick wording here to say that to the comment made by (unintelligible) recommends that an accountability (unintelligible) culture and attitude is fostered by not only establishing but also this close and existing programs on training and audits for ICANN staff in order to have staff be accountable on their day to day actions.

I think that kind of reflects what you were just saying because it not only shows that there might already be some programs in place but we of course need to know about them.

And we would also welcome expanding those programs. Is that accurate Sebastien?

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes definitely. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Excellent. So at this point are there any other comments in regards to staff accountability paper or could we say we can close this as a final version that we can add to the frozen document list?

I don't know Jeff you mentioned that you might want to go through the changes that you made to the document and maybe explain what - why you made those changes? So I see you have your hand raised so Jeff could you please take the floor?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I thought I would since there were some changes made last night just so that people are familiar with those changes and make sure most importantly that we have agreement on those changes I don't want - I want people to know what's in the document.

So and Avri made some changes as well so maybe those are the only two that I know of us that made substantial changes.

So Avri I don't know if you want to take turns in kind of jumping through what changes we made? I know you made some changes a little bit earlier on the document.

Sorry Avri, I didn't mean to put you on the spot. But I can go through mine and Avri if you want to jump in on yours.

Leon Sanchez: Yes. That will be great Jeff. That would be great. I mean so far I believe that everyone on the call has gone through the documents and I see no objections.

Avri Doria: Yes. I'm happy to do it.

Leon Sanchez: (Unintelligible) this version.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) find mine (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I should have save the mine as a redline. I know my first saved change was really in the bylaws section after the following actions. But you - Avri you may have had a couple of changes before that?

Avri Doria: Yes. I'm trying to find them now that they accepted. I think I may - okay where did I make my changes?

                 Oh I wasn't ready for this. Why don't you go through with yours and then by then I will have found mine and I'll come back.

Jeff Neuman: Okay sure. So the first change I made is if you scroll down to the bottom of Page 2 on the version that is showing up on Adobe I added a new Section A because it says that therefore the WP3 suggests that that CCWG takes the following actions.

                 And one of the things that we talked about was, you know, as part of Workstream 1 is creating a clear and concise description of the role ICANN staff, the role of ICANN staff vis-à-vis the ICANN board and the ICANN community.

                 This should include a general description of the powers vested in ICANN staff by the ICANN board of directors which needs - which need and those which do not need approval of the ICANN board of directors.

So this is something that I know has been particularly an issue with the contracted parties at least where most of that part of the community is unaware of which actions require board approval, which actions can be done by staff without board approval.

And especially this is especially important because where there are - what we were talking about the other day is really the board of directors is really the key body that holds the ICANN staff accountable. And that's true of most corporations, the board holds the staff accountable.

But if the board invests their powers in the staff without any review by the board then there's no accountability measures unless we create some if that makes any sense.

So this definition is something that we talked about of the role of ICANN staff being a Workstream 1 item. In I don't know if anyone - I'll stop there and see if anyone's got questions on that or comments?

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Jan. Would it be fair to say that we include this as part of the definitions that we have set up at the scoping document of Workstream 1?

We have a scoping document that has lots of definitions. And that of course guides the work that we're doing.

And I think that the easiest way to address this section that you added would be to include as part of that document the role of ICANN staff and what we're asking for here. Would that be fair? Would everyone...

Jeff Neuman: I am not as familiar with that scoping document. And so I'm pretty new to this whole process. So I will let others that are more familiar with that comment on that. I'm not sure I know the answer to that.

Kavouss Arasteh: And I have a question.

Jeff Neuman: Okay...

((Crosstalk))

Leon Sanchez: Yes please do.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, you are talking of self-accountability. You are talking about the self-obligation, responsibility. Do we add something protection of the staff, the staff protection, protection of their rights, rights against retaliation, rights against harassment, rights against many other things?

In every organization of ICANN size or less than ICANN size there is an ethics officer. And did this ethics officer is reporting directly to the management, top management either the board chairman or to the CEO of any actions which ignore the rights of the staff.

And that should be totally indiscreet actions and without being disclosed and protect the staff. Otherwise staff may have fear if you report something his or her supervisor or superior may take retaliation actions.

Do we have something in the ICANN or we don't have? I don't think that we should talk only about these responsibilities their accountability. We should also talk about the rights. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: In particular the harassment of the (timid). Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Can I make some response to that because it relates to changes I made? This is Avri.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Please do Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes thank you very much for the Kavouss and then I think we're going to need to get back to Jeff because he was just taking I think a break in his explanation.

Under the ATRT 2 comment one of the changes I made was the addition of however one area which ATRT 2 did make recommendations concerning the staff deals with the operation of whistleblowing activities by the staff and the need to ensure that there is a safe means by which the staff can inform the community of problems and issues that only they can see.

So we touched one little piece of that. But you are so very right about ICANN suffering from the absence of an ethics officer or a corporate social responsibility officer. That is very true.

That we did not put into this nor do I think it fits. Thought getting that in somewhere is something that would be quite good. And we've had various conversations at other times about the application of human rights to the staff as well as in general.

But at least at one point on safety in terms of them being able to speak out we have been. Thanks and then I'll - when it's time for me to go through over stuff I'll go through my other change.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much.

Kavouss Arasteh: Is that in the form of any ethic officer or in the form of what? How it works? It's good to perceive but it works.

And the staff it has been harassed or has been intimidated without going to his boss or supervisor should go to a source, a totally undisclosed and accept a higher or top management they should be aware of that.

And the staff would not have any fear of retaliation or any contrary action because they have reported the truth.

Is there any post or any entity or any arrangement that implements what you have say proposed to the ATRT 2 submissions? I'm talking of the modality and where...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Right.

Kavouss Arasteh: ...(unintelligible) implement that. Thank you.

Avri Doria: At the moment there is a mechanism. There is uncertainty about the degree to which it actually works.

And so one of the things that ATRT asked for that we're still waiting for is an external audit review of that process to see if it is indeed working and if not what we should do about it?

But there is currently a mechanism that is reported to fulfill that function. They are however barred from using the ombudsman for this purpose.

Leon Sanchez: Okay. Thank you very much Avri. Thank you very much Kavouss. I do think that point number or Number 6 of the suggestions does address the concern read by just and explained by Avri in some way.

And we're also pointing to this whistleblower mechanism that's a document. And we will of course take this as part of the conclusions from the group.

I'll go back to Jeff so he can continue to explain the changes he made to the document. Jeff could you please take the floor again?

Jeff Neuman: Yes I could. I'm just curious to see if I know Phil Corwin and Greg have their hands raised. And if it's on this first point I'm wondering if we want to hear those comments and then I can go back.

But really on the part it was just to be clear not on HR matters. It's not meant to touch any of that stuff. It's really meant to define the role of ICANN staff vis-à-vis the board and the ICANN community.

So what powers are vested in staff? You know, is it kind of clear to know? And like I said contracted parties I'll give you an example.

You know, certain things that contracted parties want to do require contract amendments. Contract amendments have to be agreed upon by the board.

Certain things that contracted parties want to do don't require amendments and therefore can rely completely on agreement by staff.

We just have no clue really which topics fit into which category. And so really a clear definition of what the role is of the staff versus the board in approving those types of things is something that we as contracted parties have been asking for, for years.

I think it fits in with the accountability so you know, how and who you can hold accountable for those types of decisions.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you Jeff. Are there any reactions either for Phil or Greg to this paragraph A added by Jeff?

Phil Corwin: This is Phil. Is it okay to speak?

Leon Sanchez: Yes please do Phil.

Phil Corwin: Yes. I just wanted to reinforce what Jeff just said with a very recent example. The .travel renewal which there was remarks made on that at the public forum and remarks made by council members when they met with global domain division staff and the board in Buenos Aires there was not unanimity within the GNSO whether the insertion of certain RPMs for the new TLD program in legacy TLD contracts was a policy change which was done in compliance with the bylaws.

But it does illustrate the issue in that I went to numerous staff persons and said well this contract and the ones for (unintelligible) does it or doesn't it require a further board approval once staff analyzes the comments on the contract and

the final decision is made? And by the way that staff report is a week and a half overdue.

And I couldn't get a straight answer. So I think it clearly identifies the need for I think one giving a particular focus to staff who engage in contract negotiations because they unlike other staff have the ability to negotiate provisions with which whether you agree with them or not may have publicly implications and to decide and to understand when the board is required to review and approve them, when it isn't and when it isn't to provide a mechanism to the community that there is concern that there's a bylaws or policy question to have a way to review that or to compel the board to and express a view on that which can then be addressed further by the accountability mechanisms that are being proposed.

So I hope that wasn't too long-winded but I agree with Jeff. It's hard to find out when the board is required to approve contract revisions and when it isn't. And there's certainly no accountability mechanism right now this speaks to any of that.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Phil. Any reactions to that Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I mean I agree with Phil although we're on different sides of that one particular issue. The point made is that they are - we're just not sure of what - who the role is, whose role it is to make those decisions.

So I think it is very important to get those types of things clear.

And I see Sam's comment. Can we maybe break out some of the particular issues such as the contract revisions?

And Sam I think that just to answer that from my perspective that's just one example of many. And I don't want to get too far down in the detail at this point.

I think creating an overall definition of listing certain responsibilities that are for the board or the staff much like bylaws generally do in terms of delineated powers between different bodies I think is just something we should aim for in Workstream 1 and then Workstream 2 and get down to the nitty-gritty.

I think right now just picking out particular examples is probably not going to be very fruitful because there's always going to be examples that we just don't think of.

So to the extent that we can think of an overall definition I think it's better. That's my view on that.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Jeff. Next in the queue I have Greg. Greg do you want to comment on this?

Greg Shatan: Thanks. I'll comment briefly. First I'm somewhat concerned with this as a Workstream 1 comment or concept given this is - you know, goes to issues that have as Jeff has said have been wrestled with four years.

And now on top of everything else we're dealing with we're going to try to kind of find the Rosetta Stone for staff versus board division of labor and power in a few weeks. So I'm not optimistic about that.

I think it's, you know, a long - in the long run something that needs to be focused on but in the short run I'm skeptical.

On a non-substantive point as long as I'm talking, I think that up in the document above where it says having reviewed and inventories there should be inserted a heading so it's clear that this is not a part of the bylaw section something like recommendations or suggestions so that we know that we're coming to the document. Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Greg. I'll definitely amend that on-the-fly. I have added to Paragraph 8 was edited by Jeff a new wording that is highlighted in red.

And just to close this paragraph I would like to read it and would read - include as part of the problem statement and the definitions document for Workstream 1 a clear concise description of the role of ICANN staff vis-à-vis the ICANN board and the ICANN community.

This should include a general description of the powers that (within) ICANN staff by the ICANN board of directors which meets and do not need approval of the ICANN board of directors. Are there any objections to this new wording?

Okay so having no objections I will close this paragraph and accept the text.

So next in the queue I have - oh, I don't know, do you want to go back to your changes Jeff or Avri would you like to comment on your changes?

Avri Doria: I'll comment on...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...change in eight as response to (unintelligible) question on ombudsman. But I can wait until Jeff has gotten or until we've gotten to (unintelligible).

Leon Sanchez: Excellent so Jeff could you please continue walking us through the additions that you made?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I think that the next change I made was a small one. It was and that the next paragraph which is B. And it said reviewed current documents. So in the next version it says it said all of the currently proposed mechanisms are also applicable to staff action or inaction.

                  And I only I put the word certain of the currently proposed mechanisms because right now -- and I don't know what it says in the new version of the IRP that people are working on -- but right now the IRP, the Independent Review Process is only applicable to board action or inaction.

                  And I went back and double checked that in the current bylaws and that's the way it is. And I noticed in the current IRP that have either been decided or still being argued staff.

                  ICANN representatives definitely make it clear that it is only based on actions or inactions of the board and not of any other part of ICANN.

                  I think one of the cases I read was someone is making a claim against board governance committee and ICANN staff argued the board governance committee is not the board and therefore the IRP was not applicable.

                  I don't know how that's going to come out but I just wanted clear to know that the Independent Review Process as it's currently worded is not available to staff actions or inactions.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes please jump in.

Leon Sanchez: Anyone want to react to what Jeff just said? I think that that is a good addition since maybe not all mechanisms that are being proposed could be applicable to staff.

So just when we say certain mechanisms maybe we should be going into detail with that. But I think that that can be an exercise that we can go and carry out in our Paris meeting.

So any other reactions to this?

Jeff Neuman: Then on the next change I made was on C. The only thing I added there were the words key performance indicators.

So it says to include workplan as part of Workstream 2. That considers the creation of the code of contact, transparency criteria, training key performance indicators to be followed by staff in relation to their interactions with all stakeholders, et cetera.

So that's all I added. But I know that this is the paragraph that deals with the ombudsman so Avri did you want to address that here?

Avri Doria: Sure. In the sentence that you're talking about with where used key performance indicators I added the training so transparency criteria, training and key performance indicators as Workstream 2 actions.

The sentence I added at the bottom was Workstream 2 would include work done during the ombudsman work of W - oh, it should be WS2. Sorry that's a

miss writing on my part, WS2 on the ability of staff to use the ombudsman for escalating or otherwise making community aware of issues.

So as Workstream 2 and I'll need to correct that and I also noticed a couple of other grammar changes like (unintelligible) end of words.

So ombudsman work is already well-established as being part of Workstream 2 and there's lots of open issues.

Now we still need to make sure that the Workstream 2 work actually happens and happens under the proper context.

What I'm adding in this sentence is that as part of the work for the ombudsman it should be in scope for them to review the rules that currently exist that's sort of the of the staff members cannot use the services of the ombudsman for issues.

Now when they look at that they'll need to go by the (unintelligible) and look at it in terms of can they use it for any issues or can they only use it for policy issues but not for personal problems or what have you? So there'll be a lot of discussion within that.

But I just wanted to answer Fadi's question that ombudsman is definitely on the table for Workstream 2 as needing major look at. And here I'm adding that staff consideration to it. Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much for this Avri. These are also very useful additions. And are there any objections or comments to Avri's additions to this document?

I see some hands up. I don't know if Jeff that is hand up because you are going to continue what (was to) the changes that you made so...

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Just it's not on Avri's changes. It's on continuing.

Leon Sanchez: Excellent. So I see and I hear no objections to Avri's additions so this will also be closed into the document.

I'm going back to you Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Sure. So then the last thing I added as the last recommendation is something we talked about on I think it was yesterday. I'm getting my calls mixed up here.

But one of the things that we had talked about was, you know, realistic and meaningful access to redress by aggrieved parties that could demonstrate actual harm caused by ICANN staff action or inaction.

So that I added to basically for commitment to carry on a detailed working plan as part of Workstream 2 to address that.

I think there was general agreement at least in the chat section yesterday but I wanted everyone to make sure that they were comfortable with that. That was the last change.

Leon Sanchez: Excellent. Thank you very much Jeff. So are there any objections to these last additions made by Jeff?

Okay so I think we have a final version for this staff accountability document. The final version of course is the one on that Google Docs link as it has been

edited on-the-fly and not the one that is in the Adobe Connect room central (unintelligible).

So I will close this document now and circulate so we can send it to staff to add it to the frozen document list for Paris.

The next document that I would like to go through is the SO and AC accountability. We have also - I'm sorry I saw Sam Eisner's hand was up. Sam would you want to comment or add something? We do not hear you Sam. You might be on mute.

Sam Eisner: Can you hear me now?

Leon Sanchez: We do hear you.

Sam Eisner: Okay great. So with his document - and I'm sorry I missed a couple of the meetings in WP3. So is this - how do we consider this in terms of Workstream 1? You know, what does this do? Is this actionable work? Is this something that will go into the report? Is this a proposal?

I guess I'm not clear as to how this - I see the parts of it set out what could be considered or setting out a work plan to getting things into Workstream 1 but how do we - what's the proposal for this to be part of actually getting into the recommendations that would come out of Workstream 1?

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Sam. That's a good question. I think that that is something that we as a subgroup can't answer at this point.

But my feeling is that with these papers that we would be sending to the larger group we will have a discussion in Paris. There's a timeslot assigned for Working Party 3 conclusions.

And I believe that the next step would be to have analyzed by the larger group how we can incorporate the recommendations into our Workstream 1 document if that needs be.

Mostly of the recommendations are being suggested to take place on the Workstream 2. And like say for example with regards to diversity we are looking into taking care of diversity with regards to those mechanisms that would require to designate people to populate the different mechanisms.

So this would of course need to (unintelligible) as part of Workstream 1. But other than that most of the suggestions that we're making would be part of the Workstream 2 working plan. I don't know if that answers your question.

Okay so I see Steve DelBianco. Steve could you please take the floor.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Leon. Yes I am sorry I just joined the call. I had to terminate another one. And I spent a few hours today answering public comments on a stress testing.

And one set of comments with the Registry Stakeholder Group were concerned that IRP could question the action of the board. But what about actions staff where board took no action?

So please forgive me if you already covered this. Is that something that this staff accountability group will handle or it's something we need to do in WP1? Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: I'm sorry I wasn't able to listen clearly to what you said. Could you please repeat the last part that you said Steve?

Steve DelBianco: Yes the last part was simply this. Getting the IRP to apply to staff decisions is that something the WP3 will handle or is that going to be delegated to WP1 as part of Workstream 1?

Leon Sanchez: Oh, okay I have now I listened well. No I think that it would be something that Working Party 1 would need to take care of.

                  We would only be delegating the suggestions so that appropriate working parties that are already taking care of these issues may take it into account when they come up with the next version of their proposal.

                  So I see Jeff Newman's hand is up. Jeff could you please take the floor?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, sure. So just to be clear right now the Independent Review Process did not cover staff action or inaction at all. So the bylaws are very clear on that.

                  Like I said, I'm kind of only in this group and not familiar with everything going on in the other groups.

                  But at this point it is very clear in the bylaws that it is only action by the board. And in fact ICANN staff has been making that argument in all of the IRPs to date including one I just read today which is by Merck. I think it's Merck versus ICANN.

And that independent review it's not decided yet but ICANN staff came back with its reply to get a complaint based on the board governance committee action.

And ICANN staff clearly made it that it only covers board action and not the full board action, not even partial board action.

And Steve I understand what you're saying that's the existing bylaws. I haven't seen the amendments of the new bylaws so all I can work off of is what I know exists today.

So all we did in here Steve was create a sentence that basically says as part of Workstream 2 to make sure there's a commitment to carry out a detailed working plan on enhancing ICANN staff accountability that includes realistic and meaningful acts as to redress by aggrieved parties that can demonstrate actual harm caused by ICANN staff action or inaction.

That's all we put in here. Whether that's the IRP, whether that's strengthening the ombudsman, whether that's creating a whole different one who knows. That's, you know, that's kind of the principle here is to have a meaningful access to redress. I hope that helps. I'm not dictating which of the - where it needs to go.

And then I see a comment from Keith on the chat that said all of these are talking basically about not cramming things unnecessarily into Workstream 1.

And Keith the only thing we put in here is part of Workstream 1 which I think is important. And it's certainly been voiced as important to all the contracted parties.

And Phil Corwin actually just agreed too is that creating a clear concise description of the role of ICANN staff vis-à-vis the ICANN board and the ICANN community.

So I think that's all we're asking for in this as far as part of Workstream 1. And I do think that's critical before the transition happens. I'm happy to talk about that as well.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Jeff. And yes that would be the only addition to Workstream 1 that we would be suggesting.

And as for the last (set) that I made addressed in these comments by Jeff and Phil these would be some definitions that we would be adding to the problem statement and definition document which is of course an annex to our proposal.

So I believe that this would have very little impact in what we are already proposing into Workstream 1.

So if there are no more comments on staff accountability I'd like to go to SO and AC accountability.

And I posted the link to the document on the chat book - on the chat books as well. I will be pasting it again so you can all access the document. And of course would ask staff to display this on the central page of the Adobe Connect room.

So there were also some additions made to this document mainly by Jim. And I also remember seeing (unintelligible) by Avri.

And I don't recall if there were also some comments by Sebastien. This is what we have on the screen now would be so for the last version that we have.

And I would like to call for any objections on the way that we have drafted these documents and if there are no objections to this version of the document that we have on display.

I see Sebastien head's up so Sebastien could you please take the floor?

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes thank you Leon. Sebastien Bachollet. Yes I was just wondering we talk about the SO and AC and the we have the same problem in the diversity document.

Are we referring to strictly SO and ACs or are we referring to all of the body within ICANN because I - we are here talking about not the board, not the staff but once again are we talking just about SO AC and that's already needs some discussion or we are talking about the different layer of each SO and each AC? Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Sebastien. The comments received were in relation to having of course (unintelligible) us for SO and ACs. As far as I can tell I understand that it would be something that would be desirable maybe to go to the next layer may be of course having the SOs, ACs being accountable for to their constituencies, to their stakeholder groups, et cetera.

And that is something that we suggest but I don't think it would be something that we could carry out of course as part of Workstream 1.

We could clarify in the recommendations that we're doing at the end of this paper on SO and AC accountability that our suggestions would be aimed to

bringing enhanced accountability not only at the SO, AC level but also to the base layers of SOs and ACs which of course stakeholder group constituencies RALO in the case of the ALAC, et cetera.

So would that be a fair addition that we would be wanting to do to the document?

I don't know I see Sebastien's hand is up still so I don't know if that's a reaction...

Sebastien Bachollet: Just to tell you that I agree with this proposal. I just one actual comment is that we are also the nominating committee, they do a lot with transparency. Do they need - do we need to add that (unintelligible) need to follow also?

And I agree with you that it must be in the Workstream 2 agenda. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you Sebastien. So I'll reword the suggestions on the fly so we can have a look at them in the next couple of minutes.

I'll take the time that you will use for walking us through the diversity paper to edit make the edits to this SO AC accountability paper and then come back to for final revisions.

In the queue I have Kavouss. Kavouss could you please take the floor?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. With respect to the accountability of SO and AC in regard with the constituency we should add the qualifier saying that where applicable.

In some cases this is not applicable. I give you example, GAC. You could not put anything under responsibility with respect to their constituency. Also the constituency of the GAC is government.

The people coming in the GAC are representative of government. They are responsible to the government and there is nothing in the - through the bylaw to modify the authority of the government with respect to the degree of responsibility that they put on the representative.

So in the case of GAC it doesn't work. You could not help the representative of GAC or GAC to anything in their own government so we cannot add anything to that.

So perhaps we should add according to the case or as the case may be in terms of (unintelligible) cases if possible. It is very important.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Kavouss. That's an excellent suggestion and I will definitely keep that in mind while I reword our suggestions for review in a couple of minutes.

So I will go now to Sebastien if you could please take us through the diversity document. I see you have taken the link on the chat box and...

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes. Leon and do you want me to help with the meeting and you do the change of the SO AC accountability at the same time and we'll be...

((Crosstalk))

Leon Sanchez: Yes.

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you. Then the document it's based also in the Adobe Connect room. I took into account almost all the comments made, proposals made by Sharon, Avri, Greg, (Jan). And I may be forgetting one or two but there are all included.

And I don't know if you want me to go through it. I don't know what you have done at the last conference call but I think that you have time to read it if you want me to comment or if you have any question please do so and I will try to answer to give you some feedback.

Kavouss is it a old hand or it's a new one?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. I - you didn't refer to what I said. I said a lot at the last meeting about diversity. I said that all of them are good but are not implementable apart from the competency and experience and geographical distribution the remaining should be in a - sort of the (qualifier) and other elements as the circumstances allow.

We could not talk about (age). You could not talk about the disability. You could not talk about the stakeholder. We should not talk about many other things -- language and so on and so forth.

These are the good (unintelligible). Other elements as appropriate. So we could not go beyond that here. I could - I don't think that you could make any diversity, any criteria for or region. Whatever I should do should put some region up some region down.

Nothing about the culture is very, very complex and difficult. And I don't think that we are capable or qualified to talk about the culture of the people nor about the language apart from the six languages we have nor about the

gender because I said that yes gender is to the extent possible but we cannot totally implement that.

As I mentioned the other time we cannot because it might be case that we will get into the problem and so on so forth.

So I don't think that you can - those are the other than competency experience and geographical distribution which currently we have difficulty in the five geographical regions.

The other would be as to the extent (possible) and possible otherwise we cannot talk about any other things.

I don't think that you could expel out something because of its age low or its age high, nothing from its origin because it is from Asia or Africa or I don't know or (Sheanna) or from the race or from all of this is good but not implementable.

So it says that according to the possibilities and to the extent possible. So to put a qualifier on that I mentioned that and I don't want to repeat it again and I hope that we would do that one.

It is difficult, otherwise we're talking and talking and talking without any implement ability and possibility. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you Kavouss. Jan I saw that you are asking its maybe is my wrong usage of Google Docs. But you we are not commenting. You were commenting in adding in added phrases in the document.

And I had the idea you took for example at the level of the point number three at the end of the document to have this for example the Fellowship program and it's not because I didn't choose your ideas. I think that you are not able to talk but if you are able and you want to talk just take the floor.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes I repeat with respect of all of them are valid but we should categorize them saying that diversity we should take into account from the geographical diversity adding (apparently) currently five region they are not balanced, second from the competence and experience. And third we could say from the other point as is possible or to the extent practice about age and others it would not take the other into account directly.

Diversity we can take into account. Competency we should take into account. Experience we should take into account. But age we cannot take into account. We could take it into account to the extent practicable.

Culture we could take into the account to the extent practicable because we have no knowledge about any criteria to say which is the culture should take into account. So these are the things.

Apart from the...

Leon Sanchez: Thank you Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: ...competence experience and geographical distribution you list the others and say that to the extent practicable. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you Kavouss. Avri please.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Hearing (unintelligible) twice I had to respond. (Unintelligible)...

Leon Sanchez: Your phone is very bad Avri. We had difficulty to hear you well. I don't know why.

Avri Doria: I'm doing the best I can. So...

Leon Sanchez: That's better now.

Avri Doria: Okay I turned off my air-conditioning (unintelligible).

                  I have an issue with what Kavouss is saying because even skill and region can only be taken into account to the extent which is reasonable.

                  So I think that to distinguish some as being absolute and some being, you know, strong requirements that need to be taken into account to the degree possible is not a good approach.

                  I think all of them should be listed and all of them should be taken into account to the extent possible. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you Avri. Jan please.

Jan Scholte: I'm going to try. Are you actually hearing me?

Leon Sanchez: Yes.

Jan Scholte: Wonderful, wonderful. With time and patience connection from anywhere is possible. Thank you Sebastien I now see what you've done which is great.

No, the points were two. One was concerning the where you have put it under next steps Number 3 reviewing in more detail and establishment of inventory of existing mechanisms blah, blah, blah.

Is it also reviewing more details in the - or inventory. Is it also doing a review with you to try to enhance these? So in other words it's not just inventory of the Fellowship program for example but also to think about how the Fellowship program could actually work better in order to generate more diversity in ICANN?

Sebastien Bachollet: Jan I put this idea on the top of the next steps. And each point one, two, three, four, five deemed to be to enhance further the (unintelligible).

Jan Scholte: I got you, I got you. I got you. I'm sorry yes I've only seen the documents for the first time, apologies.

The other question was (Matthew) had a very specific suggestion about regional distribution within the IRP and the new community empowerment mechanism. He had some formula about not having more than 1/3 of any input from any SO or AC coming from one region.

I don't know whether that was a workable proposal. I don't see it taken in here. Was there a reason for avoiding it on your part?

Sebastien Bachollet: The - my trouble was we don't know yet how the each group will be set up, that would be set up, how they will be, the number of people and all that needs to be taken into account.

It's why I think for the moment as a, the proposal made by (Matthew) are very workable. But we need to take that in front of the proposal for each and every creation of groups.

And it's why I didn't include it as a - and in as such in the document. But it's not I agree with you we don't - we did not forget them - those proposals.

Jan Scholte: Is it possible perhaps to add a number six which say spending clarification of exact arrangements dot, dot, dot? In other words do we still have it on the list? I'm afraid otherwise we may in the rush to Paris forget it.

Sebastien Bachollet: Well I ensure that we'll not but I get your point. Thank you.

Jan Scholte: Okay, thank you Sebastien.

Sebastien Bachollet: Greg you are the next.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Sebastien. Greg Satan for the record. Sorry I did not get the chance that I had hoped to have to add some suggestions to the document following comments on a prior call.

But I think that there is a missing element to the document which is recognition of the linkage between outreach engagement and diversity or more particularly that diversity, strengthening diversity needs to start with creating a more diverse pool or a less imbalanced pool of engaged participants and that - or participants at all putting aside the issue of engagement and that kind of starting with the imbalanced pool we have and trying to create some sort of balanced diversity, create the inequities as well as perhaps solving other inequities.

So, you know, I would almost add as a number one or somewhere in the next steps, you know, strengthening commitment to outreach and engagement so that there is a more diverse pool, a more balanced pool, so that diversity doesn't require its kind of machinations and the like to try to draw a- an equal mix of participants from an unequal pool.

And since we do have an unequal pool especially since we have an unequal pool I think all of these things should be only to the extent practicable or possible or striving to do so rather than absolutes.

I think there's a word must in here somewhere. There's a shall. All of those musts and shalls I think must go because at that point we're starting to create quotas and exclusionary activities. And I think that would be unfortunate.

I think that hopefully the time will come when we don't have to talk about diversity because the pool we have is diverse and participants are coming from all over.

I think there are lots of barriers other than the number of participants of each type that definitely need to be worked on -- language barriers, mobility barriers, et cetera.

But in terms of sheer numbers trying to make the lineup when you're trying to a pool where the numbers don't line up I think is a root problem that needs to be dealt with. Everything else is dealing with secondary symptoms of that root problem. Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you Greg. Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes Sebastien I don't think this list is exhaustive. It is not exhaustive. Devotion to perform the duty is not there. Neutrality is not there. Faithfulness is not there. Ethical attitude is not there. (Culturcy) is not there. Sense of responsibility is not there.

I don't think that these are exhaustive. This is non-exhaustive list and I don't think that we should treat them equally.

I don't think the neutrality is not exchangeable of anything. The most important element that guy should be neutral and impartial with respect to performing his duty.

So therefore this list is not complete. And I disagree with this text and I disagree that we should put and no change, no preference between the experience. The non-experience person no matter how polite he is not working at all.

The non-actually skillful person no matter how best he knows the language is not comparable. So we have to have a degree of importance to these things.

And what you are doing never, not in any other work organization so you are inventing something. This is an invention by the CCWG and I totally disagree with that.

And I disagree with Avri. She insists as usual and I don't like this sort of the discussion. We should have some...

Sebastien Bachollet: Please Kavouss please...

Kavouss Arasteh: ...and this (unintelligible) is not correct. I'm sorry this is the third time I am (unintelligible). Please don't interrupt me. Kindly don't interrupt me.

((Crosstalk))

This is the situation. We have to take into account of all comments. Thank you.

Sebastien Bachollet: I am taking into account your accounts. I just want to - it's Sebastien Bachollet for the recording. I just want to tell you that the question you are raising are very good question.

And if you look to all documents in the current bylaws in the elements to select a board member (unintelligible) selection ALAC member and other documents those point out came into account.

What we are talking here it's what we need to add to the current situation. It's not to say that the current situation must go away. It's just to say that we need to add some elements because we think that it's important that those elements be taken for the future into account in this organization.

And there is nothing to disagree with you on that. I tell you once again that in the bylaw, current bylaw those elements are.

And I hope that it will be possible to work in the direction of the documents suggest because I really think we need to go further in diversifying the current leaders and member of this or participant or this organization.

Alan Greenberg please you have the floor.

Man: Sebastien...

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: They are already there. I need to see the whole list. Even everything is there. And you add that one. Still we need some degree of priority. Experience and knowledge...

Leon Sanchez: Kavouss...

Kavouss Arasteh: ...is something more important than language and culture. Thank you.

Man: Who is supposed to have the floor?

Sebastien Bachollet: Alan Greenberg.

Leon Sanchez: Call to order. May I please call to order. Next in the queue is Alan then we have Jan then Akinbo. So I will handle the call back to Sebastien just to give the floor to Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I really wasn't going to comment but I plead that what we come out with is something that is both reasonable and practical and not end up allowing us to have a good scorecard but not solving the problems.

And I'm really afraid the farther we go down some of these roads that's what we're doing. I will refer to something that's happening elsewhere in the organization right now, the GNSO review where there's a recommendation that says the GNSO council must ensure that workgroups reflect the diversity in the Internet. I'm not quoting it verbatim.

We can do that. We can put people on workgroups. They won't do anything in many cases. But we will be able to tick off the block and saying it's diverse and it reflects the diversity of the Internet.

So I just want, you know, as much as we want to fix the real problems we don't want to spend our efforts and time doing things which make it look like we're doing a good job and don't address the real problems. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Alan. Next in the queue we have Jan.

Jan Scholte: Yes thank you Leon. Just to say that we can in our Workstream 2 activities do a careful review of what has happened elsewhere in global governance especially in organizations that include its civil society participation, the Committee on World Food security, the Global Fund to fight AIDS tuberculosis and malaria, the International Agricultural Assessment on Scientific Knowledge and Development and others.

There are many bodies in the last ten years in global governance which have developed quite sophisticated ways of incorporating gender diversity, class diversity, disability, regional diversity. It's simply not the case that we are inventing the wheel for the first time.

There and actually ICANN is behind on a number of these dimensions. So again I think we don't want to be overly ambitious but we don't want to be under ambitious either.

I think with the other point again to make I hear what Alan's saying. But I think the response is again was one wants to have intensified collective outreach to find the constant people.

The constant people are there. It's just that people from other regions, from other classes maybe from other genders as well don't know how to engage with ICANN yet.

It if we do - if the staff with their fellowship programs and others, other channels with an intensified effort to affect the outreach and engagement I think we will find that including diversity is really not as difficult as some people are making out. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Jan. Next in the queue I have Akinbo. Akinbo could you please take the floor?

Adebunmi Adeola Akinbo: Okay. Am I on?

Leon Sanchez: Yes we can listen to you.

Adebunmi Adeola Akinbo: Okay Akinbo (unintelligible) on the floor for the transcript. I am going to start with the issue of diversity inclusions when I had (unintelligible) statement diversity in country and frankly I'm confused.

I was thinking probably if we have those two included we should also include diversity of (unintelligible) diversity of semantics, diversity of color. I think that would be very, very odd.

We'll be missing a major target of diversity specifics. I would very much appreciate if we could define the specifics with individually (unintelligible) diversity or diversifications are missing.

Probably we could create a document of such (couples) and present it forward and probably others would look at it and see if it's how do I put it, if it's divisible to sort of say we'll be missing the square pegs in circles.

I would suggest rather that if anyone - if any member of this group feels that there are specifics the needs to be addressed it should be inked and put forward so that we can go through each and then we can see how sensible or divisible such a contribution will be. Thank you very much.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Akinbo. Next in the queue I have Alan. Alan Greenberg?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Just a short comment. Jan you know, what he said, you know, which he characterized as sort of as opposed to what I was saying I agree with everything he said.

My only point was let's make sure we are doing things which will solve a problem not just make us look good. Because there's a real danger that we put in measures that do not fix things but simply make the metrics look better. And that's not the point of all this.

The point of this is to really have diversity reflected in what we're doing and in the people who are doing it. So I really don't know why at this level in this group we're talking about the details of how we do it to be quite honest.

I think we should be establishing some principles. There's a lot of work to be done to actually implement it in reality. I'm not sure that's really our job. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Alan. And while I shouldn't I am going to do so and I couldn't agree more with you. So yes I think we should keep that in mind and establish those set of principles.

So I'll handle it back to Sebastien to continue with the next section, some the diversity paper or should we go to - should we go back to the SO and AC accountability papers so we can review the edits I just made?

Sebastien Bachollet: Go to the last edit. It's Sebastien to the AC SO paper please.

Leon Sanchez: Okay excellent. So if you could all please go back to the Adobe - I'm sorry to Google Docs so the Google Docs version of the SO AC papers.

I'm posting again the link on the chat box. And the edits that I've made are on - well I've separated the recommendations as suggested by Greg as well.

And I have edited paragraphs one, two, three - one, two and five, one, two five. So they read as paragraph 1 amended the current draft document and include in its next proposal the commitment to have each as SO AC perform a complete review of their existing accountability mechanisms to be reported to and discussed in the CCWG as part of the Workstream 2 task to be implemented in time for consideration in for its IANA review.

These reports should include consideration on the mechanism that each SO AC as the case may be has in place to be accountable to their respective constituencies, stakeholder groups, RALOs, et cetera.

Are there any objections to the wording in Paragraph 1?

Okay so hearing no objections to this amended Paragraph 1 I will know close it for edits and have it as final.

Then Paragraph 2 reads as this. The subject of SO AC accountability should be included in the purview of the ATRT process as well as the structural reviews of each SO and AC in relation as the case may be to the respective constituencies, stakeholder groups, RALOs, et cetera. Are there any objections to this wording on Paragraph 2?

Okay, no objections. And finally on Paragraph 5 review the current proposal in order to assess whether the IRP would also be applicable to SO AC's activities as well.

Are there any objections to this final edit on SO and AC accountability? I see two hands up, one Alan and the other Avri. So Alan could you please take the floor?

Alan Greenberg: I'm sorry that's a very old hand. I'll take it down now.

Leon Sanchez: Okay. Then I'll go to Avri.

Avri Doria: Hi. (Unintelligible). At the moment I don't think it does. So we don't need to review it. Do we want to do anything once we review it and find out it's either there or not there?

Because at the moment I don't believe that - at the moment I don't believe that it's covered at all. Perhaps there is an edit I haven't seen that includes it. But the real question here for me is and so what? Once we review what do we want to do about it? Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Avri. Yes I think that the next step after reviewing would be maybe to propose that we amend the documents so that we make the IRP extensive or applicable to SOs and ACs. But that is something that of course should need to be discussed by the larger group and not only by this subgroup.

I saw Jan's hand up and then suddenly it went down. I don't know Jan if you want to comment? I see Jan is typing. Okay he is passing.

Okay so I see Alan Greenberg's hand is up. Alan could you please take the floor?

Alan Greenberg: Yes just a general comment and I'm not quite sure where it fits. We are always going to need to strike a balance between an AC and SO being accountable to in general and satisfying every member.

You know, we have the ombudsman in place among other things so that when someone is really obsessed that the organization is not doing what they want there is a recourse.

I would hate to see us in a position where the one on one cases like that end up being accountability issues. And I don't know how to protect it but I really have some worry having only been in this position now for about six, eight - six or eight months already seeing several cases of it.

So I think we need to be careful. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Alan. That's a good point. Maybe I don't know if maybe clarifying is in the respective paragraph or discussing this with the

larger group would answer to these needs that you're - or to this point that you're raising now.

So I really don't seem to have an answer to that at this point.

But now the question remains on Paragraph Number 5. Do we want to keep this Paragraph 5 or do we want to strike it or do we want to maybe leave it on the packet so it can be of course discussed by the larger group in our Paris meeting?

Are there any objections to keeping Paragraph 5? Avri please? Avri is that a new hand or an old hand?

Okay. That was an old hand I think.

So I see no objections to keeping Paragraph 5 as it stands now. And if there are no objections then we would be closing this SO and AC accountability paper as a final version to be of course discussed by the larger group.

This doesn't mean that this already set in stone but it only means that we have some products to deliver to our larger group. And that will be included in the rating list for our Paris meeting.

So we have knocked down two out of three. We are doing good. And we still have 10 minutes to go and discuss the final points or the final adjustments to the diversity paper.

So I'll hand it back to Sebastien to continue with the discussion on diversity. Sebastien could you please take the floor?

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you very much. Yes I need your advice on how to go there because we are discussing the full document and we didn't get to one specific points.

I - there are two different points of view here, the one who says that we don't need to have any list of different items and diversity. But it's not the full list and the other who say that we need at least to have a starting list and that's what we are - we have today.

Leon Sanchez: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Sebastien Bachollet: As I am balancing that I think we need to figure out what we want to do. My suggestion is that we have a document with information and the elements and that could be - could go to the full group but Mr. Chair it's your call.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Sebastien. And so I would suggest as a solution to this point that we could retrace the preceding sentence with regards to the list that was being displayed to state that this is of course a non-exhaustive list.

But however our at least some principles that the group came up with regards to trying to guide those that the - any given case could be tasked with maybe populating each of the mechanisms for the positions that we would be proposing.

So this would only be a list that could guide with regards to trying to address diversity but of course it would be something exhaustive.

So I think that could be a solution that really thinks that is not an exhaustive list but that we also have to keep in mind at least those criteria. And I see Jan's hand is up. Jan could you please take the floor?

Jan Scholte: Yes thanks Leon. Maybe others don't feel strongly about it or then in which case we can let it go. But I did suggest adding a phrase just as a reminder and an explicit signal to the CCWG as a whole that we do have in mind specifying some kind of diversity, regional diversity formula in relation to the new community empowerment mechanism and the IRP once we know what the more precise institutional form of those bodies are going to be.

Again I know that we within this group we know that we're considering it and we won't be forgetting it. But when you present this to the overall CCWG they have not been involved in our meetings and they don't know that we've been thinking about it.

So I'm just wondering whether it still is prudent still to include a reference in the next steps to that consideration. Thanks.

Thank you very much Jan. That is a very good suggestion and I think maybe it's part of the next steps (unintelligible). And I see there's some comments from Kavouss that we are not respecting all these.

I am trying to find a solution to this Kavouss. I think that in my mind at least what I'm suggesting would address your concern of not having a close list of criteria.

And it would also address the concerns from those in the group which I believe are also a majority with the group that are trying to at least have some non-exhaustive list of criteria.

And I don't know maybe I think that the only solution that I can come up to and the other alternative would be to maybe signal that there is a minority with the group that doesn't agree to this criteria, that doesn't agree with having this non-exhaustive list as guidance for addressing diversity.

But I would definitely ask you to kindly provide your rationale for that so we can add it to the documents. Next in the queue I have Sebastien. Sebastien could you please take the floor?

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes thank you very much. If you look to the document on Google Jan I add your point as point Number 6. And Greg is currently writing his suggestion of about outreach and engagements that we discussed earlier and we have to read it.

Regarding the list I suggest the following changes. First to change (must) by a multidimensional approach will be useful to beat ICANN regarding diversity.

And to add that a current non-exhaustive list of elements that is already under discussion to a non-exhaustive to answer your suggestion Leon.

I hope that answers some of the concern of the different participant. And I have to read again or to read the final proposal from Greg. But I think if we can go in that direction with these four changes in Number 6 and Number 7 and the proposal about the list is going to the right direction. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Sebastien. Any other comments on this paper? I see Greg suggesting something and he's got his hand up now. So Greg?

Greg Shatan: Yes two things. One I just pasted it into chat, my suggestion. We're dealing with outreach and engagement so that's there for your discussion.

I would also say that any list of diversity criteria needs to be exemplary rather than exhaustive so that we are not closing off other types of diversity issues other than the ones that we've listed because I think we'll just end up leaving something out.

So I see that that now says non-exhaustive in the document. So I'm happy to see that I'm behind but at least in step. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Greg. And maybe being a little bit abusive on you could you kindly reflect that or add that suggestion into the documents so we can of course have this...

Greg Shatan: It's already in the document. I actually clipped it out and put it into the chat from the document so...

Leon Sanchez: Okay. So you're really fast.

Greg Shatan: Yes. I decided to work in the document and come back to the chat rather than vice versa. I had to write it somewhere.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much. Okay so we are close to reaching the end of the call. I believe that we have close to our three documents (sic). This one is still outstanding.

And what I would like to do if we all agree is to send the diversity document to a reading list with a note that very clearly states that this is not a final

version and that it has of course some areas that need to be further discussed by the larger group.

And this would allow us - it would allow us to deliver at least some working products to the larger group in anticipation for our meeting in Paris.

Are there any objections ongoing this way, having the diversity paper sent with the note that it's not of course a final document that we could agree on within the working party and that it should be further discussed?

Okay I see no objections. So I would kindly ask Sebastien since he is the pen holder for this paper if you could please add this note to the document and we can send it to staff so they can add it to the reading list for our meeting in Paris.

Okay so we still have to speak on our Paris meeting but we are waking waiting to the end of the call. I believe that we have discussed this in our regular meeting.

And maybe the expectations that we would be looking for our participation in the Paris meeting would be to present the papers that we have been working on and explain to the larger group what our directionals as for the conclusions with the suggestions that we are coming up with and then of course foster a discussion so we can find a way to properly address the concerns that were raised through public comments.

Any other comments or any other business at this point that anyone wants to raise? I see Greg's hand is still up. I don't know if that is an old hand or a new hand?

I think that is an old hand. Okay so are there any other business?

Okay I don't see anyone raising their hands so have no other business and having reached the end of the call I would like to have this call adjourned. And thank you everyone for your attendance and hard work and wish you safe travels to Paris. See you soon.

END