
JORDAN CARTER:

That was very prompt. Hi, everyone. My name is Jordan Carter, .nz. I'm one of the CCNSO reps on the CCWG, if that's not an acronym mouthful. It's Wednesday, 27th of October at [05:00] UTC. This is the Staff Accountability Subgroup Meeting of the CCWG meeting #4. Welcome, everyone, to the call. We've got a few agenda items to quickly run through, and I'm chairing this call for Avri because it's 1:00 a.m. where she is and it isn't that early where I am.

Does anyone have any updates to the Statements of Interest to make? If you've had a change to your interests, you just need to forward those details to the staff by e-mailing Accountability staff or MSSIsecretariat@icann.

There's an action item follow up to the previous meeting, which is the next item on the agenda. Oh, sorry, I skipped the agenda review. I'll go back to that. Are there any other items to deal with in this meeting? Silence or crickets. If you do think of any other items you'd like to cover, we'll have the chance to come back to those in the Any Other Business section of the discussion.

If we move on to the third item, which is action items to the previous meeting, we replied to Göran's e-mail to us, which was basically a "Thanks for e-mailing me" e-mail, and it'd be good to discuss some of these items, and we've provided both clarity about what the group is looking for.

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.

We haven't had a reply from Göran to that reply, but it is, I think, confirmed that Göran will be attending a CCWG for an hour during its meeting on the 2nd of November.

So that's it on the action points. Avri, you've got your hand up. Please go ahead.

AVRI DORIA:

Yes. I just want to point out that since you and I were specifically copied on the message he sent to the three co-Chairs of CCWG, I'm taking that as kind of an answer that he'll talk to us all then. And he does mention in that note, he does make some reference to the subjects we brought up. So I think, as you said in an offline conversation, we can try having the conversation we wanted to have with him in that context and ask the questions there. So I'd say we kind of did get an answer from him, even if it wasn't a direct answer to our mail. Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER:

Exactly, that's a good point I hadn't raised myself, and [carefully] I'd have to actually look at the people who that e-mail was sent to, so that sounds fair enough. I think then the outcome of that is that we'll have the discussion in Hyderabad, and at the end of that, any need for follow up, we can grab him and see if we can get him to agree to join the smaller group on the call post-Hyderabad.

The only other action item I think that was done since the previous meeting was the preparation of the snapshot Hyderabad report, which

is our next item, and I think Avri pulled most of that together, so thank you, Avri.

That is our next item, and the snapshot report was provided. I think it's about to appear on the screen before you. Avri drafted it, I had a few cuts. I think other people added some certain questions and suggestions as well to it. Avri, you put this on the agenda. Do you want to—what are you looking for? You want to take us briefly through that paper?

AVRI DORIA:

Yes. I just wanted to make sure that people had looked at it. Basically, it was just a snapshot. I guess by the criteria that the staff has set up for completion, we would probably be—and Bernie, you can correct me—at a 20% mark with this report.

So basically, a quick executive summary talking about it being a snapshot, talking about the brief review we had, then just basically describing our issue in terms of the WS1 report. Current state, we're just at a point of having collected questions. Still early stages in gathering info, indicating that we're on the Copenhagen time frame, indicating that we have dependencies of notice with at least three groups.

There is the Ombudsman Group, because the Ombudsman has a specific charge to look at relating in terms of, does the Ombudsman have any duties or responsibilities or purview with regard to staff issues? So that's an open question in Ombudsman, and of course, it affects us.

There's the Transparency Group, which is the only group that has its draft out for Hyderabad. There are staff recommendations, and it has issues regarding the whole whistleblowing procedures, and it has recommendations in there which may or may not affect the work we're doing.

And then I put a last quote in diversity, because attending the last Diversity Group, there was at least a question on – in terms of doing reporting on the diversity of ICANN and its components, whether there was any measure of staff diversity. And that was just posed as a question, and so I included the reference here. I'm not really sure that there's any work to be done in that area, but probably something to just track, since we did get mentioned in that group.

Then basically there's the staff dependencies, which is a conversation with Göran that we've already talked about in terms of two questions. It was just basically an inclusion of the questions that are in the question stock, which we'll get to in the next item specifically and an indication that we're still waiting to learn what actions have been taken, if any, with regard to the reports of staff activities raised in Dot Registry.

And then just some information. I just wanted to make sure that people had seen it, because it got very little review. It was out there for a couple of days, it did get some comments, but it was not heavily reviewed, so I just wanted to make sure that people knew that that's the status we're going into Hyderabad with, unless we decide to update it after this meeting. Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Avri, and that's a good summary. I don't have any questions about it. Pam, do you have any questions or issues about the report?

PAM LITTLE: No. I did follow the e-mail threads and had a quick look, or a look at the report Avri kindly prepared and submitted. Thank you, Avri.

JORDAN CARTER: Cool, thanks. And, yes, thank you, Avri, for pulling that together in the template that was given to us. Let's move on to the questions then if there's nothing else. What we had done to this was a group discussion and review of the documents and what the next steps were and how do we get the questions' answers.

From my point of view, the next steps are to seek to get the questions answered. My thought on this is to what to do. The doc's been around a while, it's built out of our discussion, and I think we should formally communicate it to the staff team who's working on the Accountability Working Group and talking in the co-Chairs and just saying our request is that these questions be put to the various parts of ICANN who can answer them for a response, and that we'd appreciate meaningful responses in a meaningful time frame, which, by my likes would be something like the end of November.

I'm giving it about a month or a couple of weeks after the ICANN meeting, and the reason for that is that most of the answers don't fit with the Meetings Team or with the people who are necessarily going to be fully engaged in an ICANN meeting. And they are quite distributed

between HR and corporate functions and so on. If it takes until the middle of December or something, that would be fine, but I think we should ask for a reasonable timeframe and see what we get back.

That's my thoughts on the process for these anyhow. Avri, go ahead.

AVRI DORIA:

I just wanted to point out also that in the printout I did, I neglected to accept all of the suggestions which I thought I had. So there are actually a few more questions in the online version which I just put the URL in so anyone could look at it. They're not actually showing up on this.

One of the few defects I found in Drive is that when you do a PDF drop, it only includes what's been accepted. And what I had gotten into doing was accepting and then putting slight shading on the stuff I had accepted that hadn't been much discussed yet.

But there was four points there that didn't – and I'm going to put those in the chat just so they can be seen but didn't get picked up because I hadn't done the [accept]. So I've just pasted those into the chat, but anyone can just go look at the document in the Drive.

I just wanted to say that, but I also wanted to ask, in terms of getting the formal and asking the question formally, so you're saying that in the first day as part of the CCWG meeting we make the formal request to the Chairs to the group? I haven't been quite clear, because the questions have been sitting there. They had sort of been that "Let's hope that staff support knowing that the questions were there might have given us a clue on answers on where to find answers," but that not

being the role they've taken, I wasn't quite sure how to take the next step.

I've done a little bit of looking for some of this stuff on my own, but I haven't found it, and so I just wanted to make sure that we had a surefire way of getting the asking of these questions formalized, and so far, I don't know what that is.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Avri. That's a good question. Bernie or Yvette, I wonder if you have a view that you could share about the answer to Avri's question. Just while you're having a think about whether you can talk to that, I'll say that I don't think we need to put this to a full CCWG meeting.

I think the issue of staff accountability is one that's totally tied up with an organization's internal processes, so that's largely why we need to ask the questions of the staff, and why the only way to get answers is by the organization answering.

So I don't think it's a matter of CCWG having to formally approve these questions as a whole so much as us just formally asking the staff for answers to them, and then if the staff make a different process for this to happen, they can tell us. But if Bernie or Yvette, you've got a different view, please share it. Bernie, go ahead.

AVRI DORIA:

Bernie's hand is up.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Jordan. I'm uncertain. I'm not a staff person and I don't deal in that universe, but if it's a question to staff, the highest-ranking staff member is the CEO, so you might communicate these questions to the CEO as part of your process to see what the answers come back as.

That's one choice, but we can also ask around internally where it might be best to ask for getting answers to these questions, and we can get back to you.

JORDAN CARTER: Yes. My own instinct or preference is that the second of those would be good, because we don't want to take them on by surprise, and as far as I'm concerned, we don't want to push things high up the food chain than we need to. So if this is seen internally as kind of a basic, reasonable research task that staff attached to CCWG can do in a week or two, that would seem ideal.

If they have to make some requests of other parts of the organization, e.g. the HR team, that would be perfectly understandable as well. But if these were seen as a political problem and threatening and difficult, then that would be good to know that so that we can take it to the right level in the organization. That's my thoughts, anyway, and Avri—

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I think probably—sorry.

AVRI DORIA: Go ahead, Bernie. No, go ahead, Bernie, I'll wait to hear what you've said.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I was just trying to respond. Probably the best thing is once you get a final, solid version of that, send it to CCWG staff with the request that we ask internally where would be best to pose these questions. And I guess we'll use that request to shop that around internally and be able to talk to people about it in Hyderabad to try and get an answer for you. How does that sound?

JORDAN CARTER: Sounds reasonable to me, but Avri, go ahead.

AVRI DORIA: That sounds like an approach I don't know that we need to do that much more work on. Maybe one more edit pass, but I think we've got the questions there. So I think that would be just a form of put them in a file and send to the staff asking the question. I think that's an excellent way. If we were presenting them to the CEO, I would do the same thing, so that makes sense. So thanks, and you have Pam next.

JORDAN CARTER: Yes, Pam, go ahead.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Jordan. I was just wondering whether Sam Eisner might be able to help out here, because I believe she is participating in this Work Stream, and looking at those questions, I would suspect or maybe expect Sam would actually have a lot of answers to those questions already.

JORDAN CARTER: That's a good suggestion, Pam. Bernie's got a hand up in response. Bernie, do you want to?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well, in these kinds of issues, Sam is one of the people we would run this by anyways to see where we would officially lodge such a request. So, yes, correct. But given the nature of the thing, I don't think we can assume it's Sam. But Sam would certainly be one of the people that would help us figure out where to lodge the question officially.

JORDAN CARTER: Great. Okay. Thanks, Bernie. And thanks, Pam and Avri. So, is the action coming out of this then perhaps that we do a final pass of the questions – which I think, to be honest, is accepting the tracked changes and [inaudible], Avri. And then we can fire it on to the staff as suggested by Bernie. I'm happy with that as our action point. Is that a new hand from you, Bernie? Or is that an old one?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Sorry. Old hand.

JORDAN CARTER: Old one. Avri, go ahead.

AVRI DORIA: A quick question from me. Okay, so doing an edit pass is good. Hopefully, Pam has read through them, so that at least we know that there's at least one other person that's done an edit pass to them. Would we want to include the note from Jordan that we have at the bottom there? I'm just questioning.

JORDAN CARTER: I don't think so.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. And then we probably want to edit the top that says it's a working draft and just do that. But ok, so who's doing that action item? Is that you, or me?

JORDAN CARTER: I don't mind. I'm happy to do it if you want me to.

AVRI DORIA: Fantastic.

JORDAN CARTER: I'm happy for you to do it.

AVRI DORIA: You've kind of had this document mostly, so, okay.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay. So I'll reformulate the top, I'll get rid of the working draft and comments. I'll make a copy of this document and do that, and there's an action for Jordan, okay. What else then? We can close that item off then, and thanks for that discussion.

In terms of the next steps for our work plan drafted for Document 1 and Document 2, I think what we need to do is talk to people who are participants in this, and to really make the point at the CCWG meeting that following on from getting the information out of ICANN, there will be a bit of document writing to do.

And the rapporteurs sign up to help the group function, not to be the authors of everything, so we need some volunteers to help do the writing. But other than that, I think we need answers to the questions before we can go a lot further on substantive work. At least, that's my impression at this point. Avri, go ahead.

AVRI DORIA: Yes, I tend to agree with you, but I also think, being realistic, if we want to get the work done, you'll need to participate on one and I'll need to participate on one. And even if we're not the main pen holder – which I hope we're not – we should probably expect to participate in them. I also wanted to point out that Klaus had added some comment in about the definitions of the three groups.

I'm not sure that that's that onerous a task, but it's probably worth doing in that first document. So I think you're right. I think we should go buttonhole some people and get a volunteer. Since Pam is the only one we've got at the moment who would ask, certainly want to ask her if she wants to help on one of them. But try and get more of the people involved into it. But I do think that we should be attached to Doc 1 and Doc 2. And I'm... Yes?

JORDAN CARTER:

I was going to say I completely agree. I wasn't trying to shy away from that more, so just to say that I'm not prepared to take sole responsibility for any of them.

AVRI DORIA:

Me either, except at the last minute when it's not getting done. But yes, I'm happy to play with Doc 1 if you want Doc 2. But I'm happy to go the other way around, too. The only reason I put myself in the Doc 1 one is it's something I've been thinking about for a bit ever since I heard Göran talk on his views of ICANN. And I expect we will see a presentation from Göran in Hyderabad somewhere. Not in our meeting, but somewhere that goes into his view of the ICANN world and the bubbles within it. And we can build off of that document as sort of the touchstone as we work through it, I think, or that presentation he makes.

So I don't know if that makes sense to you. Then if we each volunteer for one of the two, then we're each kind of putting ourselves up for trying to recruit people into that document.

JORDAN CARTER: Yep. I'm happy to take that approach. I don't mind which one I do. And if you've been thinking about it, you're privy to more information because you do more ICANN stuff than I do. So I'm happy to fill in with that. Have either of those that you'd like to work on in preference to the other, or neither?

AVRI DORIA: I see Pam's hand.

PAM LITTLE: Yes. I would be happy to assist either one or both of them, providing I'm able to have the capacity to do so. But, I would try. But I just want to make a general comment about participation, and I went elsewhere about participation fatigue or volunteer fatigue. I suspect this topic will come up at Hyderabad, because it's not just this working stream or working group, other groups seem to be suffering as well.

And I also saw some exchange between Dr. Steve Crocker and the CCWG co-Chair about the conflict between the AoC Review 3 and some of these work streams or the scope. So I was just wondering whether you two as rapporteurs of this group would have some insight as to whether there's going to be some change to those current working streams or a kind of amalgamation or separation or whatever will emerge with the AoC-3 Review. So it seems to be a bit murky or unclear to me at this point. Do you have more clarity or insight into how things will pan out or change? Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER: Avri is our resident expert in the CCWG on these processes, so go head, Avri.

AVRI DORIA: As far as I know, I've heard nothing about merging the sub-threads, the subgroups. And Bernie – who has obviously been on all those leadership calls – can correct me if I'm wrong, but I have not heard of any of that.

In terms of ATRT3, what I understand that the proposal was – and I think that's the current proposal – is that ATRT3 would be more of a level setting, and basically taking the recommendations that were made in ATRT2 and doing analysis of what got done and what didn't get done on them leaving this work proceeding. So basically, dealing with that comp, I think, things that were put in the WS2 subgroups stay in them, whereas ATRT3 focuses mostly on the analysis of the ATRT Implementation Results.

But I see Bernie's hand is up, so maybe he can flesh that out or correct it if need be. Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER: Bernie, go ahead.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well, Avri, you stole my thunder. That's about all I had to say. No, I'm in complete agreement.

PAM LITTLE: Okay. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay. Are you happy with that, Pam?

PAM LITTLE: Sorry, Bernie.

JORDAN CARTER: Did that clear that up?

PAM LITTLE: Yes, it is. But, I do have another follow-up question. It's not clear to me, are we going to have a subgroup meeting in Hyderabad or not?

AVRI DORIA: Not specifically, as far as I know.

JORDAN CARTER: We haven't scheduled one.

AVRI DORIA: We'll be meeting as part of that whole day thing. I haven't seen any breakouts. Bernie?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, that's correct. We discussed this several times, and there are no facilities for breakouts. But if it happens that people want to huddle during the week and they can get enough people together, that's fine. But there's just no possibility for subgroup meetings in Hyderabad.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER: The other point I'd make is that the whole point of the ICANN meetings is for the community to get together and exchange views about the whole program of work. So I wouldn't be too keen on trying to get the subgroups together face-to-face during the meeting per se. Avri, you might have a different view on that one.

AVRI DORIA: The only thing I was going to add is if there's a bunch of us there that are interested, that, for example, we can get lined up for working on these docs, sitting together at lunch at some point or something may make sense, but in a very ad hoc nature.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Avri. I'm open to that idea as well. It is just I thought it might overcome to some extent this participation fatigue or volunteer fatigue, because we seem to kind of not know each other well or haven't

worked with each other. Some members to this group are fairly new, so we have an opportunity to all sit down together, at least put a name to a face or vice versa might help us gel better as a group.

JORDAN CARTER: Yes. It might. And one way to do that might be to just get us all to sit together in the room for the CCWG Meeting.

PAM LITTLE: Sure. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: That might be possible. That might be hard. But one thing that could be interesting when we're talking about this – and this hasn't been mentioned in the planning meetings or the leadership meeting at all – is when we get to the work tracks just to have everybody who's in the room that happens to be working on one of the work tracks to put their hand up, or to stand up so we can all see each other at the very least might be a quick step. I don't know if that makes sense, but it just occurred to while you were speaking.

JORDAN CARTER: That makes lots of sense, it's a very good idea.

AVRI DORIA: Bernie's hand is up.

JORDAN CARTER: And, hopefully, one of the seven of us on the line will remember to ask that question at the co-Chair [inaudible] spontaneously. Bernie, your hand is up.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, thank you. From the leadership meeting, it has come out from the various discussions with the other rapporteurs that once a group actually publishes a first draft with some potential answers to questions and potential recommendations, everything seems to start ramping up a lot. We've noticed this in several other groups where it was difficult to get people to participate. And once a document actually hits people's inbox with answers to questions and recommendations, then all of a sudden, it seems to turn the engine over. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER: That makes sense. Once people start to grab on when there's more to grab on to. And so it may be that starting to get some of those, in our case, maybe getting out the questions will help spur the kind of discussion that we need.

Okay. So I think that out of that discussion on the – it's really up to the drafters in terms of the work plan. We're going to dispatch the questions. Avri's going to be one of the people who helps with Doc 1. Jordan's going to be one of the people who helps in Doc 2, and Pam is happy to help on either or both, and we'll try and make a concerted effort to find out what's going to happen with the questions and to get

some more people lined up to help with drafting [inaudible] in Hyderabad.

And we'll make an ask for the co-Chairs to get people to identify which subgroups they're following most closely so we can at least know what each other look like face-to-face. Bernie, your hand is up.

AVRI DORIA: And I think between you and I, we can try to recruit chief editors for each document while we're there.

JORDAN CARTER: We can do some voluntold there, Avri

AVRI DORIA: I'll try to recruit for Doc 1, and you can try to recruit for Doc 2. But we can find somebody.

JORDAN CARTER: Cool. Okay. Thanks. The next item on the agenda is Any Other Business. Is there any other business?

AVRI DORIA: I don't have any.

PAM LITTLE: Nothing for me either.

JORDAN CARTER: Nothing for me. Anything from staff? No. Okay. I've [fixed] the questions you had on the lists, and I'll just jot a little note to the staff. Avri, as per the chat, you don't want to read that before I send it, do you?

AVRI DORIA: No need. But you can if you want. I'll probably be sleeping for at least the next five hours.

JORDAN CARTER: That makes sense. Yes, [inaudible] so I'll just get it off now before I leave here.

AVRI DORIA: Yes, exactly. I'm fine with whatever you put out there.

JORDAN CARTER: Great. Thank you, everyone.

AVRI DORIA: I appreciate that we went through it, even if there are few. And thank you, Pam, for making it be not just staff and the two co-rapporteurs. Very much appreciate that you stuck with it.

PAM LITTLE: No problem. No problem. See you all in Hyderabad, safe travels.

AVRI DORIA: Yes. Safe travels, everybody.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks. See you. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]