JORDAN CARTER:	Thanks, Avri. Hi, everyone, it's Jordan Carter here. [inaudible] ccNSO members of the CCWG. Welcome to the meeting of the Staff Accountability Group. Avri, did you do the agenda review, or were you just taking off?
AVRI DORIA:	No, I was just about to start that. I awaited the minute.
JORDAN CARTER:	Okay, yes, thanks. Sorry, everyone. I was walking up a very steep hill at the university campus, and it was steeper than I thought it was, so that's why I'm slightly late. [inaudible] apart from the normal protocol [inaudible] we've got Karen looking into a staff paper on staff accountability, the further discussion that Avri was on the .registry decision and the staff accountability issues. We [sorted] that next steps and Any Other Business.
	Are there any other items that people want to see on that agenda elsewhere than in Any Other Business? If you think of something during the meeting, we can deal with it in the AOB section of the items.
	I also have to give my apologies. I must leave this meeting in about 45 minutes to head off to give a lecture on Internet Governance. The first item [inaudible] is statements of interest. If you need to update yours, please do so with the ICANN Accountability staff during or after this meeting. That would be good, we need to keep those up to date [with our] accountability and transparency.

The next item is an action item from the previous meeting. Avri and I drafted and [inaudible] around the new ICANN CEO, and that was about getting his views as CEO on the question of staff accountability to the community, and also that the involvement of staff [inaudible] accountability issues certainly as participants in this group.

We've sent a copy of that notes to the list. We got a reply from Göran. Avri, did you put the reply on the list?

AVRI DORIA: I don't think we have yet. I'm not sure that there's any problem with putting it on the list. I don't think there is, I don't know.

JORDAN CARTER: Yes, basically, Göran said, "Thank you for reaching out, this is an issue that I'd be happy to share my views on. Could we have a meeting face-to-face in Hyderabad to talk about it more in terms of staff participation? I need to understand more about the goals you are seeking to make sure we had the right mix of staff involved." I think that's a fair paraphrase of what he said. And so in terms of following that up, I thought it was great that he wrote back and expressed an interest.

We could, as co-Chairs, go and clarify with him a little bit what the kind of question is in terms of staff participation here. I think we should go and meet with him in Hyderabad if he wants to, but reiterate that that's more of what he might be able to [inaudible] an audio conference with this group in-between now and Hyderabad. Is that a reasonable

approach, Avri? Do you want to sort of perfect on your views and how we should reply to this together, co-Chair?

AVRI DORIA: Yes, thanks, this is Avri speaking. The only thing I wanted to say is that when we sent the letter, the hope was that we can get him on a phone call between now and Hyderabad.

JORDAN CARTER: Avri, you are on mute now, if you were not sure.

AVRI DORIA: I am on mute?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I can hear you, Avri, perfectly.

AVRI DORIA: Oh, okay, because I didn't think I was on mute. You can't hear? Jordan, can you hear me?

JORDAN CARTER: Anyone hear Avri? I'm just on the Adobe room and I can't hear.

AVRI DORIA: It seems that other people can hear me, you can't.

JORDAN CARTER: We hear you now.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, fantastic. Anyhow –

JORDAN CARTER: And now I can't again.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. I will write what I have to say now in the thing, so anybody who can't hear me can read it. Of course, they couldn't hear me say that, but what I wanted to add was we hoped to meet with him before Hyderabad on an audio conference. At this point, I think I would look to Jordan and I speaking with him, and try to get him in an audio conference with the group afterwards.

JORDAN CARTER: I don't know about everybody else, but I – okay, I heard about one third of the time Avri talking, and two thirds of the time Avri not talking. I don't know whether other people are able to hear me or not. I'm speaking. Cheryl, can you hear me? I'll try to get a dial out to ICANN staff if I'm not being able to be heard, and in the meantime, I'll ask Avri to take over the [chairing] again.

AVRI DORIA: This is Avri speaking again. Hopefully, most of you can hear me. Somebody had to do a green check to see if I can actually – okay, I see at least one person hears me. Anyone that doesn't hear any –

JORDAN CARTER: Can you hear me as well?

AVRI DORIA: Yes, I can hear you, Jordan. Let me check.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay, well, if this is –

AVRI DORIA: Can you hear me, Jordan? Okay, I think it's only Jordan who can't hear me, because I see no red checks. So let me continue. Oh, okay, no, I got Sonigitu can't hear me either. Why not? Okay, so I don't know. Does anybody have any viewpoint on what I had said in terms of how to handle this letter that we will speak with Göran in Hyderabad and at that point to schedule a meeting, a teleconference with the group after Hyderabad, since we won't be having a specific group meeting in Hyderabad? At least not that I know of, unless it's part of the whole pre-day meeting, but not sure about that.

So I don't know what to expect from him, but hopefully, we'll have something. So anybody have any comment on that? No? If not, then we

should probably move on to the next item so that we don't expend the whole meeting in technical...

Jordan, can you hear me yet, to be able to take over again? No, okay.

Actually, I see a note there saying there's not great expectations from him. I don't know him yet, so I still have great expectations for him. I have not lost faith yet, so I hope good things will happen. Just to let people know that I'm still in the optimistic column.

Okay, moving on, the next thing was on the staff paper on staff accountability. I'm wondering if Karen can take over on that now. Hopefully Jordan will be able to hear her and we'll go on from there. So Karen, if you want to take it, please.

KAREN MULLBERY: Thank you very much, Avri. To kind of give you an overview of the staff accountability paper, in a particular sense I've only been at ICANN for a year. I under took this as a research project [on each] topic to try and see what I could gather, first from the Work Stream 1 report that would be relevant for the discussion in terms of establishing the scope of the work that you might want to review and look at for building upon what you're discussing, and then when you get down to the background section, that information that I gleaned again from exchanges in Work Stream 1 on issues, areas that were raised, questions that look like they might be something in terms of possible areas for the subgroup to discuss as they look at a broader issue and find what the recommendations and work is that they want to undertake.

I'm not going to go through the specifics of all of these, in particular because I tried to keep the paper short and just capture the essence of things so that the group [et al] can go into more depth in the areas they feel are more important or relevant for themselves.

And then in the resources area, that is where I tried to go within ICANN, and in some cases for some of the papers externally what's relevant information that could be useful to help with the discussions that you have in front of you and the recommendations you want to consider. Now, I've got some particular resources from ICANN that I thought would be useful from ATRT 1 Recommendation 22. And then I would really want to call out the One World Trust report, because I actually defined accountability and did independent assessments of ICANN and ICANN staff, and interactions with the community and the Board and everything that I think might be very useful for your discussion.

I know that during my research on what to gather and what would be useful to kind of frame things for this group, I discovered that there were actually two sessions at previous ICANN meetings where there were presentations to the community and feedback and thoughts from the community on the One World Trust report. I didn't add those links to those sessions here. If you'd like, Avri, I can send those links to you for consideration. I think they provided some very good, high-level points that might be considered as you discuss this topic on staff accountability, what it is, what it should look like, how we make it better.

And then when you go through the rest of the resources, here are some things in terms of being a staff member will report into the KPI

dashboard, which is posted on the homepage of ICANN towards the bottom to give you a [slash] report of all of our projects and what we're working on, and how we're meeting the goals as they're defined in these strategic plans. So I thought that might be very specific information that would be useful, along with [Strategical] 5.2 in terms of what the focus is, and that again is under the KPI dashboard, so you can see the progress and what is reported into that goal as it relates to our objectives for the year. It kind of gives you a sense of some of the data that we're collecting and some of the way we're trying to reflect what we're doing.

Then there is another recommendation from ATRT 2, recommendation 9.4 on transparency metrics. That provides some background information for you on that recommendation, as well as some of the implementation status of what's going on related to that recommendation, and how we're integrating it into the overall daily activities of ICANN itself.

Now, to get specific, I've got some Work Stream 1 subgroup materials here, just in case you want to reflect back on more discussion and things that occurred within the Working Party 3 Subgroup that was looking at staff accountability. Some of that material could be useful to provide some background to the discussion. It might add some things that you would want to move forward into what you're looking at right now. And that's what I've put in the staff paper. Open for questions.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Yes, it would certainly be good to get any and all resources, pointers that you may have, and include them on the wiki as things that can be referenced. Certainly, I've gone through the One World report stuff a while ago during ATRT 2, and it really is a good discussion on a lot of things, so it's definitely worth including in our background material. So thank you for that. Thank you for the paper, thank you for the walkthrough.

I wonder if anybody has any issues on it, any comments they'd like to make, anybody who's read it or anybody even who hasn't read it yet but has a question. Okay, yes, Jordan, please.

JORDAN CARTER: Hi Avri, I hope that I can be heard this time. I'm on a dial-out now [inaudible].

AVRI DORIA: I can hear you fine.

JORDAN CARTER: Great, thank you. Who would use that crazy Internet thing anyway? I thank you, Karen, for this paper. When I scroll right back up to the top and I look at the two scope bullet points that you have included that were from the recommendation from our Work Stream 1 paper, there were kind of some specifics in there about like what are the powers that the Board has delegated to staff that don't need further Board approval, and there were some questions about code of conduct transparency criteria, training and KPIs for staff [relating to] interactions with

stakeholders. Did you sort of seek that information as part of preparing this paper and decide not to include it, or is that a kind of subsequent research task that we could ask staff to do or do ourselves? Could you just kind of come in on that for a moment?

KAREN MULBERRY: I'd be happy to. Actually, I just captured it from Work Stream 1. I haven't done anything further on that, because I actually thought that was the discussion and the remit of the subgroup itself. We [inaudible] happy to facilitate some things, but I did not do anything further. I was trying to frame useful things for the subgroup's discretion and we'll take it from there.

JORDAN CARTER: Cool, thank you.

AVRI DORIA: I have a follow-up question on that. Are we to assume that there is no existing information on that, and that therefore we need to do it ourselves? It being the case that this had been asked for, does that just mean that there is no information on it, therefore, it's a concept that we need to develop ourselves? Is there possibly information on such things, but we would need to at least know that it existed, and somehow request it? Is it something that we would need to do DIDP on to be able to have it, or does it not exist? I'm sort of in a quandary to know how to handle it, because this was a question about what has been done, not what should we do.

KAREN MULBERRY: Frankly, I did not ask any questions. I just captured from Work Stream 1 what the recommendation held for this subgroup in terms of the scope of the work. Did I ask any follow-up question on any of this? No, I did not. I look at the staff paper as providing background findings for the discussion, so here are elements of information that could be useful. In terms of follow-up, in terms of the scope and those details, I did not ask anyone on those at all. I just gathered them from the report itself.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you for that. I guess it was my misunderstanding. We had spoken about those in one of the earlier meetings and I just thought that you were also going to research those. Fantastic. I didn't mean to be critical, just trying to understand what it was that happened on that.

Okay, I don't see any other hands or questions, so obviously, the two questions that were asked are things that we still need to follow up on. [inaudible] discussion.

Okay, so seeing no discussion, the next thing that turns up is, what are the actions that arise from us having this paper? I think the first thing is we need to either do some research, at least to find out what documentation exists on the questions asked by Jordan in terms of documented powers that have been given to the staff that do not need further Board approval and how all that works. It may all just be as long as the CEO says "It's okay," it's okay, because he's on the Board, but just to understand how that whole mechanism works.

So we really need to get through this paper. I think we need to look also at the auxiliary documentation that I pulled together in the other document and basically start defining what questions we need to ask. We sort of waited to start doing this until we got this paper. We now have this paper, it's been presented to us, so now we need to come up, I think, with some specific questions that we need to have answered.

Since Jordan is typing instead of speaking, [first of all], I think the info here will be helpful, just getting our head around the parameters. And also, Karen, can a supplementary research tasks be commissioned? That's a bit specific. If we develop a list of specific questions or asks, would that be okay? How does that [inaudible]?

KAREN MULBERRY: Certainly, I would be happy to facilitate getting responses to the questions. Not an HR person, so I can't answer specifics, but I would be happy to reach out to people within ICANN to gather what information is possible to respond to your question.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Okay, so I guess that's one item going forward. As Jordan says, I seem to be channeling him today. In many cases, staff somewhere in ICANN will know the answers easily, so thanks for that, Karen, and thank you for your optimism, Jordan.

Okay, so any hands, and going further on this? Now basically is the next step for us to pull out various questions. We probably need to take the questions that Jordan asked and wordsmith them so that they're

carefully said and specific, and we need to pull out any questions that we need to further research from this so that we can start to answer the questions there. Anybody else, or should I move on? Might be a quick meeting today.

Okay, then moving on to the .registry staff accountability issues. There's not that much. The concept here was not that we were going to necessarily review that and discuss all of the issues in it because most of them do not pertain to our work at all. I did quote a set of excerpts out of that. I don't know whether it's possible to display them. I did not make a PDF of those, I only gave the Drive document, so unless staff was clairvoyant and made a PDF of it, we don't have one. So let me bring that document up so I can get people the URL so they can look at it themselves.

JORDAN CARTER: I can do that for you, Avri, if you like, while you keep talking.

AVRI DORIA: I have to find it on my own. It's in the agenda that everyone received, and I should have made the PDF. I know that we don't have the full level of staff support that one grows used to in other groups, so that's why I started using, by the way, Drive instead of the wiki. I've got no edit privileges on the wiki, so I'm linking everything inside Drive documents.

Okay, so I put this there, and basically, the comments that came out were – and basically pulled them, and there were things like, "Accordingly, the panel majority declares that in performing its duties of

reconsideration, the Board Governance Committee (BGC) must determine whether the [inaudible] in this case [inaudible] and ICANN staff respected the principles of fairness, transparency, avoiding conflicts of interest and non-discrimination as set out in the article Bylaws."

And basically, that is the general theme that comes out there. It shows up several times that this quote is on page 33, it talks about ICANN being obligated to follow the articles, it talks about breaches of staff, of transparency obligations found in articles, and this was with giving information and getting information, etc. It examines whether staff engaged in discrimination or failed to fulfill transparency obligations, [meaning] there's a non-discriminatory obligation as part of staff accountability.

And then again, it speaks of general duties of transparency and accountability that are implicated by ICANN's decision to shield relevant staff work from public disclosure by structuring staff work to benefit from legal privilege, and that was another one of the large issues that came out, is the balance between what is just staff work and what is staff work covered under privilege, a border that's understood, and is that border necessarily in the right place, and how would anyone know?

Those were, in the excerpts that I pulled out, sort of the point, is an obligation to the Bylaws and an obligation to accountability and transparency and those issues, and the issue of – in other words, and avoiding conflicts of interest and non-discrimination and such. So the obligations were fairly clearly made out, and so without needing the look that I was thinking we needed to take of this, is not one that

follows through with this [inaudible] ruling and whether what was fair and whether what was not fair in terms of that ruling, but just what were the expectations that that panel held forthwith about staff accountability and staff transparency.

So those were what I picked up from that. I don't know if anybody else has read through. I know Jordan read through it, but I don't know if anybody else has any conceptual content or point to contribute there in terms of our definition of staff accountability and its scope, as affected by that [inaudible].

Jordan, I see you writing a lot. Would you like to speak some?

JORDAN CARTER: Just really briefly, Avri, I think I took the same thing from you. I don't know enough about the case, and the whole gTLD program is a bit of a mystery to me, being a ccTLD person. But to my reading of the judgment, it asks some questions about what the expectations are in terms of what the community expects from staff, and whether the Bylaws bind the staff or just the Board, and in terms of similar transparency obligations. So I think that calling those expectations into question would be then to get some answers that everyone has signed up to. So that could be a helpful output from the work of this group.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Anyone else with any comments? Anybody else do a read-through? Anyone else question or issues on this? Do people generally think that this is content that should be included in our analysis of staff

accountability, transparency and the responsibility to the Bylaws of staff? Yes, I see [inaudible]. Yes, you do, thank you. Does anyone not think it's relevant to our work?

Jeff, your hand is up, thank you. Please speak.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes, I'm going to try to speak. Can you guys hear me through the Internet?

AVRI DORIA: We can hear you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Great. Yes, I think there are some points in the decision now, interesting about the influence of [inaudible] team on things that were so-called independent, and the denial of staff involvement in certain things that were supposed to be independent. And I think that – I know the discussion at the Board level in their latest retreat in Brussels, I guess, on this issue, so I'd like to see where they came out on it. I'd like to see what the results were, but it was very disturbing to me to read some of the findings on the lack of transparency and the control that certain staff had over the ultimate outcomes, which were eventually decided on by the Board.

So I think we need to take a little bit more time, we need to get the facts, and as far as what the Board has decided to do to address the issues that were raised in there, but that kind of activity needs to be

looked at, and the staff needs to adhere to the same level of accountability as the Board, and the Board [inaudible] take action based on staff activities. That staff activity is not transparent. So I do think that we should examine all of this further.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Yes, Cheryl, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I would have had my hand up a little bit earlier, but that was when, of course, the Adobe Connect room decided it would die on me and take forever to reboot. Jeff, thanks for that. I'm going to support you in that plea with a slight caution in my voice noted. I think we should do it – just proposing, but I want to be scrupulous if we can be. In other words, be extremely transparent ourselves, that what we're doing is looking forward to proactive solutions, not looking backwards in the form of, "You bad little children, here, have your wrists slapped."

I think that would be an unproductive exercise. Let's face it, sh1t happens sometimes. Let's not go back and jump into it, but let's be assured that we recognize it when we see it, and that we can make proposals that can perhaps minimize or mitigate the likelihood of jumping in as in the future. I was equally disturbed – I guess just as you were, as many people were – but by the same token, looking at organizations that grow as we have, and sometimes all the bits don't quite grow in sync and I'm not suggesting we be forgiving, but we do recognize that sometimes growing pains can be more painful than

others and we just need to sort them out and make sure that we get through them. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Cheryl. Yes, I think that's one of the reasons why I tried to divorce the extraction of points from the points of the case and perhaps where the dividing line is between legal privilege and staff was my way of saying something similar to what Jeff brought out. I do agree a lot of people were indeed shocked to read this. I might add that a lot of people were relieved, because it proved that they weren't completely paranoid.

So there was a mixed reception to this material, but I do agree that the point here is the issues that have to do with staff accountability and not the case itself. The case itself is just an example that brings out those points. Jeff, I see your hand again.

JEFF NEUMAN: I'm going to agree with Cheryl. I don't think we should send anybody to go back and penalize anyone. I just think this becomes really important, especially in normal organizations, the Board should be able to completely rely on staff. The Board shouldn't have to do – in normal organizations, a complete review over every little thing that staff does. But in order for [inaudible] the community to get comfortable with that, we have to be comfortable that the staff has certain codes of conduct or accountability measures that they can't hide behind either claims of confidentiality or privilege, especially if the Board is basing its decisions – which most Boards do – on staff activity.

So I think we've grown too accustomed to having an organization over the past 18 years where the Board gets into the nitty-gritty details on everything, and is expected to. That's not the way it should happen. Staff should be getting to the nitty-gritty, the Board should be able to rely on staff. And in order for the accountability measures to mean anything at the Board level, there has to be something at the staff level. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I'm going to half put George on the spot, and hopefully he'll forgive me for this. But he can just say no. But since the Board has discussed these – and of course, I know that nothing can be said that affects their response – but I'm wondering if, George, you can tell us whether we will get any indication to some of the questions we've got from the Board at some point in terms of what they think the answers are to some of these points that come out.

And if the answer is, "It's not time for that yet," then very much accept that with, perhaps, a follow-up question of, "When might we be hearing?"

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thanks, Avri. I'm going to be fairly positive on you're being able to get responses because it's our goal to help you make this working group a success. It's a little early right now. We just started looking at the results of working groups that are leading in Belgium a week ago and uniformly, there was, "Well, we're just getting started," "Well, we're formulating the questions," etc. But I would say if you formulate them and they're

out for discussion, this Board is going to discuss them and it's very likely to give you answers.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. That's very heartening. Thank you very much. So yeah. Anybody else have any other comments on that? Okay. If not, I'll move on. I'm sure we'll be back here.

So if there's no other questions on point three, I'll move to four, which is – it's not really Any Other Business, It's Next Steps. I don't have the agenda in front of me, just one on the slide there.

But our next steps is, first of all, one of the things that's come out of – before we even get to timeline – one of the things that's come out of this discussion is that we're at a step now, we've had the staff paper, we have this one. Let's call it a case history. It wasn't an intentional case history. It's happenstance that we have this case to look at, but we do have a case to look at.

So the next step would be to formulate questions that we feel we need to specifically dive into and get answers to in order to complete our work.

Oh, bye, Jordan.

That strikes me as one of the things, and as George said, it would be useful – and [inaudible] in the writing – to get any questions, specifically wordsmith, so that we can put them to people. So it sounds like we have some specific questions that we need to frame to the staff about the existence and content of various policies that may or may not exist

in terms of the questions that Jordan put out about when does the staff need to go back, there's the other questions that come out of the paper itself, and then a third set of questions that come out of the dot registry write-up and the points made about staff. So that's three categories.

Jordan said he'd be happy to tease out some questions and put them in a Google Doc and I think that's a great way to start. I wanted to ask all of you to also think of the questions, go to the Google Doc, comment on it, suggest anybody that doesn't want to do the Google Doc. Just put them an e-mail on the list just in case Google Drive Docs are much too difficult for you and we'll send copies of the content of the Drive Doc to the list periodically just to make sure no one gets left out because of their relationship with Google products.

So an action item next time is to collect questions and Jordan will start, but all of us need to contribute to those. And then at the next meeting, we can start walking through those questions.

I don't think this particular doc is already out. We have several docs out. One of them was the collection of information before the staff paper. It was kind of like the pre-staff paper. There was the staff paper. I took a copy of the staff paper and put it in Drive specifically so that people could comment and edit it because I didn't have the right to change the one that was listed on the wiki page. We've got this file that's an excerpt, so I'll work with staff to make sure that all of these Drive Docs are visible to people. In fact, I may just make the whole directory visible to everybody and then [inaudible] that. Yes. So there will be a specific doc. Okay. And so that's that.

Now in terms of the Hyderabad or Copenhagen job claim, the way the co-Chairs of this group, of the CCWG and WSG, had framed it was that things that were easy and things that were low-hanging as it were, as much as I hate that term, would be done within the Hyderabad timeframe.

Now I believe that we're already too late to say that we will have our draft presentation by then. Perhaps it could have happened earlier had we gotten an earlier start. I don't really think so. I think we're more on the longer timeframe which is that we have our draft solution ready by Copenhagen.

But I'm wondering if anybody disagrees with that assessment. I know at the beginning, Jordan and I had a disagreement. I always thought it was Copenhagen. He believed we might be able to make it for Hyderabad. At this point, I think it's the Copenhagen timeframe and what we need to do now is take that timeframe, look at the schedule of when the delivery gate for our draft report is to the full group and schedule backwards for our meetings going forward.

So that's where we are on that. Does that work for people?

Okay. You'll get, hopefully by our next meeting, a sort of list of our meetings between now and those gates, scheduling backwards, to try and make sure we know what we have to get done when we have to get it done.

Okay. Anything else on timeline? Any hands? I see a check. Thank you. But no hands.

Okay. Then the last thing I had was Any Other Business and I had the one item, which is still pending, which is the open and safe staff participation in the group.

By the way, before I start that, does anybody else have Any Other Business they would also like us to speak about before the end of meeting?

Nope. Okay.

So, now part of the letter that we sent to Göran was to ask him about would staff members be able to participate safely, would they be able to participate openly? And his letter said, "Gee, let's talk about that," so that remains open.

But in terms of going to this discussion, especially the first discussion we've got, I wanted to test my understanding and see if it's at all what there's sort of a support for in the group, not going so far as to use consensus words, but is there a general notion of support.

And one of the things we had talked about was that to talk about staff accountability without staff members being able to contribute to that is foolish. And I didn't want us to be foolish, [so] having them.

But then there's the idea of what are we talking about. Are we talking about a few leaders who speak formally and with authority or are we talking about a situation where staff members that aren't the leads, that aren't the people picked to speak carefully on behalf of staff [inaudible], but are staff members who speak on behalf of themselves as members of the staff can also participate?

Part of that grows out of a question that we're often asked. But aren't staff stakeholders too? And the answer comes back, kind of, "Well, yeah, they might be; they kind of should be; they certainly have their livelihood as a stake in all this, plus, they are users of the Internet, so in a sense, yes, but, very special kind of stakeholders in that their ability to speak freely is often constrained not only by nondisclosures but by corporate policies because while you can speak freely inside the company when you're speaking to the volunteers or when you're speaking to others, you must not speak freely."

And so dealing with that conundrum was part of what we wanted to talk to Göran about. So I just wanted to put that on the table in, perhaps, a hand-waving manner and just make sure that there is support for that notion of staff members who can speak for themselves as staff members doing it without risk of getting themselves in trouble with their employment contracts or their employer [inaudible].

I don't quite know how we do that, but one of the things that we decided last time and the reason to go to Göran with a note was if the CEO says, "Yes, this is a sanctioned activity; you can do it," then there's a little bit of hope that maybe it can happen. Of course, that never answers for intermediate [inaudible], but it gives it a chance.

So I wanted to open that topic up so that when we have this continuing discussion, we have a better idea of where we stand. Yes, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I guess, from my point of view, we can't go forward and make recommendations on how to change things when, in

some cases, we don't even know what needs to be changed. I'll give one of the examples that I think I gave in my flash talk or related to that, that there are times when decisions are made in ICANN and we don't even know who made the decision. So how do you hold someone accountable when you don't even know who it is?

And very often, within ICANN, for a number of reasons, you get documents signed not by a person, but by a group. And presumably, one of them within the group wrote it, maybe approved by the senior person in the group. But it's signed by a group. So you don't know who to attribute the action to, and at that point, accountability just has no meaning whatsoever.

So, in some cases, it's probably a person's decision saying, "I don't want to be identified because then they'll come back to me, so let's just do it under the group label." But it may be a management decision that said, "Everything must come out under the group." I know in the past from talking to people, both of those cases have happened.

So I don't see how we can do our work without, at least, having someone to ask questions to who can answer them and understand more what is going on in the organization where we, as volunteers, feel there is a lack of accountability. But it's really hard to attribute it without understanding what mechanisms are in the background that we're not seeing. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Alan. I thought that was a very important point. I hope it's one that we get captured as one of the questions that we need to answer.

I would believe in the categorization of help that we get from staff. That could be very ably answered in sort of that answer we got from Göran's note which was, "Make sure that you have the right leads there that can answer these kinds of questions."

So this, your point, very important, goes to the point of having, authoritatively speaking [inaudible] as opposed to the [inaudible] question of having staff that doesn't speak authoritatively but speaks for themselves. So that's good to have a case example for the authoritative staff and the kind of information we would want them to be able to give us and I want to make sure that that point, that's specific question, is indeed captured in our list of questions.

So if you don't see it there, please feel free – and I know you do feel free – to write [inaudible] documents. So please feel free to make sure that it's there and it's there with the right words and the right weight that you would like to see on those words.

Is there anyone else that has a comment on the discussion of staff participation? I know people need to leave in five minutes. I need to go be at a meeting right at the hour.

Any other comments on that? Or can I take that whole discussion item to Göran as an issue that we're interested in? Is there anyone that objects to taking that whole basket of issues as part of the introductory discussion with Göran?

Okay, I see no objection. If there was an objection, I certainly would have asked for why, but I see no objection – and certainly would follow-up with the group on that. And tell them that those are the kinds of issues that we would like to be able to have him discuss with the group. I'm sure he's got a payment on it and I'd love for us to be able to discuss those with him. So I will take that as, "Go ahead with the basket of issues and see where he's at on it and then come back to the group and see where we go from there."

Okay. So anybody else have anything that they need to say, want to say? There was a question. Please identify your name if your phone number list ends in 5316. That's for the attendance. You can either tell us all or you can just communicate with Brenda privately. But we're really supposed to [inaudible] who's here. It starts with 703 and ends with 5316.

And at that, I see nothing else. We've got a plan for work in the intervening three weeks. We've got action items that we need to solve. We have some idea of the timeline. We're going the long line, which is a question I needed to ask and we have the discussion issues for going forward with the [PBL].

Any last words from anyone else? Okay. I apologize for having talked way too much in this meeting, but it's you guys that have to stop me by putting up your hands and saying stuff.

So for today, thank you very much. Thank you, Karen, for both the paper and the report. Thanks to all our staff. And with that, the call is over.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, Avri. Thanks, everyone. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]