AVRI DORIA:     Thank you. Okay, so I guess I'll start. So, first I wanted to mention that— and I will get to the attendance in a second, but I'm doing this without my co-rapporteur, who happens to be on a plane at the moment. And we discussed it, and though I often loathe to do a call without my co-rapporteur, we decided that it was important to get ourselves reactivated at this point, post Hyderabad.

So, that's the reason why it's just me. I also have received apologies from George Sadowski, one of our two board liaisons, who can't make today's call. So, on the agenda review, and then we'll do the attendance and the SLI check, review the mandate, [INAUDIBLE].

So, just make sure that we're rooted in what we need to be rooted in. Review where we are, which includes assessing the outcomes from Hyderabad, both formal and informal, but that people may have. Discuss any recent changes and how they contribute to our tasks, and that would be recent staff modality changes more than anything.

And then status of our document requests. Also, a review then of what we need to get done and how we will get it done. Next bullet is schedule, and can we still meet the short track schedule? I get confused between schedule one and schedule two, and for a long time thought we were on the long schedule when it turns out we were actually on the short schedule, which was purely my confusion.

My co-rapporteur knew we were on the short schedule, and that's why I like to have him about, so when I get confused there's someone that actually knows what's going on. So, we need to talk about our schedule.

---

*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.*

And then any other business. I wonder if any other business, if anybody has any other business at this point. Okay, none?

Okay, so we'll go with the agenda as is, if nobody has any objections. I see no hands with objections, nor voices shouting out, so okay, we'll go with this agenda. In terms of attendance, as has become the norm, in diversity, we'll take it from the list.

I notice that we have two phone number only people. Does anybody in the staff know who the phone number only people are, or would they like to identify themselves? Who has the number that starts with 65 and ends with 97? And who has the number that starts with 70 and ends with 16? So, we can get a proper attendance taken. Aziz, that says please identify for the record, though they may not be able to read the check. Okay, so let's add 5316 as his number.

PHILIP CORWIN:    Yeah, this is Philip Corwin, and I put that in the [INAUDIBLE]

AVRI DORIA:    I don't know who the 6—

PHILIP CORWIN:    Hello?

AVRI DORIA:    I saw that. So, thank you, Phil.

PHILIP CORWIN:              Okay. Thank you.


AVRI DORIA:                 Hello, yes, I got that. Thank you. For the 6597, I still do not have a name. Also, I'd like to ask at this time if there's anybody else on the call that isn't being listed? So, do we have a 6597? Okay, thank you. I see Denise Michel is the 6597. Thank you.

So, both are identified. Thank you very much. Sorry to be so persistent on that. The next thing is I want to remind everyone about the statement of interest. I don't know if anyone has any updates on their statement of interest they'd like to tell us about.

I also see that we have a new participant, at least one, Greg, who apologizes for not having been here before. But I'm sure his statement of interest is quite well-prepared, so I'm not terribly concerned. So, welcome, Greg. No statement of interest updates? Okay.

In which case, we'll move on with the agenda. So, going to the next slide, the review of the mandate. And okay, thank you. Oh, did I make it? Yeah, okay. Thank you. So basically, it's just cut and paste from Annex 12, and I'll probably keep them in the slides as—in the future, just for reference.

"[INAUDIBLE] management and staff work for the benefit of the community, and in line with ICANN's purpose and mission. While it is obvious that they report to and are held accountable by the ICANN board and the president and CEO, the purpose of their accountability is

the same as that of the organization: complying with ICANN rules and processes, complying with applicable [INAUDIBLE], achieving certain level of performance as well as security, making their decisions for the benefit of the community and not in the interest of a particular stakeholder or set of stakeholders, or ICANN alone."

Can I have the next one, please? Yeah, and probably these could be set on sync so people could even move themselves. So, the first thing was to basically review and inventory existing mechanisms related to staff accountability.

"Areas for improvement include clarifying expectations from staff as well as establishing appropriate redress mechanisms. The CWG accountability recommends, as part of its work stream, to the CWG accountability work with ICANN to develop a document that clearly describes the role of ICANN staff vis-à-vis the ICANN board and the ICANN community. This document should include a general description of the powers vested in the ICANN staff by the ICANN board of directors that need and do not need approval of the ICANN board of directors."

[INAUDIBLE]

"The CWG accountability will work with ICANN to consider a code of conduct, transparency criteria, training, and key performance indicators to be followed by staff in relation to their interactions with all stakeholders, establishing regular, independent, internal and community surveys and audits to track progress and identify areas that need improvement and establish appropriate processes to escalate issues that enable both community and staff members to raise issues.

This work should be linked closely with the ombudsman enhancement item of Work Stream 2."

So, I'll stop for a minute and ask if anyone wants to comment on these, or whether they're fairly clear and defined to people in this group, a fairly clear set of goals that we have? Again, seeing no hands. Move on. Okay, so moving onto the next slide, and hopefully I will not be the only person to speak. So, review of where we are.

So, the first part of this was to collect existing documentation, collect records of existing processes and such. We have requested that. We requested it informally at the time that we were waiting for the issues report—not the issues report, the—what was the specific document called?

I guess it was an issues report for each of the workgroups, though it may have been called a different name. I've forgotten it at the moment. But we asked again after that. In Hyderabad, we finally understood that we needed to make that request more formally than we had, that just asking and saying we needed this was not sufficient, but we needed to make a specific request.

So, Jordan and I did make a specific request, and the status of that is still pending. So, that has been something, one of the two things that we were basically stalled on in terms of getting moving, since one of our first requirements is to review what's existing.

Now another thing we had talked about was trying to have a discussion with Yuron about staff issues. We wanted, at one point, in one sense, to

get his view of how we view the staff, since it was a new CEO with a new set of guiding principles for how he works with staff.

We wanted to get an idea of what those were so that would give us a better understanding. And we had an additional discussion with Yuron in Hyderabad that I think was quite good at giving us his view. And he has also repeated that in a blog and elsewhere.

So, I think that requirement we had in terms of who is Yuron as a president guiding a staff, and what are his general beliefs about staff accountability, staff interaction with community, etcetera. We also wanted to ask Yuron for assurances in terms of any staff members that may or may not wish to participate in this group.

One of the things that we had discussed early in the group was that to talk about staff accountability without staff members present seemed wrong somehow, or if not wrong, at least ineffective. But we also wanted to make sure.

And Yuron was really quite emphatic that, you know, he's never fired anyone for what they said or for their disagreements, and of course, if it was anyone that wished to participate, they could. At least that's what I understood. So, in that sense, I do believe that we got answers to the questions that we wanted to ask him.

Now another thing he talked about was the creation of the new complaints officer role, and that was discussed a lot at the meeting. And one of the things I wanted to put on the table is looking at that role, despite the fact that we don't really have documented how everything is done these days, the existence of that role.

I'm wondering to what extent that affects the work we're doing, affects the questions we have to ask and the processes, perhaps, that we want to recommend.

And so, I'm going to—once I finish this whole slide, I really would like to open up for discussion.

The other thing is, Jordan and I had discussions with Teresa about the issue, and recognizing the whole issue of there being a hierarchical chain of command within staff, and people have their managers report to them, or accountable to them, with that cascading upward.

But also, the issue of coming out with the community is that all of these people work with the community, they work with chairs of groups, they work with people working on groups, and the fact of we wanted to find some method of communicating sort of issues, problems, what have you, before things had to go through hierarchies, before things had to end up as complaints.

And so, we talked about that quite a bit, and while nothing firm ever got formed, basically started looking at how there could be more cooperation, how there could be more events where staff and community could sit together and discuss issues.

I guess the new CEO, being Swedish, as brought in a notion of FICA within the staff, which is an afternoon event with tea and cakes, and such, where people talk about issues, and just talk together in sort of an informal gathering setting. And so, it came up in the discussion with Teresa, whether such things could actually be held with community members.

And that was part of it. Jordan had a separate discussion with Teresa, and I'm not quite really sure. It was similar, from what I understand, but not necessarily identical. He and I are working on a writeup of these conversations, so we should have them.

Apologies for not having them sooner. So, I want to stop talking now, and basically get other people's impressions of Hyderabad, of where we are, of has anything changed given the discussion with Yuron, and basically the whole notion of finding [BLANK AUDIO].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:       Yeah, thanks, and thanks for the very thorough introduction to the meeting. Unfortunately, I wasn't able to participate in the Hyderabad meeting. I'm wondering if you or someone else could provide a little more insight on the status or timing of Yuron's indication that he wants to clearly identify or describe staff's role in ICANN? It seems to have strong intersections with this, this work. Was that discussed, the how and why and when we'll be doing that?

AVRI DORIA:       This, a piece of the phrase is to stop rushing the what rule.

DENISE MICHEL:       So Yuron, in a couple other meetings, Yuron commented that he saw a clear need to clarify and describe what staff's role is within ICANN, and that he was going to set about documenting that. Did that subject come up in this meeting, or your discussion with Yuron, and does anyone have a sense of what the timing is on that?

AVRI DORIA:            Okay, I think that we didn't get a timing on that, but I think that's part of the whole parcel of documenting such that we asked Teresa, and such, and then her staff, to help us dig up. I don't know if any of the staff members on this call might have a better answer.

We did not specifically ask him about when that would be delivered, at least I didn't, and I didn't hear anybody else do so. Karen, perhaps you can give us a little bit more background on that and other documentation that may come our way? Sorry for putting you on the spot, but if you can, as our point staff person, I would appreciate it.

Okay, Karen says she is on listening only, and the questions asked by the group are being worked on. So, I guess I don't have a better indication of when. And I will follow up to see if there's anything happening with Yuron's document on the staff roles. He spoke to it certain amounts, and I believe that it would be in the transcript, but he didn't—I don't remember him speaking specifically of a document.

DENISE MICHEL:         Thank you. Yeah, it would be useful to understand—

[CROSSTALK]

AVRI DORIA:            Okay, thank you. So yeah, we'll follow up on that, definitely. Because a major part of what we have to do depends on having this information,

understanding it, documenting it, and then seeing whether there is anything more that's needed.

Because it's quite possible, once everything is documented, we'll look at and say "Wow, that's fantastic. It covers everything, so we're done." I'm being fairly optimistic. But without getting ahold of it, it is difficult to know. Any other comments on any of this? Other people were at that Hyderabad meeting.

I was up in front, on the dais, and so probably have a very fractured view of the discussion, so I'm wondering if other people who were there could sort of give indications of, and perhaps amplification on what I said, especially since that one meeting is really the bulk of the information we've been able to get so far.

Karen has said that ICANN is in the middle of performance reviews, and that is causing a bit of delay in getting everything together. I can certainly understand that. Then again, all about performance reviews would be something interesting for this group to hear about, not what people's performance reviews are, but certainly how it is done and what sort of mechanisms, and what sort of criteria are used might be interesting information. Greg, yes, please.

GREG SHATAN:       Sorry again, for not being in this group earlier, because I actually think this is one of the most important groups in Work Stream 2, maybe not one of the most controversial, but one of the most important. And I do have an up-to-date SOI. But anyway, there was—the general message I

heard from Yuron, that he looks at the staff as being here to serve the community.

And I don't think he put a lot of specifics around that. It was a general sense of a kind of shift in tone from kind of body, building a bigger, more robust, more self-sufficient corporation, to building a better supported community. And I think it's something we need to get focused—we need to continue to focus on getting more meat on those bones. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA:              Okay, yes. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN:         And I see what Alan says here, it's definitely a midstream concept still.

AVRI DORIA:              I see the note from Alan, yeah. I was going to read it.

                            [CROSSTALK]

AVRI DORIA:              Somebody's echoing at me. So, performance reviews of people who are here to serve the volunteer community but with no input from the volunteer community is interesting. Now interesting that that gets mentioned.

That is one of the topics that I did bring up with Teresa in conversations, and referred back to other organizations I had worked with, whether it was volunteers and staff members, and where chairs and rapporteurs, and the like were indeed consulted during the—during review time. I don't know it's ever done at ICANN.

I seem to remember some earlier ages in ICANN where I was asked, as a chair of something, to give some appraisal, not that it was in any sense formal or a formalized part of the review, but that indeed that had happened. But my memory may be playing tricks on me.

But it certainly was a part of other organizations. I did not pick up an immediate willingness on that issue, but—nor did I pick up an absolute abhorrence of the concept. So, it is certainly the kind of thing that we could recommend if we found a consensus on that kind of issue, once we had seen the current criteria for reviews, etcetera.

Anyone else want to actually speak? Greg says it's a [INAUDIBLE] for this group to deal with. Greg says "If you call it a 360 review, it may go down more easily." I have to admit, I don't always understand the 360 review, and I'm not sure within the rotation of 360 for a staff member, which would be perhaps their reports, the people they reported to, and their peers, might be staff 360, where a community element of that would fit into the normal notion of 360. But be that as it may, Jeff has a separate issue with handouts. Please, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN:                    Sorry, Avri, you cut out. Were you calling on me?

AVRI DORIA:                          Yes, I'm calling on you. Sorry.

JEFF NEUMAN:                      Oh, okay. Yeah, so I would [INAUDIBLE] in Work Stream 1, and I didn't get that involved in Work Stream 1, but the one issue I did get involved in was this particular one, on staff accountability. And I have found yet another example of why I wanted this group to be constituted in the first place.

And it has to deal with areas where the community, or who ICANN's supposed to serve, can't get any answers or feels that there's a frustration that they just don't know who to go to in order to get things done. So, the example I have now, and again, it's very specific to registries, it is an example where the board passes a resolution 23 days ago, or more now, on releasing two character names, saying it was now fine to do.

It puts staff completely in charge of the implementation, and yet, registry still has been unable to get any response out of ICANN, or any kind of indication on how to move forward. Now it's only been a month. I'm sure it will stretch out into two months and then three months, and four months, and we'll still probably be talking in six months, which will bring the whole issue now to four years, I think, since the first request was made.

And I think registries feel like they're at a loss. They just don't know what to do. They have a board resolution. They want to release the two

characters. The person who's put in charge of it, in this case, is Cyrus and [INAUDIBLE], is completely non-responsive other than saying "Well, we'll get back to you," and then releasing a note.

The one thing they did release a note saying "Registry, you can't release anything until we tell you it's okay, and we're not ready to tell you it's okay." It just leaves the registries baffled, confused, frustrated, and feeling like they're helpless.

This is the type of accountability, one of the types of accountability, that's happened on a number of different occasions with different things, and I want it to be addressed in a group like this, when it was initially constituted. So again, I'm not looking for an answer here on "Yes, registry should be allowed to do it." It's just the type of frustration that registries feel like when they don't get an answer from staff that's put in charge of implementing something and how we get something done. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Yes, and I think it's good to have cases like that discussed, and of course you're right that there's no way we would solve that issue here, or even get into the specific question. But I definitely have heard of other instances of longstanding questions.

I would point out that when the GDD was formed, some people had indeed asked the question of "Given the formal separation of GDD, in a sense, how would the accountability between the community and GDD work?" And perhaps, this goes beyond just ICANN accountability, but

accountability with ICANN's legal subcomponents, and is that along the same terms? Is that along the same methods?

And so, that perhaps is another question that we need to explore. But certainly, the timeliness of responses. Now if I were to guess, we would possibly get an [INAUDIBLE] that a complaint officer would indeed be someone that could or would help in that.

But that's just me projecting on what a complaint officer might be able to help us with. Anyone else have any comments on this review of where we are? One of my problems with the review of where we are. If I keep [INAUDIBLE] at the beginning.

We've asked some questions. We've brought up some issues. And indeed, we're still waiting for our own answers on what exists, so that we can talk about it. Because I think many of us, the internal mechanisms of staff accountability are very much a black box.

And as such, we really need for a staff reveal of those mechanisms for us to be able to discuss them, for us to be able to look at them. And like the discussion that came up earlier, for us to say "A-ha. You do reviews on a six-monthly basis, or a yearly basis. What about checking in with A, B, C and D? How would that work?"

And so on and so forth. But without the information there, we're still very much stabbing in the dark, and that makes it very difficult. But we need to get going, because as you'll see on the schedule, we're on the short track. We're on the fast track for getting the work done, and it's obvious that at this point, since we're still sort of waiting just inside the gate, we may be delayed. But we'll get to that later.

So, any more discussion on review of where we are? As I said, Jordan and I will try to capture the work we have, the conversations we had with Teresa in a document. Since we had them separately, we're both going to sort of document what we had. I've sort of spoken about mine.

Jordan can speak about his when he can be on the call. And we'll put together a quick document that has both of our impressions following those conversations. But I'd really like to, before moving on, get anyone else's Hyderabad discuss—yes, Philip? Please.

PHILIP CORWIN:          Yes, and thank you. I wasn't able to attend that session in Hyderabad. Despite the length of the meeting, there were many conflicts during it where I can only be in one place at a time. Just generally, and in regard to GDD staff, an issue different from the one Jeff raised.

We all know that ICANN enforces consensus policy through its contracts with contracted parties, registries and registrars. There's also been some incidents where folks have thought, there's been divided opinion, that staff, GDD staff, by negotiating positions they were taking in closed-door meetings with a single contracted party were making— taking positions and making decisions that had policy implications.

I'd like to see this working group certainly not wade into any particular issue, but to look at a procedure by which GDD staff would be sensitized to the policy implications and would—there would be something before this process where we just see proposed new agreements when they're out for comment, which is after the negotiations, and where there'd be some procedure where they had to identify possible policy issues and

consult with the policies side of ICANN, including possibly the GNSO, and explore the appropriateness of a negotiating position before they took it and before a contract resulted.

Because by the time that happens, they tend to dig in and defend whatever's come out. So, I just wanted to identify that issue as one that I hope we'll touch on in the course of our discussions. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:      Okay, thank you. Thank you very much for that. And I see it's been noted in the notes. Would anyone else like to add to this review of where we are? I think it's very important for us to know where we're standing at the moment. If not, I'll move on to the next slide, which is our next steps.

And everybody's got freedom to move the slide. So, the next steps are the one that Jordan and I are working on, in terms of documenting the discussions held in Hyderabad, and I would invite any of the other members of this group who have had discussions on these issues with staff, perhaps in Hyderabad, perhaps elsewhere, who might have something to contribute to that, to just add it.

We will, once we have a draft of the document on Drive, we will do what we've done with all of our documents, which is open it to the whole group for comment and comment allows for people to insert text into the flow of the text. The text does need to be approved.

That's our guarantee against making it open to everybody and having somebody abuse it by writing foulness in the document. But by and

large, anything you all put in would be woven into the document. But just explaining the process. We need to then discuss the current procedures.

Once we get that documentation, and I'm hoping that it's quite soon, and we did ask for a fairly complete set, and I will need to check and see whether it does include the writeup that Denise mentioned on the role of staff from his viewpoint.

We'd need to basically discuss it. At that point, we will look at the gaps. We will look at the opportunities, etcetera. We need to review the whistle-blowing work that's been done in the transparency subgroup. I don't believe we need to do anything about it, but we should do a pass through it just to make sure we understand how it fits into the whole staff accountability equation.

Once the ombudsman work has gone a little further, we'll need to review the relations of staff to ombudsman based upon the work that's been done in that subgroup. And then we have to create our recommendations. Now one of the things that I'll probably get done in the next couple weeks, though I will be at IGF next week, is to build a skeleton outline of that document in Drive so that we at least have the out of what we need to fill in before us, so we're not working with a completely blank page.

Once that outline is built, discuss it in the group, make sure— [SKIP IN AUDIO]—and partly, I will be looking for volunteers to help with the work of getting some of those [SKIP IN AUDIO] filled. And yes, as [SKIP

IN AUDIO], Jordan and I do have the primary pen-holding responsibilities, and I'm quite happy to do that.

But the more help we can get, the more words we can get written by other people, the easier the job is and the more likely we are to get it done. So, I have that on the next steps. I doubt there's anybody that's going to jump up and down and volunteer for any task at the moment.

So, for any of these, if somebody wants to take lead in the whistle-blowing work, and come to this group with sort of a review, that would be great. If somebody wants to jump and say "Hey, I've been following the ombudsman group and I'm ready to sort of present that work," that would be great.

So, those are two opportunities for people to volunteer, either now on the list, separately, or if no one volunteers, by default it will fall to Jordan and I, and will get done. But volunteers are great. Also, in terms of the recommendations. So, anybody have—well I see a hand still up. Is that a new hand, with new comment, or is that from before? Thank you.

So, would anybody like to comment on the next steps? Is there a next step that's missing? I know I could get more detail on all of them, and will as time goes on. But we really have to start focusing on what we need to get done and what are the barriers to getting that done.

I think the accountability—or is the transparency—but I think the whistle-blowing work has gone quite far. So, that may be ready for us to start reviewing in the near future. And so, we may take things out of order as they're ready. I think the ombudsman work is still in early

churn, so I don't know that there's much there to be done yet. Nothing? Okay.

Before moving on—okay. Then moving onto the next slide. As you probably heard in the plenary meeting, we are asked to do one of the forms each month, the cash board type forms. So, this is ours at the moment. This was the one that was prepared pre-Hyderabad.

It tries to indicate that we're still at the beginning, etcetera. It shows that we haven't had that many meetings. It measures what—the number of emails and participation rate. So, our stats are not good. We are still at the early—I'm not terribly worried about it.

But I do want to indicate that this exists, that we are asked to update it monthly, and that hopefully—if I have a chance to float it by the group before I update it, if I'm not doing it at the last minute because I've been pinged on where is it, I will try and get it reviewed by the group, but I'll certainly pass it by the group once it's done.

I see a note from Philip. "For notes and for the record, my comment was on means for GDD staff to be sensitized to policy implications in certain contract negotiating positions and a procedure for them to inform policy staff and GNSO council in advance to gather feedback on impact and appropriateness."

So, okay, that's—oh, and Natalie tells me that the participation rate has been removed from the stats. Okay, I just basically took a snapshot of the last one I could find. I had trouble finding the dashboard when I was preparing these slides, so I just went to the last set I could find and took a screenshot of it and then cut it down so that I could put it up.

Does anybody have any questions or comments about this tool? It's being used by the group. It does seem to be able to give a fairly uniform view of what's being worked on, and I guess it's up to us to fill it in to make sure that it's meaningful. So, I will try to make it meaningful.

And Natalie says "We're working on a dashboard Wiki page. It will be more simple to find the dashboard in the future." Yeah, I was feeling really dumb that I couldn't find it, but I searched and searched, and as I said, finally gave up and took the easy route. Okay.

Then I'll move on to the next thing, which is the item of the schedule. Again, I couldn't find the schedule where I could grab it easily, so I did a screenshot. So, that may make it fuzzier than it needs to be. There's a track one, which was the long track.

There's a track two, which is the short track. I had thought we were on the long track, but I was wrong. It turns out that Jordan knew we were on the short track, so it was only one of the rapporteurs that was ill-informed. So, at the moment, we are on track two, as it shows there.

Theoretically, for Hyderabad, we should have already had our work well in hand. That was obviously not the case at the time, and so we certainly missed that milestone of having a draft. This basically has us coming out for public comment on our recommendations in January, which at this point, I think is fairly obvious it's something that we cannot move.

Now that means we will slip. Now I'm hoping that we can certainly have a draft by ICANN56, and I think that's a target we can shoot on—shoot for, but I don't see any way of us completing in time for the

Copenhagen meeting, which means that, as opposed to continuing to just slide until then, it may be necessary, it may be a good idea, to request a jump in the track.

Now I don't know how favorably that will be viewed. It seems that more than one of us, one group has already taken the opportunity. I think it's the SOAC accountability, has already taken the opportunity to decide in the group to move to the other track and has made the request formal.

So, one of the things I wanted to ask this group was whether there was any objection to us trying to jump to track one from track two, and such, so that we could work up a proposal for doing that. Does anybody have any comments on the schedule? Yes, Alan. Please.

ALAN GREENBERG:          I spend an awful lot of time on these meetings, and some of it's useful and some of it isn't. We're not going to make the deadline for the fast track. That's a fact. I don't see any way we can avoid that. So, I understand there was some negative comments in the plenary yesterday when SOAC accountability was suggesting that perhaps they would not make that fast track and needed to change. I think we just say we're not going to make it. If someone wants to fire the rapporteurs because of it, so be it. Let's not spend a lot of time agonizing over it. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:          Okay. Thank you. I'm actually not agonizing over it, but I did want to clear it with the group if possible.

ALAN GREENBERG:          No, but you said should we develop a proposal? That was my concern.


AVRI DORIA:              No, we should—by proposal, I meant how we planned to meet even the longer schedule.


ALAN GREENBERG:          Touché.


AVRI DORIA:              Greg, please. Yes, Greg?


GREG SHATAN:             If you can hear me. Do you hear me?


AVRI DORIA:              Now I do.


GREG SHATAN:             Hello?


AVRI DORIA:              Now I hear you.

GREG SHATAN:  Okay, good. I was just saying I agree with Alan, and I think it's kind of self-evident, given as you say, that we're kind of behind where we should be, and yeah, just not going to happen. I think that I would disregard the very few negative comments.

There's always going to be some negative comments about anything. If the sky is blue, somebody will want it to be cloudy. So, at this point, we need to do what's right with regard to that. And if every group ends up on the long track, c'est la vie. The short track was a very—was intended for kind of quick, almost binary—the easy stuff. Staff accountability strikes me as never really the easy stuff to begin with. So, a long-winded way of saying just go for it. Thanks.


AVRI DORIA:  Okay, thank you. Any other comments? I see Robin is typing. Robin typed, "There are so many different ongoing working groups going on right now, it is just not possible to get it all done on the timeline ICANN wants." I definitely support that comment, but I'm also not sure how much of this is ICANN imposed and how much of it is self-imposed or imposed by our chairs.

But indeed, the schedule is a problem for me. Any other comments on this? I see a bunch of people typing. But if not, and I don't see any hands. Jeff, and to be frank, for a lot of us, we're volunteering our time to ICANN. This work is not necessarily the top priority, just so [INAUDIBLE].

As my co-chair in another world, I totally understand that, but for me, this is one of my top priorities. But if they fire me for being a bad

rapporteur, then it won't be. And I worry less. But Cheryl, yes, please. I see your hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Avri. I couldn't help myself at this point. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, for the record. I think we need to make it clear to everybody who wasn't in the plenary that it is a single voice that raised the concern about how does the SOAC accountability group suggest that they switch from one track to another as if these tracks were somehow in concrete?

They were not. They were very much suggested in terms of we self-selected for them. In the case of SOAC accountability group, one of the rapporteurs firmly believed that they would get the job done a lot faster than clearly they were able to. And so be it. So, I think we should do exactly the same in this group. So be it. Stuff happens. It hasn't progressed as fast as was desirable. There you go. Move tracks. And I doubt that anybody would fire you, Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Sure, as much as you might dream of that sometimes. No, I volunteered, and I know I could un-volunteer any time I wanted. So, I'm happy to still do this, no matter how much I might joke about getting fired. We had a question from Pam Little, "Could we get a commitment when our questions will be answered?"

I have been trying. I don't know whether Karen is able to give us such a commitment now. I'm certainly willing to put her on the spot and ask,

but she only was able to type and not speak earlier, and such. Yes, Greg says they may dock my pay. Okay.

That means I'd have to pay to do this? Oh, joy. I would quit. Anyway, so Karen says "I will work to provide you a response early next week." Thank you, Karen. That is a response to when we'll get a response, or that is a response to the question? Please forgive my meta-question.

No, Greg, nothing from nothing leaves a negative number. Well actually, not nothing from nothing, but something from nothing leaves a negative number.

Response to the question. Thank you very much, Karen.

So, at that, joking around aside, we come to the ending of the business. And with eight minutes left.

Yes, Greg, I know you're an optimist. I thought it was very good, yesterday's meeting, somebody said that optimism was the victory of hope over experience. And I was having trouble with hope yesterday. Today, I'm very hopeful. So, for today, I too, am an optimist.

So, any other business from anyone? Hearing none, seeing no hands. I thank you all for being on this call. I thank you all for being involved. Hopefully some of you will pick up some of the other issues, like the whistle-blowing and like the ombudsman, especially if you're in the other groups, to sort of bring a report back into this one. But otherwise, we will do it. So, if there's nothing else, this call is ended. Thank you very much. Thank you, Karen, Natalie and Yvette.

**EN**

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:          Thanks, Avri. Thanks, everyone. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**