AVRI DORIA: Okay, the meeting has started. This is Avri Doria. Hello to everyone that has joined. I am one of the two co-rapporteurs of the subgroup, Jordan Carter being the other co-rapporteur, and wanted to start. In terms of attendance, we will follow the same practice as is being generally followed in the CCWG, of taking attendance via the AC room. Is anyone calling in who isn't in the AC room?

Okay, hearing no one, we'll move on to the agenda. But before that, I'd like to remind everyone that when you speak, please give your name at the beginning. Also, I want to ask people up front to please speak and not just type, even though I know I am very often guilty of just typing myself.

Moving to the next slide, which is slide – I don't have this synced, let me know if you would like to have it synced. So the agenda: first is the agenda review, then we'll talk some more about SOI's participation and observation. I have included the list of participant [pointer] there, and we'll move on to how is the subgroup situated within the WS2 Accountability work, then the Work Stream 1 mandate for Work Stream 2 staff accountability. Then, we'll walk through the issues to be worked on, talk a bit about scheduling the meetings, doing the work, how we need to go about it, and assuming there's time at the end, any other business.

I'd like to ask if anyone's got any issues, corrections, changes they'd like to see to the agenda, or have an any other business item that they'd like to see talked about when we get there. Again, hearing nothing, we'll move on with the agenda as written.

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

The next item, an item that shows up in every meeting is the Statements of Interest. The request is that all participants have filled out an SOI. Most of you are in the CCWG or other subgroups and therefore probably already have an SOI that's been submitted. Anyone who doesn't needs to do so as soon as possible, and anyone who has changes on theirs, especially changes that are relevant to the work we're doing in this group, is asked to please say so at the beginning of the meeting.

I'd like to ask two questions now. First, I'd like to ask from among the staff support on this group, is there anyone that doesn't have an SOI filled out at the moment, to your knowledge?

BRENDA BREWER: Hi, Avri. All of the people who signed up as active participants have SOIs on the wiki. Some of your observers have SOIs, but they requested to be observers. Others, who do not have SOIs, are automatically put on the observer list until they complete a Statement of Interest. Okay?

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you very much. The next question I'd like to ask is, does anyone have a change to their SOI that they want to mention at this point?

Okay, I see no one, moving on to the discussion of participation and observation. The subgroups have been put on a slightly different basis, I believe, than the CCWG itself in the ability of observers to speak. The policy that has been set is that in order to speak during the meetings,

one needs to have set themselves up as a participant and needs to have an SOI. The SOI being linked is important, but the only way to check that every speaker is a participant with an SOI is to have the speaking open to participants only.

Not necessarily a rule I was comfortable with, but the rule that was established for the subgroups. So I do want to ask any observers that wish to speak, either by writing in the chat, which is the chat for all or speaking allowed to make sure that they switch to the participant wall and fill out an SOI, so that we can deal with the rules as they've been set for this work. The list of participants and observers is listed on that webpage and it is the main webpage in the community for our work.

Moving to slide three. You have all seen this drawing before. I listed most of the next slides from the standard deck that's been around and then I just put a little dotted line box around the work that we are responsible for or are positioned in this chart. I'm going to go through these very quickly, but if you do have any questions or comments to make about the next couple of slides, please raise your hand or please type in the chat. I'm likely to miss you in the chat, so I would ask Jordan, Karen, or Brenda to shout out if I keep rambling on and somebody has their hands up.

Please mute your [mic] please.

JORDAN CARTER: Will do.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you, Jordan, but don't mute when you're going to speak. I should have known. Thank you.

Okay, the role of the rapporteurs, or in this case the co-rapporteurs is a coordination role. It's a mandate checking role. The co-rapporteurs need to provide regular neutral reports to the CCWG, we need to liaise with the co-Chairs and other rapporteurs as needed, and there are periodic meetings that we are expected to attend. And if the group comes up with any request for legal advice – if any, we don't need to – then we have to make sure that they are both necessary and sufficiently documented. I see no questions, moving on to five.

The form of our deliverable – and I think you've all seen this, we will have an executive summary, we need to describe the issue, the current state, what's in the supplemental report, essentially the things we're facing now, any recommendations that we're making. It says no wordsmithing accepted, obviously they should be clear and understandable, but they do go to the CCWG, where there will most likely be further discussion. And a rationale for recommendation, why we are suggesting why we are suggesting. And then an assessment of the recommendations, how they meet the NTIA criteria, a part of every recommendation we had including in Work Stream 1, and then to also discuss the ways in which we are compliant with Work Stream 1 recommendations. Any questions on that one?

Okay, moving on to six, our subgroup working methods. We say, "Given the small size of subgroups," they're not all that small. I guess compared to the CCWG, they are. Specificity of group, each is undertaking its propose with the subgroups meet via teleconference for one hour on a

weekly schedule. The majority of the subgroup is expected to be [inaudible] submissions using the subgroup mailing list. We discuss this a little further later in this meeting in terms of how we're going to go about working, and we are going to suggest a slightly different methodology.

To be specific about the role of staff support, staff support will participate in each group's one hour meeting to capture action items, however, each group will need to be prepared to manage their own draft document development. Once the subgroup has submitted their agreed draft, the CCWG plenary consideration staff support will assume document management on behalf of CCWG. That explains why you're seeing slides that are simple on a white background, etc. and why I gave the initial spiel at the beginning of the meeting as opposed to asking a staff member to do that part of the call. Any questions? I see none.

Reporting, documents for consideration by a subgroup for the full CCWG Accountability should be available at least 24 hours prior to a meeting to allow for proper consideration. It is requested from the rapporteurs to a subgroup prepare a written update for the full CCWG Accountability to consider each of its meetings. Subgroups should be able to provide CCWG Accountability with a draft work plan and schedule within a month of the first subgroup meeting. This is necessary to ensure that there are adequate resources available to meet the needs of subgroups, and we will be talking somewhat about our schedule again at the end of this, though we're not yet presenting a draft schedule. If subgroups require legal advice, they will have to prepare a formal request, as was said. Issues? Moving on to eight: decisions.

It's the CCWG that makes the decisions. They will follow their standards to at least [to reading] rule. There will also be public comments, but only when the subgroup recommendations that we make are approved by the full group will they be posted for public –

BRENDA BREWER: Avri, we lost your audio. It looks like you'll need to dial in again.

AVRI DORIA: Yes, I lost my connection.

BRENDA BREWER: You're back. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: I lost my connectivity for a second, so apologies, I don't know what happened to my network. Okay, so we were at slide – I guess it was slide nine, but I seem to have lost the page numbers. Maybe I haven't, maybe my screen just got bigger. Anyhow, let me [catching up] back on where we were.

Okay, so the purpose of staff accountability. This has been included in the background documents that we had posted for at least a week. Management and staff works for the benefit of the community, and in line with ICANN's purpose and mission. It's obvious they report to and are held accountable by the ICANN Board, and the President and CEO.

The purpose of their accountability is the same as that of the organization: comply with ICANN's rules and processes, complying with applicable Bylaws, achieving certain levels of performance as well as security, making the decision for the benefit of the community and not any interest of a particular stakeholder, or [certain] stakeholders, or ICANN the organization alone. I assume we're mostly all very familiar with this, but since it is the base upon which we do our work, I wanted to make sure that it got said on the record at the beginning of our work.

The task of Work Stream 2 Accountability, having reviewed and inventoried the existing mechanisms related to staff accountability. Areas of improvement include clarifying expectations from staff, as well as establishing appropriate [inaudible] mechanisms. The CCWG Accountability recommends, as part of its Work Stream 2 that CCWG Accountability work with ICANN to develop a document that clearly describes the role of ICANN staff, vis-a-vis the ICANN Board and the ICANN community. This document should include a general description of the powers vested in ICANN staff by the ICANN Board of Directors that need and do not need approval of the ICANN Board of Directors.

CCWG Accountability work with ICANN to consider a code of conduct, transparency criteria, training and key performance indicators to be followed by staff in relation to their interactions with all stakeholders. Establish regular independence internal and community surveys, independent surveys and audits to track progress and identify areas that need improvement, and establish appropriate processes to escalate issues and enable both community and staff members to raise issues. This work should be closely linked with the Ombudsman enhancement in Work Stream 2.

That is a quick review of what came before, the rules and constrains we work and such, and now I want to stop and check and see if there are any points of clarification needed and such before moving on to the next section where we start talking about the work we're going to need to do. Notice going through the beginning stuff in less than 20 minutes, leaving us 40 minutes for the rest of this meeting, hopefully a chance to get a little into the substance. Okay, I see no one has raised their hands, move on to slide 11.

I don't know, Jordan, if you want to jump in on these or if I should just continue talking. I do get sick of talking all the time, but I'm fine if we're doing it.

JORDAN CARTER: I'm perfectly happy with you continuing, Avri, if you're happy to [inaudible]. I think your voice is just fine.

AVRI DORIA: I don't mind, but please jump in at any point at which at this point I start giving short shrift or otherwise not going sufficiently into detail here. In fact, I'll stop at each slide and ask you to add anything you might want to add, and then we'll go into any hands.

So the issues to be worked on, as said in the mandate from Work Stream 1: work with ICANN to develop a document describing respective roles and responsibilities of the Board, community, and staff, and then two, consider a package of action, a code of conduct for staff, transparency criteria, training and staff KPAs, performance – I don't

know what a KPA is. I know what it is, but I forget what the letters stand for. The measurement of key performance attributes? Anyway, somebody chirp in if they actually know the proper – key performance areas. Thank you, Jordan. I would have gotten there eventually if I kept trying words that start with A. Independent surveys and audits of staff community engagement, escalation processes, for example, linked to Ombudsman work. I'll stop here.

Jordan, please, if you have anything going deeper into these discussions, and then I want to open the floor and just get some initial sets of comments on this being the set of issues we are to work on, whether we've been complete over much, etc.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Avri. Everyone, hi. I'll just say two things about this issues to work on slide. First one is that the staff paper that Karen and the staff team are working on will probably do a really good job of letting us know how much of that stuff is already there, so I don't think any of us should assume at this point that there is necessarily none of this already in place. So it will be really interesting to see that staff paper when it comes through.

The second one is, that I think the overarching point of all this is that we all see examples of great ICANN staff practice. I've certainly found the way that staff has handled CCWG work really good. In fact, I've also seen some less good staff practices supporting the multistakeholder model, I guess some of you will have as well, and so we need to both get a sense of the formal and procedural [stuff], which this slide talks

about. And also a bit about the norms or ethos that the staff has and working within those frameworks I think is relevant subject matter for us.

So those are just the two things. I think some of this is already here and as well as the formal rules, which is to think about the overall culture of the organization.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Jordan. Yes, Alan, I see your hand first. I want to remind everybody to state your name, though Alan, I know you're superb at the practice of doing that. But please, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Actually, I forget all the time. I think Jordan captured what I was going to say in his last couple of words: it's the culture of transparency, the culture of accountability, which very often is lacking, and it shows up in all sorts of very subtle ways that I'm not sure we can capture on an action, but it does get captured by the overall concept. And to look at some of the trivial examples – but I think examples are important – you get a message from someone that is passing judgment on something, important or not, but it doesn't come from a person, it comes from a group, and you can't tell who actually made the decision, who's standing behind it, or who to appeal to.

So I think the culture part is perhaps the leading one, the envelope that covers all the rest of them. Thank you. That goes along with the ATRT2 words of, you know, "It's in the DNA" and things like that, so I think

there has to be an overall umbrella for the individual items that we're covering.

Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I see that Cheryl has put a green check to indicate agreement with what was just said. Klaus, please, [inaudible].

KLAUS STOLL: Hello. Maybe it's just an addition to the previous two remarks which I fully agree with, is when we described our respective roles, I don't see anything specific in those packages about what [inaudible] would be described or neither culture. I think that we should not take these five package points as written in stone, but seriously add more packages or items into these packages.

Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. Perhaps some of this will show up in the next slide, as Jordan was indicating. But that is one of the things that we've also asked people, to add text and discussions to in the background document that we have or on the list.

Alan, your hand is still up. Is that an old hand or desire to speak again?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, that is an old hand.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. I love this terminology of old hand. Okay, I see no other hands for now, I will move on to 12. We will certainly come back to talking about this again and again as time goes on, but this is where we're starting.

So page 12 is issues to be worked on, slide two. Consider and understand case studies, and some examples of possibilities, Dot Registry LLC versus ICANN, respect for the bottom-up, multistakeholder policy process, policy versus implementation tensions, whistleblowing protection. This will require liaising with Work Stream 2 Transparency, which I am on and which I have at least tentatively put myself forward as serving as the communications link between that group and this group.

And then there's also the issue of staff participation in the subgroup. We have Sam who is pretty much an official staff participator. But one of the concerns and discussions that some of us have had is can we get more staff participation when we're talking about staff accountability than just one? And so that is a topic of interest, but of course, within that topic there are concerns about how they could do it, etc. and how one would reach out to them if indeed we were allowed to reach out to them for participation.

So that's the two slides on issues to be worked on. Before moving on to how we're going to move the work, I'd like to open up in general to the issues to be worked. Some of these were also taken from the words that

people did put in that background document – the background note. We're not doing the background document, but the background note that we put together to stand up for starting until such time as staff did have the time to produce the report.

Is there anyone that would like to discuss any of these further at this point? Realizing that this is a first meeting, and people don't necessarily want to jump in too deeply, but we do have time for a little bit of discussion.

Also, I see a new person has joined with just a telephone number ending in 8999. It would be good to know the name for that person, if we could. As Jordan says, the slides were basically taken off of the background notes where people did add stuff.

So no one wants to dig in a little deeper at this point on any of these issues? I'd like to ask on the issue of staff participation, whether, Sam, you've got any thoughts on it or whether anybody else in the group has any thoughts, A, on the need for more staff participation, staff review perhaps something and such and be a clue on perhaps how we could do that, if indeed it is something we think necessary. Sam, if you don't mind my putting you on the spot.

SAMANTHE EISNER: Sure. This is Sam Eisner from ICANN. As many of you know, I've been working with the CCWG since the Work Stream 1. I remain active in helping to support the various groups. One of the things I did during the Work Stream 1 was to help bring information to it.

I don't necessarily have a thought out plan or really too many more inputs on how to get staff involvement in this. I saw an earlier mention, on the staff accountability list I made sure to flag that so that others on the team – I wish I had a lot of independent decision-making authority on certain issues, but I don't. So I [flag] that to other people who are more involved n coordinating staff participation within the Work Stream 2 effort to flag that to see if there are any thoughts on that.

I know from the ICANN perspective we're really interested in working with this group, as well as the other groups. But I think there's a particular interest in this group and making sure that there are facts to work from and there is cooperation and that we have the right information at hand to make sure that we understand the different lines of accountability, the different parts of the organization, staff, community, and what they can expect from each other. So I know just from the outset, the message is one of we're looking forward to working very cooperatively with you. I think that if you have ideas of how you would like to see that happen, we'd be open to it. I think we should see this as an iterative process to work through.

Karen, I don't know if you've had other conversations with anyone on your team about how to do that. I think that you will also start seeing other staff coming in to participate in this work. You'll see me on many of the different calls for Work Stream 2, but I'm not the only person that you'll see working from ICANN on these items. So let's consider this the start of a conversation and if there's some brainstorming or anything we can do, we'd certainly be happy to help facilitate that.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Karen, I see your hand up, please.

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes, thank you very much. To add to what Sam stated, I have been consulting with other folks within the Multistakeholder Strategic Initiative Team, and we're the group that actually works on the organizational and AoC reviews to see if they would be interested in our view in terms of participating if they're invited. I wasn't sure if you would like them to participate in these kinds of discussions. If you are, then I will very much make arrangements to have some of the folks that have been long time participants in that work come and attend or address certain things. If you've got topics you'd like them to cover, they can do that.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I do believe that there is an interest in staff participation, but I'll ask the question at the moment whether there is anyone that thinks that there is a problem that we need to consider, whether there's anyone in the group that feels uneasy. I certainly don't and encourage it personally, but I do want to check further on the group. I don't know, Jordan, whether you have anything to add on that theme.

JORDAN CARTER: I'll take a quick call, Avri. I think it's a tricky issue, because on the one hand, we want to get a staff perspective and view on that staff and the work of the group. But on the other hand, we don't want to put people in a difficult situation and I certainly don't know how much discussion

staff has of this kind of culture within the organization. I don't know how varied the culture is across different parts of ICANN. But I think the one thing that we could maybe do is just write a note to Göran as the chief executive and say that we want to encourage a staff perspective here. And we know that Sam is able to participate and just ask if he thinks there's any other degree of participation that can happen. That might be a simple, concrete thing to do.

AVRI DORIA: Thanks, that actually sounds like an interesting idea. I'd be curious to hear what other people here think about it. From talking to a lot of staff members in preparation for this, I have gotten the impression that within staff, there is a strong belief that there is a freedom to speak openly when staff is discussing things, but that they really aren't supposed to take those discussions out. So I think it makes sense to perhaps send that letter and to find out whether indeed in working this particular issue that constraint can be relieved n some sense, so that the employee that is participating does not feel under the constraint of what they can't say. So I think that would be interesting, I think we can try to draft such a letter and bring it to the group for review before sending, if that seems reasonable.

Does anybody have any comments on anything that's been said so far? I see nothing. Okay. So am I safe to assume that with the caveat of what Klaus said that this is not a closed sect, that indeed, other things may be added to the basket – to mix metaphors – that this is essentially the starting place for our work and sort of the way we will start to organize

it, the way we'll look at it in terms of trying to put together an initial schedule. Any comment there?

Karen, is your hand up anew or is that a hand from the previous time, an old hand as they say?

KAREN MULBERRY: Sorry. It's an old hand that I forgot to put down.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. Okay, I see no other hands at this point, so I'll move on to the next set of slides.

Slide 13, as I say, we will be coming back to all of this time and again. And please, if there are things you thought to say but didn't say, please put them on the list, please add them to the background note that has several sections open for discussion of various issues, and for describing issues that aren't currently on the list.

The staff paper is expected late this week, early next week. They have had a gigantic loss of bandwidth in staff and are still catching up, and that's one reason we put together the background notes, so that we could get started with our discussions without having to put that extra bit of pressure on them that we can't do anything until – as they said, doing the work on these is pretty much up to us. There's a brief pointer to where that background note is, but it's also referenced on the community page for this working group on the wiki.

Jordan and I are in conversation, really want to try and do as much of the work online as possible. People have lots and lots of [meetings] and such, so definitely on the e-mail list, definitely using the ICANN wiki, hopefully using shared online documents like the background notes, where one or two people will take the editor role on a note, and everyone in the group and even others will have an opportunity to add suggested content and to comment on what's there.

There are certainly other tools that people use, for example ongoing group chat in some form, usually Skype these days. There are other tools like Slack that some projects use to great purpose, but somehow I don't see us starting to do that. But I didn't want to overlook the possibility of using that kind of tool if it made sense.

The other suggestion that we're putting before you is fortnightly calls, and I must admit when Jordan wrote that, I thought I knew what fortnightly meant but I had to go look it up because I always call it every two weeks. Just in case anybody has the same confusion as I do, it comes in origin of 14 nights, I hadn't realized that.

So that was our original proposal. Now, the original set up called for weekly, but this is something that we've been looking at, and so would like to get some opinions on. This will also be affected by the next topic, which is how long will the work take? Are we one of those that get done quickly and will be ready with draft by Hyderabad or are we on the longer track that has draft by Copenhagen? And I'll show some of the slide work next that relates to that and making that decision. But before I go to that, are there any comments on what's here at the moment? I'll

come back to the fortnightly calls after I do the next slide. I see no one requesting comments, so I'll move on to slide 14.

It's important to mention that we do have [inaudible]. We have Jorge as lead and Ram as backup. Are either of our liaisons on the call today? If so, I welcome them. Okay, I'll move to slide 14.

In terms of schedule details – and this is what was given in the CCWG. There's basically what they called the simple, lighter topics or the complex type or intermediate, long term. I would also think that in deciding between the two categories of groups that are ready for substantive draft by Hyderabad or groups that are ready for substantive draft by Copenhagen that also has to do with dependencies on other things. We do have some dependency on Ombudsman and we do have some dependency on whistleblowing or whatever we want to call that particular work item, so I think dependencies is also part of this equation.

And they drive the schedule differently. I definitely believe that if we see ourselves as one of the groups that can be done by Hyderabad, we probably need to meet weekly and not fortnightly, but I don't know that we're quite ready for the weekly meetings yet. I certainly don't want to start scheduling them until we have the paper from staff, etc.

I tend to believe – and I don't know whether Jordan and I agreed on this, and I think we probably didn't, at least initially – is that we're in the somewhat more complex, certainly dependencies, and we're in a slower start mode with a draft by Copenhagen. Now, notice that both of them have to be completely finished within 2017. One, the Hyderabad

schedule needs to try and complete by February and the Copenhagen schedule needs to be complete May, June. So as I say, I think we're on the draft by Copenhagen schedule, but I'd like to give the floor to Jordan and then anyone else that wishes to comment on the schedule details.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Avri. Yes, I do have a different view, but I'm not certain. I think that we are one of the simpler topics. I think we have two kind of key work output areas to do, and depending on how much is already [inaudible] in ICANN, which we won't know until we get the staff paper, what we might have is almost more of a validation and reinforcement job, and the design is something that looks workable in dealing with what happens when people aren't following the norms and processes, a way for the community to raise concerns effectively. If that's where we are, then I think it should be a very simple thing to get us ready for discussion by Hyderabad, even if we're only meeting every two weeks, because I don't think we'll have a lot of writing to do, we won't have a lot of originating new content to do. We won't have a lot of scrutiny and drafting to do.

If, on the other hand, the staff paper suggests that a lot of the things that are listed there are already in place and there is a lot of that kind of originating and consulting work that does need to be done, then I think definitely, we're in the longer term, more complex projects, because it is a more complex project. So I'm kind of waiting to see that paper ICANN is working on because I kind of conclude that, personally.

AVRI DORIA: [inaudible].

JEFF NEUMAN: [inaudible] everybody.

AVRI DORIA: Now I hear you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Hi. Yes, my question is what was the direction given to staff on what they are writing? Because it would seem to me, Jordan, on your question of what's in the paper, staff is not going to write a paper that – I would think staff wouldn't just write a paper more on what they do today and just affirming that, but that may be very different than what we see in practice. So what would they have to write? What was the specific instruction?

AVRI DORIA: Karen, thank you for putting your hand up to respond.

KAREN MULBERRY: You're welcome, since I'm the one who's actually kind of working on the staff papers. What they are, Jeff, is a reference tool. It captured some of the comments that were submitted in Work Stream 1, what the elements were that were mentioned in Annex 12. It also provides

references on things that I can locate within ICANN that might be relevant to the topic that you're discussing. It doesn't contain anything beyond just materials that would be the foundation of your work that you're approaching in the subgroup.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. So, Jeff and Jordan, does that sort of give you more information to help you in your appraisal on this topic?

JORDAN CARTER: For me, it doesn't, because it'll depend on what it says about all of those things. I'm looking forward to seeing it, but I can't make a call until I have.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes, and this is –

AVRI DORIA: Karen. I'm sorry, go ahead, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes, I'm kind of in the same boat. I just know that there have been lots of issues over the years that a number of us have been involved for a while. I've certainly been involved for a number of years, and there is always a feeling that certain issues could never get addressed and when staff did something or does something, that there was just no final, ultimate resolution or a way to address the issues. And so I think staff

accountability is actually pretty complicated at its core to a lot of people, so I'm more of the mind that I think this is going to take us a little bit longer than Hyderabad.

I don't think it's a simple item, I think that there are very complex mechanisms now in dealing with [inaudible] accountability and ICANN as an organization's accountability. But staff is given a lot of discretion to do things and if people feel like they can't get redress from actions of staff, then that destroys the multistakeholder model. There was some very strong language in the Dot Registry versus ICANN decision. I'm not going to take one side or the other, but if you read that opinion – which I encourage everybody to read – and ICANN's response on the blog, ICANN responded to an article that was written on it, it was a good response. I really encourage everyone to read that. It is very complicated. It's not as easy as it may initially sound.

Thanks.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thanks. I'll make sure that the references to that are available both in the background notes, and I'll ask staff to help with it on the wiki. I don't assume that I have editing rights on the wiki.

Are there any other comments on that? Also, Karen, I'd just like to ask if you've got – and I don't want to push on schedules – but ask if there's any further information on when we can expect it, other than the end of this week, last week, next week.

EN

KAREN MULBERRY: And I do apologize. It is on my list and I want to make sure that I captured everything. I'm still kind of finalizing the draft, so I will take not of some of the items you've raised in terms of additional information that might be useful to have in the background section or the resources section, because that's what I'm trying to build out so you have a robust something to work from. It will probably be early next week before I can get it to you.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. On the one thing going back to the fortnightly, is there any objection to at least starting on the fortnightly schedule? So that means we would not – I love using that word – so that we would not have a meeting next week, but our next meeting would be the following week? And, oh yes, let me talk about the scheduling. In terms of the scheduling, Tuesday and Thursday were days on which no one indicated they couldn't. So even though Wednesday had a better hit rate for people who could participate, there was at least one person who said they couldn't because of other commitments. So therefore, tended towards the Tuesday, Thursday days. Looked at how other schedules were going, and it looks like Tuesday was a little less crowded than Thursday, but I wasn't sure. But I did not want to schedule our first meeting for last Tuesday because it was just too soon. So we set this one on Thursday.

I am, I guess, fine with either Tuesday or Thursday. I'm wondering if we – especially when we're on this every two weeks schedule, that we basically keep a flexibility between picking a slot that is available in the rotation and shows up either on a Tuesday or a Thursday, or whether

we want to pick one of those two days as always being the day. One of the things we do plan to do is the rotation through the three times to the best of our ability, unless we find a strong objection to doing so from the group. So I'd like to open the floor about the schedule discussion or the Tuesday-Thursday targeting for our meetings, or the rotation through the three time slots.

I assume, Jeff, that your hand is from the previous time. Or is it a new hand? Staying up – no, it's not. Okay. So, anybody want to comment on the scheduling of meetings, or is fortnightly, either Tuesday or Thursday with full rotation an okay plan? Hearing no objection, I see one green check. Hearing no objection, we'll go with that. Obviously, we can review this at any point at which it becomes problematic for anyone.

At this point, I've got one last slide, which is just resources to make sure people know where to find the wiki page, the mailing list, the archive to the mailing list, and the background notes that we have created, and that remain open for comment and suggested changes. At this point, has anybody come up with Any Other Business that we need to cover, any issues that we need to discuss but that they did not get a chance to comment on or have since thought of a comment?

Seeing no hands, I thank you for this meeting. I'll talk to you all in two weeks. And please keep thinking about the issues, keep contributing to background notes, keep discussing on the list, and I'll see you all at the next meeting, whenever that might be. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]