EN

OPERATOR:	This meeting is now being recorded.
AVRI DORIA:	Thank you. This is Avri Doria speaking, the rapporteur [INAUDIBLE]. So, hello to you all. Hello, everybody. This is [INAUDIBLE] check and SOI check, and we'll do a quick update on the working draft document. Sylvia's the rapporteur on this one, and she can't be at this meeting.
BERNARD TUCOTTE:	Avri, you are very faint.
AVRI DORIA:	We will also have a discussion. I am very faint. That's the way I feel. Okay. I will adjust my—yeah, that's because I'm holding it in front of my mouth, but I don't want to keep doing that. Let me see if I can adjust the volume on it. Levels—oh yeah, they've tripped down to 53. Is that any better?
BERNARD TUCOTTE:	Yeah, it's better.
AVRI DORIA:	Okay, let's see if that's any better. I can adjust it some more later if need be. So, going into a detailed discussion of responses—and thank

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.

you, Bernie, going into a detailed discussion of responses, the staff questions that we got in response to our questions.

And there is some catch there considered both I think [INAUDIBLE] and myself. So, it needs a discussion. And then depending on how much time we have, discussing the first draft of document B in that it's still lacking information but it has been done, and of course we've posted further questions to the staff on that.

And then a schedule check and a preview of that indicates that we are indeed slipping a bit, but we'll talk about that then. And then there's probably no any other business, but even if there isn't, there is any other business. Does anybody have any other business at this point that they'd like to add to the agenda? If there is nothing.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This is [INAUDIBLE].

AVRI DORIA: Yes, please.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This is [INAUDIBLE].

AVRI DORIA: Yes, thank you. Okay. Now in terms of attendance, attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect, but we do have three phone numbers. I

know one of them is just me, and one of them is Greg Shatan. Who has the one ending in 1933?

GEORGE SADOWSKY: That's me, George Sadowsky.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you, George. And Greg Shatan has been named, and 5079, is that you, Julf?

JULF HELSINGUS: Yes, that's me.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you very much. So, I guess that's the attendance at this point. And go to the—anybody else that hasn't been spoken of or listed? Okay, great. Now I'll go to the SOI check. I'm assuming everybody's SOI is up to date, but if you have an SOI update that you'd like to tell the group, please speak up now, raise your hand, whatever.

Okay. Seeing/hearing nothing. Just want to remind people that we are obligated to update our SOI whenever it changes. Okay. Moving to item two, the updated working draft document A. A fair amount of editing has been done on it. The clean version there has been focused.

The old markup version is still available, but is not to be edited. I made a mistake and actually edited, but we rolled back any edits I made to the original markup version. And it's only that first one, the clean version

there, that is being worked on because the schedule had been for us to try and complete that one at this meeting.

But since this meeting was at a bad time for Jordan, and we couldn't find a meeting that even Jordan and I could agree on, a meeting time slot that was still open to move to that even Jordan and I could even agree to both be at, we decided that we would keep the editing online.

Very few people have done so. I thank Greg for coming and making a pass through the document. But that we would leave the document open for further edits and finalizing the cleanup during the next week, and then would use the 16th meeting, meeting on the 16th, to focus on finishing that document so that we can pass it on to the plenary.

So, that's the update on that working draft. I do encourage everyone to try and find the time in the next week to go to the draft document and make some comments. Anybody that can't do the draft document, the PDF that was sent out is—contains all the current changes and the comments.

While you can't export such a PDF directly from Drive, you can export a Microsoft doc and then the text back to Adobe to get all that, the current changes and stuff. So, the three PDFs that I sent out should be proper snapshots of where they were last night my time, when I went to them.

Actually, even a little earlier than that. But so, if you can't edit the Drive document, please take a look at the PDF that was sent out and send any of the changes to the list, and then either Jordan or I can put them into

the document. Any comments, though, that anybody wants to make at this point?

Any major comments that they'd like to get on the record? Jordan will listen to this. So, if anybody has any major comments that they'd like to get on the record that are large shifts that they believe needed in the document, I'd like to open up the floor just briefly to get those on the record.

So, does anybody have anything they feel they need to say about document A in the large sense? Okay. So, I'm going on the assumption that we're moving in the right direction on document A. I do invite everybody to take a read on it. At next meeting, we will try to get the sub-team consensus on the document for sending it forward through this meeting.

Okay, moving on, unless [INAUDIBLE]. Okay, moving on. We got a set of questions from the staff in response to our set of questions to document B. And an interesting set of questions. I think they may cause some interesting answers to be thought up.

Brenda—I guess it's Brenda or Karen, whoever is doing the AC, could you put the response document? Thank you. I see you're doing it. I see more people came. Thank you. Okay. Now one of the problems with that PDF method is, of course, it makes the screen a little small.

But anyway. So, we have the questions. I put in part of one answer to question 2, and I don't believe I put it in the right format yet, but I just jotted it down. Klaus contributed a lot of the text, and if he's willing, I didn't tell him I was putting him on the spot—I'm being echoed. I hate

hearing the echo. Okay, but Klaus, if you'd like to talk to the questions. One, if you care to, or I could start with the questions. Go ahead, Klaus, please.

KLAUS STOLL: Sorry, Avri, I didn't hear anything what you said. I only heard you saying go ahead.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, that was good. Okay, what I'm saying is in terms of the answers, question one response I believe was contributed primarily by Klaus. The question was, "What are some concrete examples of concerns that the community has with regards to staff accountability? Are the concerns about individual service delivery, individual staff, or about the potential that staff might cause a violation of ICANN policies, processes, bylaws?"

And what I had said, Klaus, basically is that the answer that is in there is primarily one that I believe you contributed. And as such, I wanted to give you a chance to talk to it as opposed to my going through. If you'd prefer, I could just go through it paragraph by paragraph, but I wanted to give you a chance to talk to it.

KLAUS STOLL: Thank you, Avri. Thank you for giving me a chance to bring that. I just didn't receive what you said. Just to make a long thing short, I promised last time that I would go through the document A and extract the answers to the question 1-4 out of it.

While doing it, I just simply realized [INAUDIBLE] to basically repeat what we already got. And by trying to condense it, I basically realized that what's behind the questions, and actually what we are talking about is a very, very simple basic fact, at least it seems to be of value at least in my thinking, and basic practice simply, that the role between staff and community basically reversed, what staff basically has conceived, or should have had a role.

Staff's role should be in support of the community. Basically, when one looks through everything, and if you look what the situation is with the documents, and even the [INAUDIBLE], you realize that basically there's a reversal of role, that it's actually the community that now is expected to serve the interests, or outcomes, or whatever you want to call it, of staff. And I gave a very—

AVRI DORIA: Can somebody please mute themselves?

KLAUS STOLL: I gave a very detailed response, I guess, too big a response to that example with regards to outreach, but there are other examples which could be cited. So, that's very short, and I just put it in there, saying what I wanted. But I'm not too sure if somebody else looks at it, better support around the words to take out.

It's just a starter. That's how far I got with the thinking. Of course, it can be refined much further. And the second question is quite simply, it allows in part of the questions, actually the opposite of what I started,

Avri, is happening, shouldn't be some parts of the answer to the question in document A. But really quick. I just—again, it's just out there as a proposal for reply. I tried to think first thing, but it doesn't mean it has to be exactly my reply. Thank you very much.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Klaus. Yes. And I very much appreciate people being brave enough to—excuse me, I suppressed a cough. So, I very much appreciate the work you did to put some content in that people can start working with, commenting on, thinking about.

I'll just mention, this is just a personal comment, I wasn't sure that we had good alignment yet between what is said in A and some of how developed in those answers. And I think that's important to look at before we finalize. So, I don't see any hands on that. Hopefully people have had a chance to read it.

What I'll do is just quickly, since question one is so extensive, if there are no comments, I'm actually going to start, just a walkthrough, not by paragraph, but by section of the question, just for people a chance to look at it and start thinking about some of the specific sub-teams and parts that Klaus has opened up on question one.

So basically, it talks about, first of all in the first part, ICANN centricity resulted in lack of relevance. And I just wanted to see if anybody had any comments on that paragraph. I'm not going to read it. Actually, I've got two people just on audio, but I'm not sure that reading it is the best use of our time.

But somebody can speak up if they would like me to read through the answer there as a conversation-starter. What do people think? I have no requests for reading. So, I'll not do so. So, no comments on the bullet dealing with ICANN centricity resulting in lack of relevance?

Okay. The main point in that is website resources, so mostly talking about ICANN, and I'm not talking about the issue, the wider range of DNS and internet ecosystem subjects. Yes, Klaus? Did I misrepresent this?

KLAUS STOLL: No, not misrepresent. I just—why I put that paragraph in there, it becomes fairly clear that, for example, in the outreach. Everything is done to promote ICANN.org as an organization, and it basically literally a head count on how many people are invited to events, dinners, receptions, or whatever, to promote ICANN.org and the process, or whatever, are given about.

But nobody from the staff side on the outreach seems to be interested in actually promoting the DNS reception, what it's all about. So, that's why I called the ICANN centricity. Part of that is at least in the non-commercial sector, quite simply, that we can't—it's hard to find in the operational [INAUDIBLE] organizations you'll find, but what we are doing, or what ICANN is doing relevant.

Because basically, it's always a come to Jesus, come to ICANN. It's not a come to the governments to participate, and become a fully-fledged citizen of cyberspace. That's why I put that paragraph in there, just for staff. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Any other comments at this point on this paragraph? So, we're just doing an early reading of this, and this document is like all of our documents, open on the Drive document, and happy to see people commenting and suggesting edits to the document.

I just wanted to make sure that is out there. Okay, moving to the next section, which is a similar theme, which is the staff-centered strategy, in that it's—I'm sorry. Okay. So, the strategy is staff-centered, which goes along with what Klaus was just saying, is the idea that the main objective is executed and guided by ICANN staff and indicating that that is contrary to ICANN's bottom-up process of governance.

Any comments? Okay, I'm seeing one comment from Julf indicating that [INAUDIBLE] the community. [INAUDIBLE] the registries have some thoughts on question one, but we will resubmit it. Hopefully, Julf, you can submit them directly into the Drive doc.

But if they're submitted as a statement on the list, then we'll try to fold them in. But hoping for edits. Okay, then I see no hands. Moving on to C, building on the theme of staff-centricity and speaking of the outreach strategy, a discussion on the documentation as opposed to materials.

Again, largely centered around understanding ICANN is necessary but perhaps not sufficient. Speaking of the density of the material, the specific language issues, and that perhaps an indication that, again, it's not language that may be appropriate for the intended stakeholders.

EN

So—and some of it is [INAUDIBLE]. So, any comments on materials and language in this answer at this point? Okay. Moving on. Then there's a paragraph on lack of understanding volunteers or others' needs. Basically, indicating that there isn't a full understanding within ICANN of what goes into being a community member, what goes into being a volunteer.

There's assumptions there about—or statements here, about contracted parties and non-contracted parties that people may have comments on. But there are also discussions of time of effort required for engagement effectively and such. And then the discussion of resources.

Any comments on D at the moment? Not getting much discussion going here. Okay. It's too early to take this silence as agreement, but just want to warn people that over time, silence will become agreement until we ask for a specific consensus.

So please, get your comments in early on some of this stuff to make sure that we get something that the group is—has discussed well. Okay, moving down. Overcoming barriers. So, then there's a discussion of how to begin to do that. And refers to making processes more readily digestible, making volunteer engagement easier, facilitating ease and effectiveness of volunteer efforts in governance processes and needs to do so by consulting with the [INAUDIBLE] that, just focusing on top-down programs.

Any comment on that? An agreeable crew this day. Okay, then the next item is reversing the roles between ICANN staff and ICANN constituency

organizations. And I think this was one of the underlined points that Klaus made in his introductory [INAUDIBLE] here.

And yeah, it speaks about the first step being the reversal of roles between staff and ICANN constituency organizations. I wasn't absolutely certain in my reading that I understood the full extent of that, but that basically, it talks about creation of win-win situations.

I'm not [INAUDIBLE]. And then making DNS the focus. [INAUDIBLE] situations are good. I'm just not sure how that gets it to you. And then making DNS the focus of more of the work. Any other comments on that? Okay, I'll keep walking through it. And then there's the section on direction resources. Okay, yes, Jeff, before I go on, please.

JULF NEWMAN: Yeah, thanks. This is Jeff Newman, for the record. Yeah, the comments I want to make, so the registries have been in a dialogue with ICANN staff on particularly this question here, about improving accountability on things that ICANN staff has been doing, which we don't necessarily view comport with the bylaws.

The registries have been discussing this for a while with ICANN staff, but because of the fact that it did not want to implicate individual people, it doesn't want to necessarily make the specific examples known in a public letter at this point, or a public statement.

But needless to say, we're trying to work on a way to submit our concerns, especially on this one, where we find that staff is really

substituting its own judgement or pushing its own agenda out to the community, and then just asking the community to ratify its thoughts.

And there have been several situations, like certain technical—from a technical side, certain technical solutions that ICANN has wanted to push, when it hasn't necessarily been through the proper community channels. In other words, it's trying to take advantage of specific situations where certain things have not gone through full community input, and add those to things like consensus policy, and just saying well, they're implementing the consensus policy.

And I know this sounds pretty vague, but again, we're still in discussions with ICANN staff on this, and frankly, the registries are a little upset at the fact that staff sent these questions back to Work Stream 1, or sorry, Work Stream 2, to us, to this group, when it knows that this dispute has been ongoing, and I think it's kind of bad faith on their part to send us these questions when they know that we've been having these precise discussions.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Jeff. And thank you for the background on the question. It does help me to understand. One thing I'd like to point out, and I appreciate the way you're trying to speak of this. I think one thing, in terms of getting more specific, is while that may tell the registries something about specific people that you're talking about, the rest of us would probably not be so informed.

It's not like we all know what all staff members do. In fact, that is one of the difficult things sometimes to figure out who's responsible for

something if you don't already know. So, I'm not sure that you getting more specific in your descriptions would be announcing to the world that person X was problematic in their decision making.

So, I think that generality will work, and I think it was important, since the question has been addressed to this group, and we do have an obligation to answer it, for everyone that's got detail, that's got real examples, real concerns, real experience with this, to actually find a way to convey it now.

Because if we go beyond this point in WS2, where we're talking about staff accountability and we don't deal with an issue, then later it may be more difficult to bring it up as a new issue, when everyone knows that it existed before. I see two hands. Jeff, is your hand a renewed hand?

JEFF NEWMAN: Yes, thanks. This is Jeff Newman. Just a question. So, I know ICANN staff submitted this in response to us, but it seems very defensive by them. What are they going to do with these answers? We asked them a series of questions, and rather than answering those questions they came back and asked us questions.

How do I explain this in the best way to the registries? Because for the registries, they feel like this is incredibly defensive and actually, kind of improper for them to be sending us these questions. Because what it seems like is that until we answer these questions in a way that they find satisfactory, they're not going to participate in our work. Is that [INAUDIBLE]?

AVRI DORIA:

Okay, sorry. You're making more assumptions than I was ready to make, so I don't know. But you have a stronger knowledge of the background discussions than I do. I don't know if it's defensive. It may be just trying to understand [INAUDIBLE].

From one of the other questions, from question two, for example, you do find a little bit, perhaps, of uncertainty that exists in the staff about whey we're asking these questions, and how we would react to their participation. And I think their participation is indeed—their participation in this group when we're talking about staff accountability, is important.

Their decisions, whether singly or collectively or mutually, to not participate, is indeed worrisome and such. So, I'd love to hear what people have to say about that. Klaus, I see your hand.

KLAUS STOLL:

Thank you, Avri. Jeff, first of all, thank you very much for what you said. Because this is now cross-community. Basically, we have [INAUDIBLE] periods, as you have on other levels, at least on the operational concerns side. And everything I've written there is something which has been documented and which has been given in writing and in discussions to staff.

There's nothing new there. We only experience ICANN [INAUDIBLE] as the answer to the question is. And last time, I simply put these points into staff, basically it was ignored and there was no answer

forthcoming. And when I pressed the point about these things, basically staff said that it was offensive that these points are even made, which really basically proves the point I'm trying to make that we have a reversal of roles.

And I think the major point and the major outcome of this working group, to be a little bit provocative, is that we have to work and find ways how to stop that process and trying to get back to how things should be, and not trying to document the wrong status. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. I see no other hands. We're a little bit over—

GREG SHATAN: I just think that—this is Greg.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, go ahead, Greg. Yeah, please go ahead.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: And George here after Greg.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you.

GREG SHATAN:	Thanks. This is Greg Shatan, for the record. Just in listening to the conversation, especially as Jeff Newman brought up, registries. A delicate attempt to balance concerns about private versus public conversation and the staff's defensiveness or perceived defensiveness, politically correct.

This in itself, the thought conversation over the last 15 minutes, shows some of the difficulties of staff accountability. And I don't know if there's a way to in essence work these issues, [INAUDIBLE] there, into our written report. The conundrum of having to choose between a quiet, bilateral attempt to seek a solution, or to use a more public multi-stakeholder method of accountability that may actually result in a more messy and protracted attempt to gain a result.

It seems to be a very unfortunate choice to have to make in an organization that is attempting to elevate both accountability and transparency. The lesson seems to be that you can't be transparent and hold someone accountable if you actually want to get results to advance your business purposes or your technical purpose.

You kind of almost have to choose between accountability and transparency, and pragmatism, to get a result. And that kind of is a huge problem for multi-stakeholder processes and for transparency and accountability. So, I think there's kind of an underlying staff accountability problem right here, that we find ourselves in, and somehow, we need to find a way to—as uncomfortable as it may be, express that.

And I think that the way to move things forward, it may be uncomfortable. Of course, anybody's who's being held accountable will be somewhat defensive and uncomfortable. As the leader of a constituency, president of the IPC, I sometimes am a little uncomfortable in the conversations in the SO/AC accountability group, but I'm willing to take lumps to the extent that is part of the larger accountability/transparency multi-stakeholder process we're all in.

And everyone needs to be willing to take their lumps and also to not let the divider to actually be an accountable/transparent organization get in the way of being an organization that works for accomplishing technical and business and social objectives. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Greg. I have George next, and then we have Jeff with a hand up. So please, George, go ahead.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thanks, Avri. I'm speaking in the role of board liaison to this group. And it sounds to me like there's less discussion going on than two groups at a distance from each other sort of lobbing rocks across a large barrier. And that's unfortunate, and we should not take that as a status quo.

I would like to find out from the staff side what's going on here. I happen to be in the Los Angeles, at a board workshop, at the present time. And there's obviously some reason why you're feeling that this is going on. I admit to not having read the documents.

So, I'm not sure. I don't feel I'm standing on solid ground. But there must be a story on the other side, and it seems to me that the way in which this is progressing, that's not going to come out because of, I don't know, reluctance to engage in, frankly, communication. I don't know. But let me see what I can do to understand what's going on in the next few days. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, George. I have Jeff and then Klaus.

JEFF NEWMAN: Yeah, thanks, Avri. This is Jeff Newman again, for the record. I am looking for it, in Hyderabad there was one open discussion between the board and the contracted parties. And there is a transcript from that in which some of the concerns were expressed.

And we did say we would submit a letter to the board, which I will say that one was submitted to the ICANN staff and the board. But at this point, the registries, because it implicated specific people, the registries have asked for that letter to stay confidential between the registries and the board and the staff.

So, I will provide a link in the next couple minutes when I find it, from Hyderabad, about the contracted parties meeting where some of these concerns were voiced. Again, this is why we thought this question was a little insulting, in some respect, because we had pointed out examples, and it's almost like they wanted to take these discussions and force them into the public, which kind of didn't make sense.

Because again, we didn't want to implicate specific staff members and cause kind of a he-said/she-said type of thing about specific people. So, thanks. George, I'll post this link. And George, [INAUDIBLE] the registries. If you ask Cyrus, you will get some more background on those issues. Thanks.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Jeff. Klaus?

KLAUS STOLL: Thank you very much. George, I really appreciate that you want to dive into that issue and talk to staff, but I really would appreciate if you talk to me or other people, who have the full history and can actually point you in a more specific direction.

Because these are things which are going literally for years and years and years. And before you talk to staff and before you make your inquiries, we invite you to get a little more of the background information and then take the action you think is worthwhile. Because I know, as stupid as it sounds, I know exactly the answers you will be given, because I've received the same.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thanks.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Philip?

PHILIP CORWIN: Yeah, good morning. Philip Corwin, for the record. Can you hear me?

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Yes.

PHILIP CORWIN: Okay. I just wanted to ask because I had mute on. A couple of comments here, now that I've had enough coffee to participate meaningfully in this discussion. Now that I'm aware that these are questions coming back to us from ICANN staff, I guess putting them in their best light, one might view them as an attempt for the staff to gain better understanding of the concerns of community members, though I'm not aware of the specifics of the situation Jeff Newman is referencing, and I see no reason to think that his concerns are not valid.

So far as being—community members being afraid to raise issues in a transparent way within the full community when they have concerns about staff actions or practices, I personally haven't had that problem, but I'm not representing a contracted party, a registry or registrar, within ICANN.

So, I don't have to worry about the possible blowback in my contractual agreement with the organization. I can say, and over the years, I've

certainly gotten feedback from people with contracted parties who are very concerned about raising any public criticism of the organization for fear of impact it might have on the prospects of your company in future contract negotiations.

On question four, from them, let me get down here, the part about the enhancements of the reconsideration IRP process, I don't know that we can yet know whether they're sufficient to address any valid concerns because they haven't been exercised yet.

The only way to find out if they represent a significant enhancement over the prior IRP and reconsideration options is to actually test them. And finally, I would like listed under the answer to question one, a very clear example. And I'll—there's a representative of a constituency, which does not hold the same position.

But a very concrete example is that in 2016, the business constituency and the non-commercial stakeholder group filed a joint request for reconsideration over what they believed was improper actions by global domain division staff in pushing registries to accept a URS in their revised renewal agreements, while that is an issue being considered as to whether it should be consensus policy by the RPM review working group.

So, I know there's other views on whether that was proper for staff to do. The IPC has another view. But it asks for—the question asks for what are concrete examples of concerns that the community has, and that's a documented concern that a considerable part of the non-contracted party has took in an official reconsideration request.

So, I feel that it should at least be listed as something. And the situation is ongoing. There were just comments filed yesterday on the .mobi renewal agreement. I'm not going to get into the specifics, but there's still concern within parts of the community about that practice. And I'll stop there. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

PHILIP CORWIN: Oh, I wanted to add one thing in terms of personal experience. I'm not going to name the staff person, because the staff person is still employed in a senior position with ICANN.

But I found that back in late 2013 or early 2014, after I published an article that was critical of the way that [INAUDIBLE] and the board had laid the groundwork during that [INAUDIBLE] conference by adopting a board resolution in secret, that this particular senior staff person made it very clear to me in ICANN meetings that I was persona non-grata so far as this staff person was concerned.

Again, it didn't concern me in that I didn't have to deal with this person, and the person was not in a position to do any significant harm to the organizations I represent within ICANN. But again, if I was a contracted party, I'd be in a very different situation. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. Thanks, Jeff, for a quick summary. We've got 13 minutes left on this one. And I want to get through this and touch on the other documents before we end the meeting. It seems like there are many bilateral instances—I'm echoing.

Okay. Now it's still echo. I'll try to go on. So, basically, I'd like to invite, encourage all of you that do have things to say to get them into the document. I think it is an important thing for us to be noticing that many people think that the problems they are having is unique, and I certainly, in terms of subject matter, they do appear to be unique.

But in terms of relationship, they may not be so unique. So, using this opportunity to try and get to the commonality of some of these bilateral issues, given our multi-stakeholder methods, it's good to get them stated at this point. George, I said I'd come back to you because I had heard you trying to come in with a comment. So please, George, before I move on.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Yeah, thank you. I think what you're doing, what you're saying, is absolutely right. It's very hard to argue specifically on the basis of feelings, on the basis of isolated incidents that can't really be described well enough because there are people's feelings involved.

This is my own personal feeling. I don't speak for the board here. But my sense is that the more detail you can come up with, the more likely you are to be able to resolve issues like this. And also, decide whether—if you're looking at a specific instance, such as this presumed retaliation that Jeff alluded to—I'm sorry, Phil alluded to.

The question is, is that one instance or is that a reflection of a very general and pervasive feeling or attitude on the part of staff? And I don't think you get to be able to answer those unless you go to specifics in an appropriate venue. And I would agree that making—opening this up with specifics to the entire community is likely to result in some kind of a food fight.

You may not want to do that, but you shouldn't avoid talking about specifics as examples in the working group, in a confined space where you can really drill down and figure out what's going on. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, George. Okay, I want to quickly just go through the other questions here. Phil, is that an old hand? Sorry, I wasn't going to say old hand anymore. Thank you. Okay, so there's further content, although we've touched on much of it in this discussion.

So, I'd encourage people to read question [INAUDIBLE]. Just to make sure that we've mentioned the other questions. Question two has to do with participation in this group by the community and statements that at least I had made, perhaps others, at other times have made about there being a nervousness on staff about speaking out.

And I think that sometimes the concerns we have about what happens if we speak publicly. It both goes for the staff and perhaps, even to a greater extent, because they have jobs that depend on it. And all I could say is, as the person that's been making this, and this is a personal point here, that many have spoken to me but they've all done it in utmost secrecy.

And I've even been asked not to mention, at times, what the specific subject was. Because if the subject was mentioned then the person would be known by someone in staff and that that could be problematic. Now the staff also asked if it was because you were afraid of the perceptions on how the organization will respond or how the community will respond.

And I must admit that at least one person that talked to me said that their concern was on how they could speak to the community without perhaps it being taken badly. So, the answer to question two is yeah, on both sides. And I do want to see people comment on these.

Question three had to do with expectations that respect behavior, and there's a set of questions. So, what is the expectation of the community on this? And then we have question four, which Philip already introduced a little, which was "Do you think there should be areas where people in ICANN organizations should be directly accountable to the community?"

Now if you look at document A, we're answering that sort of at a halfway point of saying input, but not directly accountable, not reporting to, as it were. But there's a lot of nuance in that gradation that we haven't talked through. And one of the things I don't understand in these questions is if we do the role reversal that we speak of, I'm not sure that that's the right [INAUDIBLE], but it may be.

How does that affect this direct accountability issue? And how does that—so those are questions that I have about the questions. I really

appreciate the discussion we had on it. I think we could go further on it at this point, except for time.

So, I do ask people, following the method we've tried to pick in this group of doing as much work in the document as possible, to please, over the next two weeks, really spend some time with this document as well as the others, getting your viewpoints in.

And my last comment to George is I don't think we're throwing rocks over the wall at each other, as you said. Rocks are far more aggressive than I think this is, and I don't think it's gotten to that level at all. I tend to see this as throwing bundles of dirty laundry over the wall at each other and saying "You take care of it." "No, you take care of it." "This is your dirty laundry." "No, this is your dirty laundry." And such. More than a rock throwing.

So, I don't want to raise the level of interaction to it being quite that malicious yet. Just that's a personal view, but I wanted to put that in. Okay, stop in this. We have five minutes left. I just want to cover the other two documents. Yes, maybe I can sit there—okay, so I have been very bad about doing this.

I should probably get them quickly read, although they will be in the record and I think that they have been captured. I don't know whether it's Brenda or Karen that's capturing them, but thank you. So yes, those answers are done. On document B, document B, we sent a set of questions.

We got back a set of answers. Not just questions, we got back a set of answers. But in the answers, they referred very frequently to

EN

documentation that wasn't available to us yet. So, in starting up the report for B, I have taken—and I think Klaus has also contributed.

I'm losing track of how many things he's contributed to, because he's contributed to so many. Is taking what information we could get out of their response. I've also been spending some time wandering about the website, the public parts of it, to see what clues I could find in reports and things on—writings on what they key indicators are, etcetera.

So, I have tried to pick that up, but that reports needs a lot of fleshing. It needs a lot of fleshing based on the further request we made to the board of "Can we see these documents that are the code of ethics, that are the training materials?" etcetera, so that we have a better idea and can describe things better.

So, we're still waiting on further information. But because we have an obligation to deliver, doing our best at trying to answer the questions from the things we can glean on it, and such. Okay. So, that's where we're at on that. So, I ask anybody to please also—document A and the questions, I think, are the most critical.

But we are also slipping on the schedule for B. And so, I'd ask any of you that have any knowledge, or that have any access to information, even if you're just generalizing it and not quoting it, please start adding content to this so that we can start to build up, as we continue to wait for the responses which have been assured will come very soon, possibly by the end of this week.

So, I remain confident and hopeful of getting a response, and hopefully getting a response that includes the documentation or access to the

documentation. Okay. On the schedule, and I don't know if we have it put up, but basically, at this call, we were supposed to test agreed changes to draft document B.

We're not there yet. We have not done that yet. We did not have dealing with these comments in our original schedule. So—I mean the questions from staff in the original schedule. So, that's something we need to add to it. We had also planned to finalize document A to hand off to the next plenary.

We're not doing that today. We obviously didn't do that today. So, that has moved to the 16th, when we were supposed to finalize B, which we won't be doing at that meeting. So basically, we have slipped on our schedule. Jordan and I need to get together, and we haven't yet.

I wanted to see where we were on this meeting, also on recalibrating our schedule. I just wanted to get that said that there's been a fairly insistent request from staff on when we will make and end of it and when we will deliver our documents on time.

And I wasn't sure whether they were talking about final documents or intermediate documents, I wanted to have this meeting before I'd be able to answer. Jordan and I need to recalibrate. We've hit the hour. I don't know if anybody else has a last comment to make.

I did monopolize these last five minutes, or even these last 10 minutes. Okay. Then I thank everybody for being here. I'm really quite grateful that we've got into a substantive discussion. I think that's one of the things we haven't had enough of in this group yet.

So, I think this is really good. And please, please, please spend some time on the documents, either using the PDFs that have been sent out to send in comments, or preferably go into the document and just change it and make comments. Any other business? I didn't ask. Does anybody have anything else to say? Okay. Thank you, and thanks for the extra minute. I think we can end this call.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, Avri.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thanks, Avri.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]