
AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. I should have asked for that. Thank you for starting the recording. The first thing is to go through the agenda. Basically, a report back on the staff engagement conversation that we had on the 11th.

Then our main focus will be on the Issues Analysis Table, basically going through it, going through the changes. And basically there has been a discussion of sending it on to the plenary as a discussion item before we move on, so we want to talk about that as part of the issue.

Then there will be a document update, which could be rather than quick, on the other documents that are going on. Started going away from Document A and Document B, the Roles of the Board, Staff, Community and the other document which is basically Current and Recommended Accountability Measures. That was the Document B.

Then briefly the Next Steps on the Issues document, on the delegations, and on measures. And then just a note on all docs.

Then quickly an updated meeting schedule, which is there, and Any Other Business. Does anybody have any other business that they would like to post a discussion to at the beginning? Okay, then continue moving on, though I did see Jordan was typing.

Then the next one is an SOI check. I just want to ask if anyone has an SOI that they need to update that's relevant to this group in terms of the work we're doing. No? Okay, remind everybody in general that if your material concerns change and you have a different mix of interests that may affect what you say and do, then please update your SOI.

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, did you want to say anything before I started? I guess not. I'll move on.

On the staff engagement, and perhaps Jordan will join me on this, we had the second of our phone calls with Patrick Dodson and other of the senior leaders and basically started talking about – including Diane Schroeder and Theresa Swinehart and such – on how to work out some of the issues we're trying to work out.

And basically discussed issues, including the whole review cycle in terms of how reviews were done and how, if we were going to recommend some notions of interaction during that process, how it would be done. There was an agreement to give the group a view of the review process, how it's done. That needed to be prepared a little bit before giving to us.

Somebody has me echoing or something. It's very weird.

So that was one item that we talked about. It was [I'll add one saying] that it's very good.

Welcome, Klaus, back to the group after a health break. I'm glad you're feeling better.

So that was one of the major items that we discussed. There others were basically a bit on how the measures document, which documents that exist is something that they'll take a look at and help us make sure that we have a solid basis on discussing the things that exist.

We also had a discussion about how to bring some of the staff – senior staff, however – that would be able to speak comfortably with the

group to help work with us while we're going through some of the solution spaces after we've talked through the issues. But also part of that discussion included making sure that any issues that staff had with the work we were doing with staff accountability, such as issues that may have shown up in their four questions, would also be included.

I want to stop there and give Jordan a chance to comment and give Patrick who has gone from participant now to a host – so either Patrick or Jordan, do you have something to add from that discussion that I missed or a perspective I didn't take? I see no hands. I hear Jordan is typing. Nothing from Jordan.

PATRICK DODSON:

Nothing really to add. Just to clarify that preparation of the materials to help this group understand more of what's involved in the performance management process, it's simply just compiling that and cleaning it up. It's part of the operational documentation, and it's very focused on employees and written that way. So the HR group, Diane and her team, want to just make sure they go through it and make sure that it makes sense so that it doesn't cause more questions than it answers. So hopefully that will be done here in the next week or so.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay, thank you for that. And that is what I had understood but, yes, it is more than I said, so thank you for adding that.

Someone has an open mic and [is eating]. It might be Cheryl. It might be – I don't know – but anyway...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, I [inaudible].

AVRI DORIA: Okay, because every once in a while I see your phone acting like it's talking, so I guess it's not yours. Anybody else want to ask a question about the staff engagement. And as I say, participation by others will happen after there has been a discussion among the senior staff about who best has the time and what have you to participate with us. Yes, George?

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Hi, Avri. Thank you. How far did you get in discussions with the group of staff that you mentioned in regard to really examining and solving any of the issues in your issues document? Was there real progress made, or are you still just structuring the space for the real discussion? Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, George. Specifically, structuring the space for the real discussion, to use your words. Basically, understanding what the questions were, understanding what the process was, the contributions and such. As I say, one of the last steps in it after we get this bit more of information is bringing in a couple of, not senior staff, but senior-ish staff members – I'm not sure who – that can actually participate in the discussion and going through the issues, and that will be done with the group. We weren't doing that as this smaller meeting. What we were

really trying to do is structure how we will go forward over the next six weeks. But thank you for the question. Okay, any other comments on that one?

If not, then the next step is to start going through the Issues Analysis Table. And Jordan – oh, Jordan lost audio for a bit but seems to be back, so welcome back. Jordan may want to take over part of this discussion. We have the issues table that has been worked on. Let me find that. I want to actually bring up the table in my system so that I see it.

But basically what Jordan and I discussed was the notion of finding a temporary spot on this and say, okay, we've gotten it [to] this first step. We want to take it to the plenary so that they a) see what is that we brought up since we [started the] discussion there and then [b)] make sure that they don't have anything to add and that they understand the context that we're working in.

What I did in preparation for this meeting and perhaps took too heavy a hand, but I don't think so, in terms of accepting the many suggestions and comments that people had put in so that we had a relatively clean document to go through here, the only one I didn't accept was Number 7, and that's because I was the writer of it and have got this kind of rule that says if one of the editors writes something, someone else has to accept it. So I didn't accept that one into the document but basically accepted everything else so that we can read through and we can change and fix what we have to at this point. But it has everybody's contributions folded in.

Jordan, did you want to say anything about this? I guess not. Okay. By the way, I'm assuming I can still be heard. It's total silence out there and not even an echo, so just please someone let me know that I am being heard.

ALAN GREENBERG: You are being heard, Avri.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We hear you, Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I was just about to hang up and retry. Okay.

So then going through this table, what I'd like to do is go through it row-by-row and see if people are comfortable with what it says there, see if there's anything they feel needs to be added or what have you at the moment and then move on. And then at the end, see if we're at the point where we're willing to send this forward.

Okay, so the first row, the issue is: "No forum in which community participants can safely raise and work through concerns about staff accountability or performance." That was the issue.

The contributions to the issue were (and I'm not quite sure I totally understand this first one): "Suggestion not made before?" And then the second point: "Fear that given staff role in relation to contracted

parties, criticism may lead to repercussions – that is where ‘safely raise’ comes from.”

I guess, if I understand correctly – yes, Jordan, please. I see your hand up. I do not hear you yet. Okay, Jordan says he’ll need a dial out, so I guess I’ll keep going for now. And then we can come back to whatever issue.

So on “Suggestion not made before?” I guess the point being made is that there is no forum because no one ever asked for it before? If that’s not a correct interpretation, then we should probably clarify.

And then the impacts: “Unexpressed concerns with performance mean potentially useful feedback does not reach the performance management system.” And second bullet: “ICANN organization may feel unresponsive to community concerns not expressed due to fears.”

Other than Jordan’s hand which is still up, any other comments on that? Or is that fairly adequately expressed? Okay, seeing no comment, I’m assuming it’s adequately expressed. Though George is typing and Jordan is being called and it is the row he had his hand up on.

George, we went through a first reading of this exercise a week ago. There have been edits in it since then. George’s question was: “Didn’t we go through this exercise a week ago?” That was a first reading of the first draft, and now we’re reading through it a second time as we try to do before moving on with it.

Okay, Jordan, are you here again?

JORDAN CARTER: Can you hear me this time, Avri?

AVRI DORIA: I can hear you this time, so please go ahead.

JORDAN CARTER: Sorry about that. I'm on a very slow connection, and it obviously wasn't letting me talk.

The only thing I was going to say was that we did work through [1-6] last time and there have been no changes to them. So I don't know if we should go through them one-by-one or just ask if there are any further comments on those to save a bit of time.

AVRI DORIA: That's fine. I can do that. I can just basically stop on each row and ask if anyone has any comments on it if people don't need the more detail.

JORDAN CARTER: I thought I might also take the opportunity to explain that first bullet point, the "Suggestion not made before?"

AVRI DORIA: Yeah.

JORDAN CARTER: Which is literally what it says. There might not be a forum for community people to raise and work through issues because no one has asked for it, no one has suggested it.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, that was the interpretation I took. I guess it was while you were in transition. I just wanted to make sure that I understood it because I wasn't completely clear.

Okay, so anyone else have a comment on Row 1 before we move on to Row 2? Alan, you speak of it's a best practice but not an efficient practice. Oh, you mean the practice of going through twice? Okay, and that's why we're trying to find a balance between best and efficiency because often the most efficient practice is the worst practice.

Okay, on Row 2, any...?

ALAN GREENBERG: I do have my hand up though.

AVRI DORIA: Oh, you do have your hand up. Please, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: This is the sixth of seven hours of meetings today. I'm allowed a little bit of flippancy at some point.

It's interesting. We see "no forum in which community participants can" raise issues. I don't know where we put it here, but even when issues are raised in the past they have typically been, from my experience, patently ignored. So even when you go out, put your own whatever at risk by calling out people, my experience has been you tend to get patted on the head saying, "Yes, yes, we understand. Don't worry. Things are going to get better," and you never hear anything about it again" and things don't necessarily get better. So I'm not sure if this falls into "no forum" or is yet another option. The receptiveness is never there even when you try to reach out and create a forum.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you, Alan. We should look through while we're going through the other rows and [if indeed it doesn't show] and if people think it belongs there, there's always room to add another row.

Okay, so keeping that in mind – and, yes, Jordan is saying it sounds like another issue to him, and so perhaps by the time I'll get to Row 7 there will be a Row 8. So anyhow, okay.

Row 2, were there any comments that anybody wanted to make on this one, which is the implementation development policy issue? It's an issue that's actually showing up in lots of discussions at the moment. No? No comments? No further additions on that? Adequate? Fantastic.

Move on to 3, concerns about culture, less focused on supporting community in its work than it should be. Any comments on that row? Okay, I see none, so we'll think that that one's okay to go forward.

Number 4 – oh, yeah. One thing I did add, for example, I added to 2 and I added to 5 were references but not any substance was changed in content.

Okay 4 was the institutionalized route for community feedback to be included in staff performance and accountability [systems]. That discussion on that row, anybody have any comments on that one? Is it fine as it stands? No objections? I see no hands. I hear no voices.

Okay, 5 is accountability commitments in terms of summaries and substantive responses to recommendations or concerns from public comments. Any comments on this one? There was a possibility that this one might have included some of the concerns Alan was speaking of before, but it really is specifically directed to comments in public comment periods. In this one, I did add the reference to the ATRT recommendation.

Okay, Number 6 is the new one, so I'll go through reading the row. Number 6 is: "No clear forum in which staff can safely raise and work through concerns about community members' behavior or performance." Under the considerations was: "Staff members have noted a similar concern about not having clear guidelines for raising concerns with community members they interact with and also fear retaliation if issues or concerns are raised." Then the second bullet says: "Could be out of scope for the Staff Accountability work, but it is a reasonable topic for future discussion in the ICANN system." Then there were no points in the third column, the impacts column, although I think that the impacts would be similar to others in terms of lack of understanding and doubts and a problem with trust.

I'll open it up for questions. In my feeling related to the second point of whether it's in scope, I would think that the other side of the coin of staff accountability would kind of have to be if what we're talking about is trust and we have an issue that sounds a lot like this one, then perhaps the mirror image of an issue we are covering would indeed be appreciate and in scope. So that would be my view on it. Anybody have a comment on Number 6? Okay, so in other words this one can be allowed to stand also? Okay.

Then the next one was one that had been discussed a couple times but didn't make it in, but I had told people that I would get it in so I did. It's: "Concern about the compensation scheme, including but not limited to at-risk bonus paid to staff, specifically whether they may be policy related or may relate to determining the completion target dates for community work or other aspects of community activities within ICANN."

Then under the contributions to the issue: "The concern is that this may constitute an exogenous inducement, similar to those that the community must list in their SOI (Statement of Interest) without being known by community participants." Then a second bullet: "Staff members are often in the position to recommend paths and possible solutions to the community members they work with. If there are incentives that may affect the recommendation they are making without those incentives being transparent, staff suggestions may be treated with suspicion." Then the impact was: "Contributes to uncertainty and doubt possibly affecting trust."

I'd like to open up discussion on that one. I see some stuff here in the chat. Is any of it stuff I should read? Okay, there was one discussion about the ability to invoke the Ombudsman in such issues, but there was sometimes even reluctance to do that. Jordan wrote – okay, so this was related to the previous: “I think contributions to that problem would be inconsistent approach by ICANN managers in dealing with feedback” – Jordan, it would really be good if other people spoke – “and maybe on an organizational culture that doesn't support addressing concerns raised by community participants.” Right. So, yeah, that was all related to Alan's point.

So coming back to 7 here, is this okay as listed and should it be accepted into the document? As I said, I wrote it so I did not accept it, but I will if people say it's okay to. Or Jordan can because I see he's in the document. It's okay? No comments? No questions? Okay. Yes, Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER:

I think it's fine to add at this point, remembering that our next stage for this [document] is to ask the whole CCWG for feedback. So I think at this point, we don't need to be too worried about adding stuff. I think we'll be doing a winnowing and consolidating process after we get some more issues from the whole group.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay, great. Thanks. Okay, and as I notice, seeing no other hands, and this is not on the sheet in front of you. You would have to go to the live document because it was, as I thought could happen, that Jordan as he says in the chat did write up the line for his impression of what Alan was

saying. So 8 now reads: “When concerns about a procrastinate incident or experience related to staff accountability (or performance) are raised, the response by ICANN managers has sometimes been to set the concerns aside and not respond. And this was marked as raised on call. I don’t know, Alan, whether you’ll want to comment on the description.

Then under the contributions: “Inconsistent approach to dealing with feedback among ICANN managers” and “organizational culture not supportive of addressing concerns when raised.” Then the impacts: “Could contribute to people not raising issues.” Second bullet: “Could contribute to concerns about staff accountability.”

Having heard that, following the pattern that Jordan said about winnowing comes later, any issues, questions, comments, suggestions on that one? Okay.

So we’re up to 8. Now I want to make sure that we have – I see no hands – that we have no one who objects to us taking this list as it currently stands, maybe some minor fixes if they go through, and sending it up to the plenary for discussion at the next plenary meeting. Any questions, comments, or what have you on that? I see no objections. I just want to make sure that we have a – yes, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I just want to make sure that they don’t view this as a first reading but as solicitation of comments.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay, yes, we’ll make sure of that.

HAVE

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. Okay, anyone else wish to comment? Yes, Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Avri. Yes, I think that we can send this document to the CCWG, and we can say, "Hi, all. We've been doing some work on identifying the key issues of staff accountability. Here's the list so far. The key questions we'd like you to think about are: Are there gaps in the issue set? Are you aware of problems that relate to the staff accountability topic that aren't referenced here? Can you think from your own experience about whether the ones that are already listed are actually issues, or is it the first time you've heard of them?

So we're trying to use the CCWG to fill in any gaps and to understand whether what's here is more systemic or whether it's more one-off cases that have been found. I think those are the two most useful bits of feedback to specifically ask people for.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, sounds good. Which one of us is going to write that up? We can talk about that later. So we basically need to include a slight cover note to this when we send it out.

Okay, Alan, I see your hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I have what I think is a new one. It's a brand new one, like the last making I was on. I honestly cannot recall other occurrences of it, so I'm not sure if it's a one-off or a systemic thing. But it was a situation where we were essentially asking for staff to do something and the response essentially came back saying, "We don't have the resources. We don't have enough people. We can't do that. Maybe volunteers should do it."

Like I said, I honestly can't remember staff coming back and saying that in other cases, and I'm wondering is this something which I've missed or is it common.

AVRI DORIA: I go with Jordan. Is it a staff accountability issue or is it a different issue? It may be, but it is an idea that I would say is starting to trend in various ways. I've certainly seen it. I don't know that I'd call it a systemic problem yet, but I've seen it. But is it a staff accountability issue? What do people think?

ALAN GREENBERG: What else is it if it's not that?

AVRI DORIA: Well, I asked Jordan's question, so maybe Jordan wants to explain the question. And, Greg, I see your hand.

JORDAN CARTER: Sorry. So the reason I asked that question was because I wondered whether it's an issue of organizational capacity and prioritization. I'm not saying it isn't an accountability issue. It seems to me though that if people say we don't have the capacity to do this, that's quite a good thing to hear rather than not saying it and not doing it. So on one angle it could be seen as a helpful approach to being open and accountable: to acknowledge that something can't be done. But on the other hand, if it reveals that prioritization setting [posture] of which the community has no visibility [and] no input into, I think that's an organization-wide problem that I've been trying to raise through the cross-community topics for the next ICANN meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess if the response was, "We don't have the resources. We'd be glad to sit down with you and try to write a request or a justification for more resources," which might get rejected for priority reasons as it moves up the ladder, that's a different answer. Just a thought.

AVRI DORIA: Right. It seems like if someone believes that a new row is required and we're in the "not winnowing but adding" mode, then it seems like a row with this should be added. Does anybody object? And it would be good to have the wording in there. I don't know if, Alan, you're in a position to go add a row.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not, and I'm not even sure...

AVRI DORIA: Let me go to some of the other hands now. I've still got yours up Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry.

AVRI DORIA: But Greg has had his up for a while.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Avri. My arm was getting tired. It's an interesting question. I will assume that staff accountability relates not just to frontline staff but really in a sense to all the staff within the organization up to the CEO. So it may be that frontline staff who are dealing with this were absolutely sincere, that they're going flat out and exhausted and whether or not they would respond to a request in response to help write a request for more staff.

So this is in a sense certainly an organizational accountability or maybe what Göran is calling "the organization" being accountable, which isn't quite one of our subjects but staff accountability is closest to it because we used to call it "staff" until he called it "organization." It may be that this is a higher level of staff accountability in the sense that somebody above those staff who are dying of exhaustion while they're trying to do

our work is maybe not paying attention to adequately resourcing volunteers in some form, or maybe they're not being informed.

So there is definitely a staff accountability issue here, but it's not quite of the "there is a staff member I am interacting with who is not giving me what I think I need or needs to be accountable for something." We don't quite know where in the chain of command the issue lies, but it certainly lies somewhere in what we would call "the staff." Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay. Alan says he's willing to drop it at the moment. I did add another row to the table, but I haven't added any other words. Before sending it on, I would certainly want us to have something written. And if we're not going to wordsmith something now and if somebody doesn't have words that they want to stick in, I would say let it go for now and see if we can think of it and perhaps bring it up again at the plenary meeting as a suggested other topic. But I don't know that we've done enough thinking on it yet to have words for it. It didn't come as trippingly off the tongue as the "pat on the head and be told to go away." Alan is agreeing with that approach. Greg, your hand is still up. Is that for a further comment or a remnant?

GREG SHATAN:

Just a further comment that I think we do need to put a pin in this in some fashion, whether it's the more specific issue of just being told "we don't have the resources." I'm trying to think what has happened in that regard in my experience. I can't think of it per se, but it has happened rarely. But nearly always, staff seems to bend over backwards in my

experience to try to do something. Although sometimes things do seem to fall between the cracks and I end up being the nudger rather than the nudgee.

And then there's the larger question of organizational accountability. Accountability by the organization, but we're not quite sure where in this accountability needs to be found. So I think those are two points that may have come out of this. I'm not sure whether either of them goes in the table, but we shouldn't lose them if possible. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay. Patrick has suggested: "Appropriate methods for addressing requests that exceed bandwidth, resources, budget, etc." Is that an adequate expression of the issue?

In fact, there are even indeed large examples of this. For example, but this was done very upfront in terms of how WS2 was being managed, that because of the budget that was being applied to the effort, all of the WS2 work in the subgroups was going to require more intensive efforts by rapporteurs and presenters even though the staff has then done more than they said they would do, but that it wouldn't come with the full panoply of services we were all used to from Work Stream 1. That was an example of when there was a bandwidth constraint and it was announced upfront. There was: "Here. You control your budget and decide how it will be spent." So that was a place where that consideration was taken into account, but it's an exception.

So I just pasted in Patrick's [so] that we have it there, and perhaps we can think of other words. Is there objection to including that

fragmentary Number 9 there as a pin on a new subject? No objection? I assume the green check is agreeing to no objection, so we'll leave it in. Okay, thank you.

Okay, do I think we have got the essence of an issues table. I think if anybody is looking online, that they'll see that Line 9 is being filled in from the discussion we just had. I certainly can put out a PDF of this at the end of the meeting since there were some things that were heard but not seen. And people can take a look at it, and we won't send it off for a couple days. Bernie, when is our deadline for getting this submitted to the plenary?

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

23:59 Wednesday next week UTC.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. Very precise answer. Okay, so we may put up a PDF here and let it sit just to give people a chance to comment on the words that are being added as we speak now so that we have this one in as well. If anybody objects to 9 as it was put in later, we can strike 9 and go with the previous 8 that we already discussed.

Okay, that would have us moving on in the agenda unless there are any more words on the Issues Analysis Table. The next thing is basically just taking a look at where we're at on the other document efforts and discussing any issues that came up about them.

The first one relates to the roles of the Board and the staff. It basically relates to the delegations document that was discussed last time. And

also an issue was brought up on the list. I'm not sure it's an issue that we need to deal with, but I wanted to make sure that it didn't get lost. It was by Greg in terms of the relationship of the CEO and the Board and who does strategy and all of that. So I wanted to make sure that we didn't lose that and put that on the agenda for discussion. But, Jordan, since this is the document that you have been tending, I wonder if you wanted to take the floor on this.

JORDAN CARTER: Yeah, just briefly, Avri. Sorry, my typing stuff in the Adobe room isn't working because the Internet connectivity is so bad.

AVRI DORIA: Actually, it's showing up.

JORDAN CARTER: Well, some of it is. I'm lagging, I think.

Anyway, the point I was going to make just is that at the last call I promised to write a one-pager. That is what that second bullet point under this item 4.1 says. We were going to explore whether the ICANN delegations document and plus [inaudible] how the community relates to that might serve as a documentary part of that first bullet point and in the Work Stream 1 report. I haven't written that document yet because of the work that I get paid to do and got busy. So I intend to do it this weekend when I don't have to do any paid work. That should be fun. So I just wanted to apologize for that not happening as promised.

And then to say that I thought that Greg's [e-mail] on the existing delegations document was very interesting, and I think it does relate to staff accountability in the sense that if the Board doesn't delegate appropriate levels of authority to the CEO or hold the CEO accountable for doing the strategy piece, then the whole organization's performance and ability to be held to account is likely to be compromised. So I thought it was a good point to raise.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay, thank you. Anybody else wish to comment further on the delegations or the point made by Greg or any other points in relation to the guidelines? If not, I'll move on. Yes, Greg, please.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. Just briefly, when I was first commenting on that, I didn't realize that what I was commenting on was actually a standing ICANN document. I thought I was commenting on our characterization, but it's really ICANN's characterization of the delegation. It seems to me to be a bit off, both with regard to what the innate tasks of the CEO versus the Board are. And also, the idea that all delegation somehow stems from the Board, which is rather interesting.

It may be appropriate in this case where the Board may be viewed as the thing that ties the community and the organization together, but it's certainly from my novice-to-intermediate level knowledge of corporate governance an unusual way to look at the role of the executive function within an organization. So just [inaudible] my observations and wondering where that might go. I'd actually be curious to know what

George as a Board member thinks of this point. Just curious. Thanks.
Bye.

AVRI DORIA: Thanks. [inaudible] Did you want to answer now, or did you want to listen to everybody else first and then give us an answer?

GEORGE SADOWSKY: I better listen to everybody else, but let me just say that the Board governs what the CEO; the CEO does everything else. That's a very high-level view of the delegation of authority. But I guess from that point of view, it is the Board where authority starts. We hire the CEO. We tell him what to do. There's obviously an interplay between the CEO and the Board, and then CEO then directs the staff to achieve the goals that the CEO [and] the Board have agreed upon. But I get the feeling there has to be more to this discussion because that's too simplistic. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you, George. Jordan has his hand up, then I put my hand up to make a personal comment on this issue. I saw Cheryl. I thought she might have her hand up or want to speak at a point, but I'm not sure. But anyhow, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Avri. I just wanted to – I don't know if this came across in the last call or whether everyone was here – but the [inaudible] report back

I guess from the meeting that we had with staff did indicate that this document is part of an evolving improvement to the clarity about what is delegated and what isn't from the Board to the CEO. So it was kind of characterized as a work in progress and where things are at, at the moment, and not a last word or necessarily a document that had been around for a very long time. So that might just be some kind of context to keep in mind when discussing it.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. I would assume though that this discussion is part of what gets included in the paper that you're writing about questions and comments on these delegations.

In terms of my personal view what I wanted to add is I remember that there were a fair number of us that at the time that a new CEO was being looked at, we were saying, "Hey, folks, strategy belongs to the community and the Board and, therefore, we need someone who executes." Now obviously, not going so far as to say, "Therefore, our president is just an executive director," but basically taking that kind of awareness that in ICANN it is the community through the Board that expresses strategy and that it isn't determined by the CEO, that we didn't need another CEO with a grand vision of what ICANN should do.

So that discussion is part of the push and pull that we see, and I was very much on one side of that and that's why I raised my hand to make a personal comment on perhaps the appropriateness of the interpretation. Thanks. And now I'll put the hat back on.

Any other comments? George, did you want to follow up with anything based on what was said?

GEORGE SADOWSKY:

Not really, except to say that I think you're correct regarding the "draftiness" of the document with respect to its status. You will not be surprised to know that occasionally the Board and the CEO need to clarify their respective roles, and I believe that this was a document that was attempting also to address that. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. Any other comments on the 4.1 document? The roles and delegations and such? Okay, seeing no other hands, hearing no other comments, we have ten minutes left. And thank you, Bernie. I see you said it also. If I had read the list, I wouldn't have said it because it was already said.

4.2 was the current and recommended accountability measures. That's essentially the Doc B. That, there has been no new text really added. A few minor edits. But basically that one is still waiting to go forward and show. Basically, if you look at the next steps on all the documents, that one will be updated after we've seen the process review material to see where some of the things we've talked about and also after we have worked through the issues and come up with remedies, if any of those remedies or recommendations require some new procedure. So that work will be very much driven by the solutions to the issues, and so it's still a little premature on it. But trying to make sure that it's ready to quickly put content in once that's available. Any questions or comments

on that document? As you noticed, I'm trying to get away. So that's where we are.

So moving on to Next Steps, on the issues document basically its "send issues list to plenary for discussion and review." But what I'm going to do first is make sure that the final row has been completed and put out a PDF and send it to you all for a last check for a day or two so that I can send it in by Tuesday of next week, so at least one day before the deadline.

So that, and then we have to start working on, after the review, anything that gets added or changed in the plenary, but then start developing possible responses to those issues. Hopefully, we'll have some staff participants for that discussion.

On the delegations, there's still the pending one-pager. Already discussed on measures after the document. Then I added a bullet here: "On all docs: participants, please periodically do an edit pass, get familiar with the documents, recommend text, add comments."

All the documents we're working on are live in Drive. For anyone that can't get access to Drive, you have the PDF. It's a little bit more laborious to do a cut and paste of the line you want to change and then tell us how you want it changed, but I'll put those through or Jordan will put those through once we get them. So if you can't get the Drive, that's one of the reasons for putting out the PDFs: you can still tell us what needs to be fixed.

Okay, any questions on Next Steps? Okay.

The schedule update has not changed, but what has changed is the line below where we said we may need to add weekly meetings to try and get done by mid-May, by end-May what we want to get done. Hopefully, I mean, if we finish stuff early, if we don't end up needing the meetings, we can cancel. But we had no meetings scheduled for May because when I had originally slotted in meetings, I was sure our schedule had us being done by April so I didn't schedule any.

So basically I have tried to schedule something and fit something in, still maintaining the rotation as best I could with available slots and trying to give a couple days in between and making sure that they were days that both Jordan and I looked like we could be at and came to a list of other meetings. So I just wanted to let people know. I understand if everybody can't make all of them, but the more of us we have making them the better chance we have of something reasonable.

Any questions or comments on the updated meeting schedule? Of those, only one of them had already been in the schedule.

Okay, what have I missed? Somebody has to go clean horse stalls. Oh, I was thinking that would be a preferable expenditure of time. I understand. Okay, so anybody have any final comment on that? Anybody have Any Other Business? Hearing no other business, seeing nobody typing – unless people are typing their goodbyes, they are typing their goodbyes – in which case, I thank you very much. You can end the recording. The meeting is adjourned. Thanks, and Happy Holiday, etc. – Passover, Feast of Easter, everything.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]