
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. So, I'm starting. We've got a very family agenda. First, we'll start with the intro, which is what I'm doing and the agenda review. This is Avri Doria speaking, I forgot to say that. We're supposed to say that at the beginning of each one of our speaking.

So, the first thing is the agenda review, which will include the agenda, I mean, the attendance check, then the SOI notice. Then we'll try to complete finalize document A. This, I think, is our primary task for today, document has gotten a lot of work.

Then after that, we need to get into discussion of draft document B, which has moved a little bit further in terms of recording where it's at, but has no recommendations yet. And then, I doubt we'll get item four, but it's there just in case we have lots of time left, is a continuing discussion of responses to staff questions.

One of the reasons all three are there is just to make sure that everybody has got the draft, the URLs for the document. Then we'll do a quick schedule check, and then any other business. Does anyone have any other business at this point? I made a mistake and read something in the chat while I was doing this. Any other business at this time?

Okay, I'll ask again at the last five minutes. Okay, any changes on this agenda? Any comments? I see no hands, I hear... Yes, Jordan.

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.

JORDAN CARTER:

Jordan here. I do have a question, which is just to say that, under schedule check, can we just deal with working out what we're going to send if anything to the plenary for discussion in Copenhagen? I made a suggestion on the main list that we would have at least one document to deal with, and that we should get some time.

And I think that we should confirm that and the schedule check looks like the right time to do it.

AVRI DORIA:

Sure. I mean, all I've got for the schedule check is the table [inaudible] last time, that has our original date for something and our new date for something. So, we can do whatever we want during that. But yes, the most important thing is if we didn't succeed at finalizing document A, then when are we going to do that so that we can try and meet the promise given to the plenary for...? Okay.

So yeah, that would be the most important one of our concerns. But I really just have a one table to give us a view of where we're at, because we are slipping. With each meeting, we slip a little bit more. Okay. So, hearing just that one emphasis check on the schedule check, I guess we can accept this agenda, move on.

Next thing is attendance is taken by looking at the Adobe Connect. Is there anybody who is just on phone, that isn't on Adobe Connect, so we can include you in the attendance? I hear no one on that. So, last thing

is, statement of interest check. Does anybody have a statement of interest change that they want to announce?

Okay, this is Avri. I do want to mention one thing. I don't know if it's necessary, but since the question came up, I happen to be in GNSO Council for a week as an alternate replacement, and don't know whether that's significant for SOI check, but figured I'd mention it. Having said that, I see no one else with any SOI check, so we can move on to number two, which is finalize document A.

If Karen can put document A up in the window, and then I'll turn the floor over to Jordan to walk through the document, and I'll pay attention to hands and what's in the chat. So, Jordan, it's yours.

JORDAN CARTER:

Great. Thanks Avri. Hi everyone. My name is Jordan Carter, the co-rapporteur for this group who has been working on doc A with a few others. I just wanted to start by saying, I'll put the link to the Google Doc version in the chat, it's in the agenda as well, so if anyone wants to look at the live doc. This is a slightly weird document, and that came out due to some of the comments that Greg had added, which are really useful comments.

And that's, with staff accountability group, and we were told by annex 12 of work stream one's report that we had to write a document that described the [inaudible] and responsibilities of the staff, the Board, and the community. So, sometimes it feels that the scope gets a bit big, and I think that's a filter we need to keep in mind.

Secondly, since we've last discussed this document on the call, I've made some editing suggestions that would see this substantive document being a bit shorter and the appendices a bit longer, to aid with ease of reading. It doesn't seem necessary to me to spell out some of the things that we've been asked to do with, in huge debt because it wasn't necessarily information that couldn't be found elsewhere, or that was necessarily very germane to our focus.

And staff accountability, so some of that stuff will be here, pressed to work through. Thirdly, the approach I'm going to take with this discussion is just work through the document and go into substantive comments, that are still there, and just kind of invite the opportunity for people to add some comments, or add to thoughts, either respond to comments that are in the document, or if you've got something to say about it.

If you want to stop in between those points, please say so at the time. And my hope of where we'll get to at the end of this discussion is agreed points of editing and change that can then lead to a 1.5 doc that we wither sign off or tweak on the email list [inaudible] for Copenhagen. If we have to, we can have a verbal chat, which really, really finalize next week's meeting, that will be right up against the deadline, so it's better if we can get there today.

So, I hope that process makes sense, and we will just scroll through and now. Unfortunately, there is a lot of comment boxes. And it looks a bit more complicated than it is. If you go to page three, all I tried to do there is to add basic start to the read by explaining what sections are going to come.

So that's uncontroversial. And it's the language itself, and it needs to be tweaked, we should say there. There is a comment in there, from Michael Bay, about the need to mention the CEO. My response to that is, the CEO is actually mentioned in the staff parts, so you wouldn't put it as a summary here because this is actually a summary of what the next three sections are.

And then we get into some substantive comments. So, I'm trying to look at this PDF possibly like many of you, that's [inaudible], so I can't see the chat while we're doing this, just so you know. And on that page three, there a comment, 16, from Mathieu as well. And it's about the Board [inaudible] functions. He's actually saying that the Board sets the strategy, and then [inaudible] I guess would agree that that's in consultation with the community, and that's more than strategic oversight.

I think he's right that we should add language around those lines. And [inaudible] comment about oversight enterprise risk, bullet list at the bottom of page three. It is kind of assuring that there are processes in place to effectively manage and mitigate risks, so there are two key roles of the Boards that aren't on that list and should be.

So, on that page, that's all the comments there. Are there any sort of points that you want to raise about that?

AVRI DORIA:

I see no hands and no comments in the chat.

JORDAN CARTER: We'll move through this at pace. If you find something and we need to go back, that's totally okay, don't worry about it. I'm not trying to [inaudible], I'm just trying to keep the pace going. On page four, there is excellent comments from Greg Shatan about what the ICANN Board doesn't do.

I think that he is right, simplistic drafting about what the Board doesn't do, doesn't actually say [inaudible] based on what is already there. And I haven't put it away to fix that, yeah, but we do need to. And the keep one that I think that Greg makes. Greg might want to talk about this one himself, is that it's too simplistic, and it actually, in some cases, [inaudible] process don't reach consensus, and it would be inappropriate for them to do so.

Greg, I think you're on the call, do you want to talk any further about that? Don't have to.

AVRI DORIA: Doesn't seem to be reacting.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay. We can come back. I mean, the comments are to an extent, for themselves... George, I see that you're on the call. Do you have...? Could you discern a way to get the main point we were trying to make?

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Whoops, you're gone.

[CROSSTALK]

AVRI DORIA: I can hear you, George.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Okay, try again, go ahead. What was the question?

JORDAN CARTER: On the page for this PDF, there is a little section about what the ICANN Board doesn't do, and one of the things it says is determine policy work [AUDIO ECHO]...

And we have in the comments, Greg pointing out that that's not really quite right or quite adequate, and so I wondered if as a Board member if you had a chance to read those comments. If you had any comment to make on that, or [AUDIO ECHO]...

GEORGE SADOWSKY: I have it in front of me. Which comment? Is it comment 21?

JORDAN CARTER: 20, 21, 22, yeah.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: 22. I don't want to slow up the process while I'm reading the comments. I've read the document, but not the comments on it. So, I know that's not very helpful.

JORDAN CARTER: No, that's all right. Maybe you could [AUDIO ECHO]...
...and then on the email list, either [AUDIO ECHO]...
...better way to put that [AUDIO ECHO], that would be very helpful. If you are able to.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Okay.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Please re-mute yourself, George.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thank you. I will.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks for that. Yeah, I think, I mean, it's good to draw from an experience of them, for members in trying to get this stuff right, or to

just think about the comments [inaudible]. In terms of this other comment from Mathieu, in terms of the CEO role about helping shape and setting strategy, yes, for the leaving that out was intentional.

It isn't intentional on my part. I am a CEO and I know that we have a role in that kind of role, [inaudible] to set strategy. So, my expectation was that we could add that, and add something that they do, appropriately [inaudible] to say, consistent with the onboard directions outside the Board and the community, because they are a player in that process, hopefully they created an interesting one, and without being the sole determinant of the direction.

The next, if we move down to page five of the PDF, there is a question, again, it's about the strategy, about what staff doesn't do. And I think we can amend that comment, about halfway down the page, from Mathieu, it's comment 24, just to say that, while they don't decide it, they do contribute to developing. So, we should just caveat that by saying, by making sure that people are clear that [inaudible] decide the direction, but they may not have a role in shaping it.

And there are some tract changes in 1.3, that I'll just clarification, proposed to accept, and the same on page five. In page six, the bottom of page six, I have been worried a bit about the length and the amount of detail that's in this paper. And this is part of what I said at the introduction about just trying to shorten it and make it more readable, and the proposals were for you to consider was that we move several pages of content into an annex, so that it's available.

And that's the content that is on pages [AUDIO ECHO] and 10, and 11. The top half of 11, so it's quite a lot. But it's step [inaudible] is useful or not, depending on your comments, but it doesn't immediately [AUDIO ECHO] to the interesting needs of this paper.

It's more sort of background and more establishment. And I think the point of putting it out there, is this would go to a public comment, is to illicit comment and thinking among parts of the community, so it is good that we include it, but I've just tried to [inaudible] it and point to it in the purple text that's on the bottom of page six.

So, I don't know how people feel about that, if that's okay. I think it will add to our readability of it. So I'll pause there.

AVRI DORIA:

This is Avri. Question. Okay, so, I'm trying to understand what you said. So, you're saying only the purple stuff would still be here, and then the rest of it would be moved to, the rest of it from here until 11 or something, would be moved to it?

JORDAN CARTER:

To an annex.

AVRI DORIA:

So, an annex.

JORDAN CARTER:

So, that's just [CROSSTALK]...

Yes.

AVRI DORIA: Starting with original text on seven through to... I'm just trying to be specific about it, all the way through to three, on page 11.

JORDAN CARTER: Yeah, so it's basically that whole [inaudible] section to discuss some status quo, so [inaudible] to norms, and said, my point is, it's quite long. Some people would be interested in it, others would want to see just what we're recommending, and we could shorten the paper by putting it, not as a separate document, but as something that gets divorced from the whole paper.

It's a staff-driven, the end, quote/unquote.

AVRI DORIA: Thanks. I was just trying to be specific. This is Avri again. We've got one comment from Cheryl, who is okay with the annex approach. And we have two hands up. First, Greg, and then George. So, Greg, please.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. This is Greg Shatan for the record. I would support the annex approach. When I went through this, especially the second time, I really felt like this had become kind of a broad ranging thesis on the [inaudible] of ICANN's relationship between staff and community and Board, and while it was interesting and even fascinating, and certainly,

you know, a read, I felt like, really had kind a bit off the topic. So, the annex approach is a nice balance, meaning can give some [inaudible] and kind of the more holistic thinking that's behind more meat and potatoes analysis of [inaudible] and recommendations. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you Greg. George, I have your hand up next [AUDIO ECHO]...

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thanks. I think anything you can do to make this shorter and more concise and more crisp, will help it. I resonate a little bit to Greg's description of it being a thesis that's inserted in the document. I would concentrate on the important, if you use the points that you want to make, and take the extraneous material and make it a footnote, or make it an annex, or whatever, or just fill it.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you George. This is Avri. If I can speak. I'd be against killing it. I don't think of it as totally extraneous, though it is a bit dissertational. So, I'm also supportive of the annex idea, but would be very against the killing it notion, simply because I do believe there are some considerations in there, that are worth having people read and perhaps discuss. [CROSSTALK]

I see no other comments.

JORDAN CARTER:

Can I respond to that, Avri? Thank you. We will annex away. I think I would like to just tweak the introduction to say that the work stream one report did make us, it gave us quite broad writing instructions that feel [inaudible] necessary, so we included some material in this public comment draft that might submit it beyond [inaudible] comments about the recommendations primarily, or something like that just to make sure that people don't get lost.

Thank you. We still need to look at what the comments were in the contents, because we're going to include it. There are some editing changes, not very many. They attract changes, I'm not preparing, not really [inaudible] to add any of those in particular, because none of them are significant, except right at the end, on page 11.

There is a tweak by Greg. A comment by Greg in response to a comment by me. And I thought that Greg's comment was perfectly reasonable, that was comment 28, in response to my comment 27. And so I was just proposing to include that [inaudible] say so.

And that takes us on to section three, which is proposed changes and clarifications. And that section has got a few comments on it, not only on page 11, on page 12, we can make the change that Greg has suggested. Those [inaudible]... And at the bottom, I added some new text about, I tried to go from... I tried to meet the purpose section, which was a proposed change and clarification.

My read that page and a half, what I thought the clear, that what the summary was, was that they need to be a clear statement of the roles and the components in the community available, and talking about the

culture, the organization, and that should really be more [inaudible] and say if required. And so I hope that those additions are all right as well.

And then we come to the more problematic section, to be honest, which is section four. That was headed as activities that should be started or continued, or stopped, and the draft of the text was to be honest, very different. It was, I would describe it as...

And we do have an apology for this call, sorry, I forgot to mention this. This reminds me. [Inaudible] he is unable to attend the meeting, he sends his apologies. And I think Jeff sent his apologies as well on the email list. Sorry for that.

There is a bunch of comments in there, and the problem I had with the content was that it didn't do what the section promised. It didn't talk about things to start doing, and things to keep doing, and things to stop doing. So, I tried to write some of those based on what was in this paper.

And I was hoping to get some more input on things to start and stop. I thought that the original text that was there was interesting, and we saw that it was interesting, but I just thought it just didn't quite do what we said we were going to set out to do. And so, I think that that means that the logic is either to just leave it in this version and not just continue it into 1.5.

A different option would be to include it as an annex, but then we would need to spend a bit of time getting it into shape. And so I think my recommendation to you as rapporteur is that we, instead of keeping with that content, go with the bullet points I've listed on page 13, and

illicit your suggestions and suggestions of the group over the next couple of days, that listed [inaudible] to start, continue, and stop.

And I welcome any feedback on that.

AVRI DORIA: No hands and no... This is Avri. You've got no hands and no comments at the moment.

JORDAN CARTER: I realize that for some of you, this will be the first that you've seen of this suggestion. So, let's see how we go.

AVRI DORIA: Greg has got his hand up. Please, Greg.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you. Greg Shatan. Since nature abhors a vacuum, I put my hand up. But Jordan is correct. This is essentially my first time seeing this. I did have, you know, a similar problem that Jordan did with the text that was here prior to the bullet points being put in front, even more so being kind of a think piece on ICANN, way beyond the concept of staff accountability.

And you know, had some specific comments where I thought things were well off the mark, such as the comment 45 on page 15, I think is mine. And a few others. So, you know, I guess the question is, do we

need...? Is this another annex? In which case, I would still think it needs serious work. Is it a replacement job? Or what do we...?

To some extent, there is kind of the question of what is the promise of this section, which is, you know, I guess it's things that staff should start doing to be accountable, or is it just things that staff should do generally, or things we all should do. The [inaudible] section here, doesn't actually have an actor. It's phrased [inaudible], so I don't know who is doing any of these bullet points and things, and that very least, the [inaudible] text should indicate who is, whose job bullet points should be, because right now, they say [inaudible] in the abstract, so it won't barely communicate an action plan to anybody at this point. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay. Thank you, Greg. There are no other hands and no other comments at the moment.

JORDAN CARTER:

Can I make a comment that [inaudible]? I think, I just thought about this again and thought about that. I think my recommendation of the approach that we should take is to leave, I'm trying to be polite, leave behind [inaudible] delete the existing [inaudible] content for section four, and that we should merge section four and section five, and just have one set of recommendations that are about things to start doing, things to keep doing, things to stop doing, because it actually isn't, there isn't, they're the same thing.

They're just different types of recommendations that should be in one place when you think about it, if we do leave behind the text that's there. Greg [inaudible], I think we've gotten rid of [inaudible], Greg. I mean, if there are any left. And then we could have a more rationale discussion about those bullets and the recommendations, and they could be pulled into one section, it would make the document shorter and clearer.

So, that's an approach that we can do.

AVRI DORIA:

This is Avri. I tried to put my hand up to speak, but I can't seem to put my hand up at the moment.

JORDAN CARTER:

It is up. I can see it up.

AVRI DORIA:

I can't. Okay. I think that, as you say politely, leaving it behind, may be an idea, but I think we should wait to finalize any such, until we've had a chance to have a discussion with [Claus?], since he was a major author. Oh, now I see my hand. Since he was a major author of that piece. And so, I sort of, you know, recommend moving it to a possible annex, and then seeing whether we decide that we go through and edit it, and leave it also there as another piece for consideration, with an appropriate, you know, header, or we actually, as you say, leave it behind.

But so, [CROSSTALK] to say that. Yeah.

JORDAN CARTER:

That's probably [inaudible] text that he largely wrote, so here is a three part suggestion. We merge sections, we put this text in a hypothetical second annex, and I have a go at editing it to take account of the reasonably extensive comments that have been made on it, and I try to characterize what it is and how it relates to this piece of work, and I do all of that tomorrow, so that there is time to review and have a look at it.

And we finalize the call about what to do with it, on the next call, which is still just in time for us to get [inaudible] plenary. [CROSSTALK] ...a few health issues at the moment, which is his apologies for this call. He has to be away to deal with some of that. So, I think we should reach out to him, and as [inaudible] suggests [inaudible].

AVRI DORIA:

Got no hands. [CROSSTALK] Cheryl's hand is up, go ahead Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

This is bizarre. I can type, but my hand refuses to [inaudible]... Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And I'm just saying that for Avri. I would also, when we reach out to [Klaus], if I could suggest this, say that we did discuss at this meeting, whether or not to annex, which will require a title and a rewrite, or to leave behind, you may say leaving behind is fine, I just put this together as a thought piece and [inaudible] is done.

We should allow him that opportunity, as opposed to making him feel that he is being only asked to engage in a radical rewrite. Just, you know...

JORDAN CARTER: Good idea.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. And I would have writing out of [inaudible] by the time I finished that. Thank you. I'm shutting up again.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. And Greg also typed a note saying, agreed with Avri, and perhaps we can find some concrete objects in the prior text, for example, evaluating staff against KPIs. And Cheryl [CROSSTALK]...

JORDAN CARTER: I could add those, and do a bit prior to that, and add them and then highlight them in the newly combined recommendations, and [inaudible] continued section. [CROSSTALK]

AVRI DORIA: Cheryl was okay with that idea.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay. So let us then not spend any time on the comments that are in it, but let's just look at some of the comments on the recommendations which have been [inaudible] about grouping them. And the...

AVRI DORIA: Which start on page 16 for anybody that's looking.

JORDAN CARTER: Yeah, comment 54. Greg asked what does it mean? What does it mean [inaudible] that ICANN's intervention from policy outcomes [inaudible] processes. Good question. That was a [Claus] recommendation and he isn't here, so I suggest the action is to put a pointer to him to ask for his comments on that, if he's willing to answer them, and that we deal with it in the next call. I hope that's okay.

AVRI DORIA: No hands, no comments.

JORDAN CARTER: On recommendation...

AVRI DORIA: Oh no, hands, Sébastien just raised his hand. Please, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, can you hear me okay?

AVRI DORIA: Yeah.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, thank you. Avri and Jordan, I was coming to this call just to be able to do some link with the subgroup. I am a rapporteur about the ombudsman's office, and I didn't read in detail the document. Sorry about that. But going through, and it's now the third time I raised that...

I have trouble with the way we are talking about ICANN. And I know that it might be troublesome because I see you decide to have the staff name organization, and sometimes in the document, I am never sure about what we are talking about, if we are talking about staff. And for example, here, it's written organization, it's the Board and staff.

And in previous iteration, it's written staff is the organization. And I don't know how to do that because from my point of view, all ICANN is the organization, maybe with a big O, but nevertheless, you need to find a way to be sure that when you talk about something, it's the same everywhere, and not really redefine it each time.

And I know that it's difficult. But, and that's the first point. The second point is that, in previous part of the document, you are talking about the CO being the voice of the organization, and it's a real question for me. Is it still the voice of the whole ICANN? Or is it just the voice of staff that's being, why it's called ICANN organization?

And I don't know if it was in this subgroup that we need to discuss that, but it's one of the questions that is troublesome for me. And the last

point to say before you go through recommendation, I am trying to write a paper about ombudsman versus a complaint service, something else, and I don't know what will be the something else.

I will take the last version of your document, because I think the previous one in taking some part of the document, in my document, and I will send it, hopefully, by end of the day today, because I think it could have some elements for you to think about in your own work. Thank you. I hope that it was not so unclear, as I am just waking up. Sorry about that. Thank you very much.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay, thank you Sébastien. We also have Greg in the queue, but I wanted to just ask one question related to your first point, which is, on this definitional stuff of how do we talk about staff? How do we talk about community? How do we talk about ICANN at all?

I think that that is one that we have to define consistency on across WS 2, and perhaps, I don't know whether that's something that needs to come up in the plenary, or in the leadership meeting. I see we don't have any of our chairs sitting in on this meeting with us, but basically I don't think it's for any particular one of the subgroups to try and nail down the definitions of those, because having sat in many of the calls, I've heard bits and pieces of the same conversation several times.

So perhaps that's a request that we need to sort of escalate up to the larger group and the chairs on this. How do we describe this one entity that is mysteriously broken down into three entities? And like most mysteries of the trinity, it's difficult to comprehend. So, if no objection,

I'll try to put that to the plenary from here, and I see no objection, but I see a couple of green checks. And Greg, okay, go to your hand, thanks.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. This is Greg Shatan again. And here again, I think there is this mission creep, or even sprint, way beyond staff accountability, and to kind of organizational analysis, or organizational psychology, you know the first couple of points, A and B really almost don't go to the staff at all, [inaudible] in any way, some of these are more about staff accountability, or about helping staff to be, or about staff oversight, which is the flipside of accountability, but I think some of these are just kind of way outside of the remit of this subgroup.

And that kind of reflects what was going on in the prior section as well, which is you know, something that was a fairly narrow remit, you know, staff accountability to me is a critical aspect for these kind of slide [inaudible] on holding the Board accountable, both for itself and for actions of staff, but not really all that much time on how we hold staff accountable directly, and I think that needs to be kind of...

And also about the limitations are on holding staff accountable directly. So, you know, that needs to be the focus, not you know, [inaudible] in policy making is not quality of decision making. Policy making, you know, obviously there are policies at ICANN, or develops most of the, many of the policies are developed out in the community.

So, you know, it kind of seems to me to be again, kind of, maybe some good thoughts, but not in the right place, not in the right subgroup, and

kind of taking away from the focus that should be here on the issue of staff accountability per se. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. Jordan, I see your hand. Go ahead.

JORDAN CARTER:

I think, thanks Avri. It's Jordan here. So, I think Greg made a really interesting point. I think this is the only group, I think, [inaudible], dealing with kind of the things that staff do, and accountability is the framework for that. The culture in which accountability happens is kind of determinant of how it works, because it really influences the extent to which formal tools are needed, I think.

So, getting the description right in terms of culture and doing more analysis of it, as sort of suggested in some of those bullets in four, might be useful. But I think I broadly agree with you about those ones being out of scope. Can we add a comment to that, suggesting that and [inaudible] Greg suggest that a scope for [inaudible]?

And carry on the discussion?

AVRI DORIA:

I see no objection and no hands.

JORDAN CARTER:

Okay, that's... I'm conscious that we've taken up three-quarters of the call already. So next one where there are some more comments, is one

of the comments is just in relation to a comment that I made about the mutual accountability thing, I don't think it's the same thing, ignore that. The context of [inaudible] recommendation F, I propose to delete because I don't think it's an actionable recommendation.

So, I hope that doesn't create any massive problems for anyone. And [inaudible]...

AVRI DORIA:

This is Avri. On that one, one of the things that does show up in the document, that staff sent us, that are more about the next document than this one, but in their other businesses document, while it isn't an absolute prohibition, there is very much a strong position against full-time staff having other business involvement. That's not the case for part-time staff, and it's certainly not the case for consultants.

So, there may be something to be dealt with in that respect, in terms of what about the part-time and consultants? And you know, their statement of interest, and I think that there was something done about that at some point, but I haven't been able to find the evidence of consultants and their conflicts of interest that they bring in by virtue of other work they do.

So, I'm not sure that they're structural or operational, but there may be a necessity for some statements of conflicts of interest among part-time and contract workers, I don't know, but that's just the one thought I had. [CROSSTALK]

JORDAN CARTER: ...comment and they're asked to take into account, sorry, I've interrupted you.

AVRI DORIA: No, no, no. I was going to go on with comments, but you're responding to what I said. I'll do that after you finish.

JORDAN CARTER: I'm done.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. So then, Greg has said, it's a lot more than A and B, it's also G, K, and M. Also N, and O seems right off the mark, though I would love to hear what Sébastien, as the rapporteur of the ombudsman subgroup has to say about that, and in the ombudsman discussion.

JORDAN CARTER: I think we should consider that when we get the paper that Sébastien just mentioned, which [inaudible] on the next call, and I think we should consider it with a view to deleting it, which is a view I made very clear, I think, already. [Inaudible] something about the previous one, but if we make the ombudsman's office [inaudible] an ombudsman, when a different group is actually completely charted with it, I think we should just take all of this completely out of [inaudible], it's not our work.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. I've just lost my connection to the Adobe Connect, so I can't see hands, if there are any. It's restarting, but go on.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLELT: Avri, Sébastien raised his hand.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, go ahead Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Jordan, I will [inaudible] that for the moment, you keep your thought about the ombudsman into the document, because it's, for what I am trying to do, it's very useful to see what is the thought of the other subgroup. And at the end of the work, I think, yes, we may be able to have one single document and some link between the work done by the other subgroup, but it happens that there are a lot of discussion, there are some discussion in various subgroup about the role of the ombudsman, is one of the reasons why I try to write a document.

And once again, I will hopefully send it by today for some consideration before the plenary call, not to be discussed today, but to see how it would be discussed during the ICANN meeting. Don't take them out because it shows where each group is, and it will help our subgroup to do the best job. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks for that. I guess my only point would be is that the comments have been lodged on this, and only one person agrees with what's there, so in terms of specific suggestion or argument that the ombudsman's office isn't [inaudible] conflict resolution and judgment, that the facilitator [inaudible] processes. I certainly don't agree with that.

I get the sense that Greg doesn't agree with that either. So, if the group agrees with it, then we should leave it in. If the group doesn't agree with it, we should take it out. And my sense is that where we are now with nine minutes left in the call, we should probably draw this item to a close, and just get that reintegration of sections four and five out, and invite people to do a bit more commenting, and just really sharing, do you agree with this recommendation or not?

Where is the consensus point on it? I mean, we'll determine a consensus point on these at the next call.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, I see Sébastien's hand again.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Very short, thank you Avri and Jordan. I was not saying that we need to, specific issue, I was talking about, when you say we will put everything about the ombudsman outside because there is subgroup. Of course, my comment was just please keep what you think as a subgroup relevant to your work, even if it's a go about the ombudsman and we will have, within the ombudsman group, to take into account.

It was not at all to say this specific sentence is appropriate to put into the document. It's not my job to do that, and I'm sorry for this misunderstanding from my side. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you, Sébastien. Okay, so with eight minutes left, I think we've got a path forward on this, but people really have to chip in over the next couple of days to get this thing finalized. I'm going to, unless there is more comments on document A, I'm going to talk briefly about the, just so it's not completely abandoned here. Basically, what I've done, [inaudible] and very few people have weighed in on it, I did go through all of the documents that we've got from staff in the last delivery, and put a section in that basically just talks about the documents that exist, and quote their purpose in the document just so that there is a reference there, go through the document.

A little pulling out the information. The documents are, very much, I would say, vanilla, corporate documents of this sort. There was nothing that I noticed in them that gets into the multistakeholder nature of the organization, or any of that. I think one of the questions we may want to have going forward, the part of [inaudible] that's completely empty, talks about changes needed, or recommendations.

So, that may be part of this discussion we want to have, I don't know. So, I just wanted to bring that up. And now, I think we're going to jump, with six minutes left, what I recommend we do is jump right to the schedule check, and we do have a note from Jordan, that was the last thing I sent Yvette. And it's only the table on the first page.

And Jordan put a comment, it seems like our next call is actually 3 March, which is less than 10 days before the plenary. I think we have to ask permission in the group to be a late paper, or we could schedule another meeting for a week from now, and see if we can't get a meeting in before that 10 day deadline, so that we can make it.

So, that would kind of be my recommendation. So try to fit a call in next week, to try and get this completed, something we didn't manage to do today, but okay. No, that was the... I sent the document just as the meeting was starting, Yvette, that was basically the title of it was, what was it?

The title, it's an older document, proposed next steps, and it starts out with a page on the table. But anyhow, it talked about consensus document. Consensus leading to document A was today, it was the meeting we skipped on the 16th, so it became today, so now that will change to our meeting of next week, assuming we've got agreement on it changing.

The document I can put in the URL so that people can get to it directly. The URL for that one, even though it is on the agenda, is...

It's that. So, then there was... So basically, this date becomes, you know, whatever date our next meeting has. Today is 22 February at the latest, perhaps 29 February. I assume it's on next, you know, in the same, similar day slot, perhaps not the same time slot, but we'll see what we can get.

So, if that's okay with people, we will schedule another meeting and document a consensus, we'll have a new date of 29 February or

whatever day it is that we have the meeting. We should also try to, I will put in the schedule of that meeting...

Oh yeah, there is no 29th February. I hate February, not enough days. But anyhow, thank you for the note Jordan. So, 28th February, 1 March, whatever. We have to get through B. Now, I would like to ask people over the next week, while looking at A, please also spend some time on B.

You'll notice if you look at B, that recommendations, there has not been any input on those. We now have what I believe is a fairly comprehensive set of the documents that exist, and the points, so if we believe anything else needs to exist, it's document B where we need to discuss it. So please, people, if you have a chance, please take a look at that, and start commenting, start suggesting text.

I will do another pass of the documents we received from staff to see if there is more I can pull out into description of existing stuff, but beyond that, really need some input from people on recommendations, if there is going to be any. The question document remains. So we basically have to complete that draft.

It's not complete yet, so that date will also change to 1 March for now. And we've talked about having a consensus meeting on that on 3 March, that will obviously get adjusted to perhaps, from [inaudible], perhaps that will even have to be the meeting itself in Copenhagen. The response to staff questions, I have, as an original date on there, our next meeting.

So, hopefully people can also take some time on that, and we have notification from Jeff Newman that the registry stakeholder group is submitting content for that. So, we've got a minute left. I don't know if there are any comments on the schedule shifts. And I see Jordan, yes, even 27 of February, if the slots are there.

We can look at it afterwards, if [inaudible] and hope we can find one that new people can come to. Anybody come up with any other business for this last minute? Jordan has none. I have none. Does anybody else have any?

Nope. In which case, I would like to thank you all for a productive meeting. And wish you all a good continuation. And please get some time in on all of these documents over the next week, so that we have a prayer of it at least meeting our third date. I see Cheryl is typing, we are at the hour, and Cheryl says bye.

And I'll use that as a queue. Bye for all, bye to all and thank you much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]