AVRI DORIA:

Okay. Hello, everybody. I'll start this off. Thank you for joining this extra late meeting here. We only have one item on the agenda, and that's to review the craft update to the Plenary that Jordan wrote – or was certainly a primary author – and sent out I guess it was yesterday for people to look at. I see there are a number of comments in it now. In fact, it also includes comments I think I sent, because I reacted to Jordan's request that I edit it too late.

So I'd like to turn it over to Jordan, if you're okay, since you wrote the document and I'm sure you can talk us through it quicker than I could.

JORDAN CARTER:

Sure. Thanks, Avri. It's Jordan Carter here, .nz, one of the co-rapporteurs. There are only really two points that this document tries to get across. One is the plea for a more effective working method, and that's just to get people thinking. I don't think I've got a perfect working method in mind. But out of your call yesterday, I think the top of page two there was one suggestion. That was getting some senior people on the staff side rather than this odd exchange of documents process that we've got, just to speed things up really.

Then the second point was to sort of look at the scope of the work and see if we've got some agreement that we can send things down a bit and do what George really suggested last thing, which is cut the – I'm going to call it waffle, essentially – the documenting of things that are already documented elsewhere or that are already worked on by others and get the problems out and propose some solutions to them and get

community feedback on that, which seems to me to be a much more useful exercise.

So I've had some feedback off list and through comments that makes, that tightens up that language, but I think this is a document from the co-rapporteurs to the group, it doesn't need to stand as a perfectly worded consensus document. It's designed to spur a conversation. So what would be good to know is whether those are the two rights to make, and any other feedback that you have so we can get this into the discussion and have some good feedback from the rest of the group, and in the meeting in Copenhagen in just over a week.

That's all I'll start with, Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. So the issues are on page two. There's issue one and there's issue two. Now that Jordan has sort of covered that the first one was the challenge of working effectively with ICANN, and then the second was adjusting the scope of work because what we have been meeting – just to add slightly to what Jordan said, what we have been doing is what Work Stream 1 set out for us to do.

The note kind of explains that and explains where we're at, and that we certainly have lots of written down. In fact, according to some, we have far too many words written down, and we got this sort of pull on the emergency brake at our last meeting.

Do we have the issues right? Is issue one stated properly? Do I see any hands? Anyone who want to comment on this? Don't know how much

time you've all had to read it, but it is short. Especially page two, which is the critical page is short. So I have no comments, so I can assume that one is expressed okay? Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Avri, connecting microphones and not off my little tablet is extraordinarily annoying. But anyway, hopefully I'm not echoing at you. As a conversation starter, I think the articulation of the two primary issues is basically good. I fear however – not that we can do anything about it – that [all] many of the wider Plenary will do is just read this conversation starter and no idea of the greater work and the words of wisdom and the very in-depth, in some points overly deep analysis that's in that document A and B.

Look, it's what we've got and what we have to work with, but I just have a fear that this is just going to be read like an executive summary and nobody actually look any deeper. So we might have to drag them kicking and screaming through the high points and holidays of the other work. That's all.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thanks. Well, I felt we were going to point them at and perhaps give a PDF of the other document so that they had the background and could read it. But I know what you're saying. George, I see your hand.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thanks, Avri. I'm going to comment on issue one. I think you have here both a short-term problem on how the working group has not been able

to establish good communication with ICANN and a longer-term problem which is, has this been going on for a long time? Is it likely to continue? Do we need more permanent mechanisms to make sure that this communications is enhanced?

I think the short-term problem we can solve, but if there's a shadow of a longer-term problem in here, then I think you're quite right to raise it. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. Alan, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. George said – in fact, I think effectively the same thing as I was going to say. I'll say it differently. The fact that this group is having great difficulty working with ICANN staff is indicative of the problems that we as volunteers very often have working with ICANN staff.

AVRI DORIA: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: So it is not only a problem we have in doing our job, it is a symptom of the larger problem that we're trying to address doing our job. It's almost a meta description. So I think it's a really important one, and the fact that it is a problem we're having, the group that they should be bending over backwards to demonstrate that there are no problems with ICANN

staff transparency is having the problem. I think there a big story there. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. Jordan, I see your hand.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks. Yes, Avri. Thanks for both those comments. My impression is that the challenge here is that the working model that's usual is volunteers prepare documents and staff kind of support them. And this is a bit different to that, because the specific task is to work with ICANN, so it almost implies that the volunteer group should be in a kind of dialog of [by] negotiation [inaudible] of ICANN to prepare some of these things.

I think it's that, that's the working method difference that needs to happen. So I don't really see it as a lack of support or a problem or that front, more the kind of – it's an unusual way of working, so that's why we need to call it out and see if we can get an unusual, maybe very specific way of working through this problem. That might in turn unlock some of the other issues. So I hope that the language has captured that.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thanks. Although it doesn't necessarily capture – and actually, Alan has his hand up – the other problems, the ones that have been sort of as you say waffled about in our other discussions where one particular group would say – I'm even being careful about it now – "Well, we've been having this, this and this kind of problem, but we're

trying to write up something that won't use anybody's names so that there won't be any retaliation," etc.

And over the course of a month, we've had a couple of those discussions, but because of whatever reasons, nobody's really been able to put those on pieces of paper in our group yet, so we have this shadow in the background but nothing really tangible. George's comments was basically that our point here is pointing to this group's problem because of its specific nature, but that it is perhaps a reflection of another kind of problem, or perhaps there's a third issue, that it's not that.

So anyhow, I'll go to Alan. Please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Jordan's description of how it should work, that is the volunteer community sets policy and staff supports them in doing that is a rather simplistic model of part of what we do. Certainly, I've seen that model fail where we try to get information from staff and it is not forthcoming, but a lot of other things that we do, certainly in my position as a Chair and working with staff to try to make the overall process work, I see the kinds of symptoms we're describing here all the time. Because it's not just us creating policy and staff supporting it. It has to be a much more interactive and collegial process, and that doesn't always happen. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, Thank you. Jeff, please.

JEFF NEUMAN:
Thanks. Sorry, it took me a second to get off mute. Finally, I am able to report – although it's not posted yet, even though we've asked ICANN to post it. I will send a letter around to the group. It's a letter prepared by the registries and registrars to the members of the ICANN Board, and it's a follow-up to a letter we sent in December.

The letter in December, we still ask for that to be confidential because it does go into detail and does actually have people's names in it, and so that we're going to keep confidential. But we summarized the principles in the second follow-up letter that we would like to see or that we believe.

So, I'm going to send that letter around. I'm just trying to get the address of our particular smaller workgroup. It's a PDF version. So I will send that around now while the call is going on, but it sets forth certain principles and things that we see.

AVRI DORIA:
Okay, thank you very much. It'll be good to see that letter. Okay, so that brings me back to the rapporteur's note, is perhaps we really do need to list a 1A and a 1B on the challenge of working effectively. I don't know, what do you think?

Jordan and others. Yes, Jordan, you have your hand up. Thanks.

EN

JORDAN CARTER: I don't think so, because I think that's part of the substantive contents of the second issue. I think it's something that we should work through and sort of highlight the examples and challenges, just like Alan has done here and I think Jeff's letter will, and have that as some problems to which we propose solutions.

So I think it's about the scope adjustments, whereas we I think are calling out a specific way of working for this group, and what would be really appealing for us is for ICANN to get some staff the mandates to work with this group on doing the task. And so what we're asking them to do is to change what they're doing in the process sense, whereas the issue raised more broadly I think is part of the substantive content of the work that we have yet to do.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, got you. Makes sense. Okay, so basically, issue one stands. Do people have any comments on issue two which Jordan was just talking about, adjusting the scope of the work? And does that express what it needs to? Yes, Jordan, you said you would have to leave, that you only really had a half hour to get to this. And we've got 11 minutes left on that half hour. So on the second one – yes, George.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Yes, thanks. I'm pleased to see the way that this is phrased here, because it does reflect the conversation of the last meeting. And I think I would have an issue with just the way in which the two last bullets. One is documenters [felt] summarized the very specific things, and two is state the problems that have been identified.

I think I haven't seen the paper that Jeff is circulating right now, but my sense is that the thing to do is to use the issues that have come up as a result of this whole conversation as input and try to figure out what kind of a mechanism resolves these things immediately as a matter of course, if at all possible not ignoring the fear of retribution.

So developing mechanisms which allow these things never to come up to the point where we consider that it's a problem. It's essentially a process issue. What kind of process do we use to resolve these things as they come up? I think that's what you mean here. It doesn't quite say it for me, but it's close. Close enough.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thanks. If you have any wording suggestions, since we have to get this in I guess today or tomorrow at the latest, please. Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Yes.

JORDAN CARTER: Yes, thanks. Thanks, George. I think you're right, and so what I just proposed in the chat, there's that sort of [inaudible] narrowing of scope, then there's the second one about stated problems or identifying the problem.

And then there's one that just said proposed solutions to resolve these problems. [inaudible] suggesting we add proposed solutions to resolve these problems, or mechanisms that could resolve them as they arise from time to time. So I think that kind of pushes your points and makes it clear we're looking for ways to embed changes to the organization so that these problems don't happen.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, looks good. George, what do you think?

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Yes, I like it. And we were using the term stress testing a few days ago at the last meeting. I think perhaps one of the things that the existing set of let me call them complaints, specific complaints at this point could be used for is essentially stress testing any of the mechanisms that are proposed. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. Any other comments on this? Another comment from Jordan. The effect of the change would be overall to get us focused on the issues raised or identified and solutions for ways to prevent. And that's the change of scope. Yes.

Okay, so if there's nothing else on these two points, is there anything else on the rest of the letter? The setting of the background or such.

I see no comments. Yes, it has been great a feedback, and it's given me a certain confidence that we've taken that emergency stop at the last

meeting and sort of at least have taken a first step towards figuring out what to do about it.

Okay, this doesn't need to be a long meeting, so does anyone else have other points that they want to make about this? And yes, Jordan and I will work on finalizing and getting it sent in. Thank you, Jeff, for your just in time letter. It's hard to keep referring to something that no one has seen, so very much appreciate that.

Anything else? If not, I thank you all for your time and for making this extra meeting, and I look forward to continuing the discussion and hopefully getting ourselves back on the rails in terms of getting this work done.

Thank you all. The call is adjourned. Over, even.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, Avri.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks, Avri. Bye.

AVRI DORIA: Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]