JORDAN CARTER:	There we go. Jordan Carter, .nz, one the ccSNO members of the Accountability CCWG. Welcome to this meeting of the Staff Accountability Working Group of the CCWG on Friday, the 7th of April at 05:00 UTC. Thank you all for joining the meeting.
	We've got an agenda in front of us on the screen and that you've had in your e-mail. Our first item is to do an agenda review. If there are any topics that you'd like to see raised or discussed on that agenda and don't fit into the General Business category, now would be a good time to raise them. Or if you think of them during the call, we can deal with them at the end in AOB. So if you do have those, feel free to type them and raise your hand.
	We'll note that the attendance is asked per the Adobe Room. If there is anyone who is here only by telephone, could you please tell us now that you're hear by phone so we can get your name on the attendance list?
GEORGE SADOWSKY:	George. I didn't realize there was Adobe Room. I'll look for it. Thank you.
JORDAN CARTER:	It's the MSSI Project room, George, if that helps.
GEORGE SADOWSKY:	Thanks.

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: So George Sadowsky –

AVRI DORIA: Jordan? Avri. George, you're 1933 – the phone number. We should identify you as 1933.

JORDAN CARTER: Yeah, I think it must be because that number moved when George was speaking. So I think we can assume that it is him.

On the SOI check, if there are any updates that anyone needs to make to their – I don't know what's going on with that, sorry, my browser went crazy – to Statements of Interest, could you please let us know now?

Assuming not, if you do have those, if you remember you've had a chance in your interest declaration, please feel free to share that with the staff and the staff e-mail list.

That's the kind of intro material. The next item on our list is on the engagement with ICANN staff. I'll give a brief report back of a call that I had with Patrick Dodson, who's on the call, from ICANN staff. Also on that call were Samantha Eisner from ICANN Legal and the person who does HR for ICANN, Diane Schroeder. Have I got all those names right, Patrick?

AVRI DORIA: I don't see Patrick on the call, but I do believe those are the people attending.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay. Thanks, Avri. Through our scheduling and invitation mix-up, Avri was hoping to be on that call as well, but we didn't actually manage to get her the details, so she wasn't on it. We'll have a follow up call next week.

I'm just going to give in this item an update to you on that how that discussion went. I think at the last [inaudible]. And just a standing note to please keep your microphone on mute if you're not speaking.

AVRI DORIA: This is Avri. Actually, Patrick is here. Sorry.

JORDAN CARTER: Yeah. He and Yvette are the hosts of this call. I think we've got the names right, so we can move on.

The purpose of the call followed on from the discussion that Avri briefed you all on last week that she and I had, along with Thomas Rickerts, at ICANN in Copenhagen. That was to set up some conversations for me as the co-rapporteur dealing with our Document A on the roles of the community, Board, and staff. And Avri, Document B, on the existing HR systems. We had agreed [on] those calls to just get us in touch with the right people in ICANN as a starting point for discussion.

With Avri not being there, we focused a little bit on the roles document. We worked through the guidelines on delegations that have been shared with us before to see whether that met the requirements in our Work Stream 1 report about what we needed to do and that part of the report that specified that work that turned into Document A. I can give a bit more of a background about that document when we come to Item 4 on this agenda.

The other thing we talked briefly about was the issues table, which has been floating around for a couple of weeks now and which we need to bring to a close at this drafting point.

I just want to say thank you to the staff for the call. It was a really constructive and useful discussion. It helped provide some context to some of how the ICANN staff decided this discussion is seeing things. We didn't get into the discussions particularly about general staff participation in the work of this working group. There still needs to be another group between this group and Avri as well to talk about Part B of the work. But it was a good start to the conversation and I think it will flow through into staff being able to make a contribution.

What I basically asserted is that we want and need the input of ICANN as an organization to make this a useful process in improving staff accountability. It can't be extremely imposed. It needs organizational buy-in and it needs to be clear about what the community is looking for.

I think that I would like to hand over to Patrick. Patrick, are there any other elements of the chat we had earlier this week that you'd like to talk about at this point?

PATRICK DODSON: Thanks, Jordan. I don't know if I have anything else to add. I'll echo your sentiments as far as it being a productive conversation. We were encouraged by the dialogue – I know from Sam and Diane. I think that clarifying that this call that happened this week – and the one next week is really focused on just asking questions for clarification and context. Having the discussion about the right way to move forward – from the Board's perspective, make sure that we have the right staff members involved on the conversations as the issues are identified, as not all staff folks are equal in their experience or ability to contribute. So, all good and I'm looking forward to continue the discussion.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Patrick. I guess the only other thing that came from that conversation that I should mention is that I invited Patrick and the other staff if there any particular staff issues in terms of that issues table. I think you'll see some track changes from Patrick, which we can discuss in our next agenda item.

It is important to stress, I think, that, in case anyone was wondering or concerned, that you certainly have my word that we're not going to try as co-rapporteurs to turn this discussion with some senior staff into a sidelining of this working group. It is that kind of coordination and dialogue and understanding context better as the discussion moves on. All the discussion, the substantive discussion and decisions, will be happening in this group, which is what our job is as this group. It's where the conversation needs to happen.

Are there any questions about that update, or should we move onto the next item, the issues analysis table?

I don't see any hands waving or frantic typing in the chat, so we will move on. The issues analysis table has been presented to you all. I guess that you've got the Google Doc link from the agenda. I might just try to find it to paste it in to the chat as well, which I can do there. If you want to look at the live version of it, it should be that one. The PDF version that the staff put up is [helpful to look at]. That doesn't make clear the tracked changes that have appeared in the last few days because I think when you PDF a Google Doc it doesn't necessarily carry the tracked changes over, which is one of the downsides of [this], unfortunately. If you're having a look at this and you're following it, it would be preferable if you could take a look at the living electronic copy.

The point we need to get out of this discussion is really to say whether there are any other headline issues remaining in terms of the left-hand column. If we think what's in the contributions to the issue or impact of the issue columns is good enough – what it needs to be good enough for is not perfection and not some kind of memorialization that is a statement of our views about these definitely being impacts and contributions in a written-in-stone way; what it needs to be good enough for is to be able to take forward for some plenary discussion.

So if there's anything that's obviously erroneous in there, we need to fix that. It's okay, I think, at this point to have a lack of agreement about whether the contributions are necessarily the right ones or the impacts are the right ones because what we want to do is tease out some discussion, I think, from the Plenary. Obviously if we have a huge view

that something in there is wrong, we can take it out. Of course, if we think there's a big gap in this table, we can add stuff into it.

The only other thing I would like to say – oh, Yvette is see is having another go at this. Yvette, if you are, the easiest way to turn this into a fully comprehensive PDF, I think, would be to download it as a Word Document and make sure you're tracking the changes. Then PDF that tracking changes version of the Word document. It should keep over the changes. Good luck with that.

The only other point I wanted to make was just a restatement of the reason for this table. What we settled on as a method as your co-rapporteurs with the idea that we should be clear about what the issues are that we're trying to solve and what the impacts are and the causes are before we try to move onto to making solutions for them. So our work that will come together in the next phase after we've worked out what the issues will be some solution generation. Then when we place things up for the Plenary in the middle of May, the idea should be, "These are the key problems, and this is our proposal for how to start solving them." It won't need to be a "boil the oceans, solve everything at once" approach because ICANN is evolving, not having a revolution. That'll be the next phase of the work.

With all that said – sorry that I'm talking a lot – are there any general comments about what's in the table or are there any specific points that have been raised that people have queries about or want to add to? Any introductory comments?

EN

Because I see none, what we'll do is we'll just take a little walk through each line of the table, which will just identify the issues. It is, I think, reasonable that these aren't a huge swag of issues. We don't have to have a huge list at this point because, remember, we'll be asking the community in the end whether they think these are the right issues and whether they like our solutions. So we'll have a large set of eyes being able to add things or shape this in the future.

If we have a look at the first line, which is community persons having a forum to [inaudible] and work through any concerns about staff accountability or performance, the sort of contribution that was suggested about why this must be issue is that maybe it hadn't been suggested before. There's this fear that's been noted that, given the staff [of the] contracted parties any criticism of staff may be [to] repercussion. That's where the safety raising came from.

So it seems in terms of working this through that the impact might be that there are unexpressed concerns of performance from time to time, which might mean that ICANN isn't getting feedback that would help it improve its performance, and people may then feel that ICANN is being unresponsive when it would like to be responsive but isn't getting information that would help it to do so.

I hope that the model makes sense. Are there any comments about that? Or should we move onto the next?

I realize that people read and think about this stuff at different paces, so I'll keep pushing on. But if you realize you had something to say about something, we won't hesitate to back up and go back to it.

The second item issue is staff seen as crossing the line from policy implementation to development or decision and that there is currently no way to address that problem. Some contributions might be staff concerned with making sure things are implementable and implementing them may solve things that then are seen by others, maybe community persons, as crossing the line into policy development. Maybe the policy development process doesn't adequately document policy to an implementable state, so staff has no choice but to fill in gaps that end up making policy. Maybe there's no process to reconcile policy implementation with development, leading to disagreements not being solved.

There's another bullet – I think suggested by Jeff – that implementation is seen as solely staff's responsibility as opposed to all parties having to do that role. There's the registry that [inaudible] staff on that. The registries have made themselves available to help on those matters.

So those are some hypothetical contributions. Then there's another comment just over the page in the PDF on the screen. Maybe the issue is disbanding of policy teams prior to implementation, so there'd be no clear reference points [out for] questions during implementation. It may be that the way that the processes are drawn out that informal offers to contribute don't work out.

The impact of that staff being seen [through] that might be impact on relationships. It might cause conflict, and it might have implementability issues. In other words, because ICANN staff are filling in some gaps, they implement policy in a way that is not as technically feasible as some would hope or can't be done for business reasons and so on.

EN

So it's about that set of issues. How is that feeling? Avri, I see you've got your hand up. Please go ahead.

AVRI DORIA: Thanks. I think this is a well-expressed, but one of the things that I'm not sure where it fits in – probably a contribution to the issue – is that, last year, a whole new set of procedures was put in and approved. This is with the gTLDs. But it can serve as an example. I'm not sure the degree to which it's being used yet, but given the long tail that there is on any policy effort while it's going through the implementation stages, these are these Implementation Review Teams that have been created and have been made part of the process, where a set of the members of the Policy Team remain as part of a working Implementation Review Team available both to help when an issue is noticed and to watch the implementation and raise flags when something is noticed that seems to be running wrong.

So there is a process. In fact, also, within the GNSO, a new form of PDP was put through in terms of the expedited PDP, which is basically, if, during the time of implementation, some policy gap is noticed, there's a process for that.

The final part of that whole policy implementation relationship, which is basically seen as 90% policy/10% implementation at the beginning of a process and 90% implementation and 10% policy at the end of a process, has all been documented and did go through an approval process, I believe, up to the Board. So that's probably a document we should bring in here as a contribution to this discussion because there

was quite a bit of work done for about two years on trying to get this straightened out. The fact that it's still an issue a year after that went into effect is something that probably needs to be looked at. Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Avri. I think that raises a really good question, which is something we need to decipher and disentangle in all of these issues, which is: how contemporary are they? In other words, we don't want issues that were issues a number of years ago that people have held onto and that have actually been solved. It sounds like what you're suggesting is that there have been process changes that reduce the potential impact of the problem.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah.

JORDAN CARTER: The other question – I don't think it applies to this – is whether it's the result of a one-off challenge or if it's a more systemic problem.

AVRI DORIA: If I can, there are still old PDP policies that were put into place before this process that are still in the implementation tail. So indeed in those cases, while the expedited PDP is available to them, they may not have created these Implementation Review Teams. So anybody can do an expedited PDP – I mean, anybody can request it. The Board can request it. The Council itself can start it, etc. and such. But on some of the older

PDPs that are still in implementation, there may not have been the Implementation Review Team. But any policy process that ended within the last half-year or year should have one of them.

JORDAN CARTER: Great. Okay. Thanks for that filling out, Avri. Of course, in organizations which have intermittent participation, they do an extensive meeting structure like this, where people across the community pay varying levels of attention. In my experience in our smaller version of ICANN at home, it takes at least a year-and-a-half for things to shift. So it'd be unsurprising if there were a lag effect involved.

I've jotted a few little notes in the end of the contributions to this issue that signal these questions, which people are welcome to review in the Google Doc. I still think it's worth putting up with the question explicitly asked – whether these changes have resolved in getting wider CCWG feedback.

I also note Patrick's point in the chat. Patrick, it may be worth popping that also into the G Doc.

So I think it's going to tease out a really interesting discussion. That's my view. I hope you all feel the same. It might be worth us popping onto the next of these five or six issues. If you've got any further notes to add, I think it would be good to do those. If we need to add a notes column or something, we can do that as well.

The next one was one of the four that came up in the list at Copenhagen because those are the [inaudible] of the ICANN staff is less focused on

supporting the community's work and policy development that it should be. I said the contributions that – I just copied that in and I drafted these – I said that it was uncertain what the contributions might be to that. I said in terms of impact to validate it. It might see the community thinking the staff focuses on other matters.

My inclination is that we should leave that there with that lack of detail to draw people's eyes to it and to seek their input on it. I personally have no examples in mind of evidence that this is the case. I think that the only one that comes to mind for me is some of the Work Stream 2 info from ICANN staff being probably a lot slower than I would have hoped. But actually that didn't feel like a cultural issue.

Are there any comments on this one from anyone? If not, we will rock on to the next one.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: This is George. Sorry. I had trouble finding the mute button. It was interesting to me. You pointed out that you had no examples to provide. Does anybody on the call have any examples to provide?

If not, I think it would be worth finding out to what extent this is a burning issue or a serious issue or perhaps an occasional issue. Right now, there's no sense of how important this is. If you had lots of examples of this, it really would be a burning issue. So how do you prioritize this in terms of seriousness of issue? Thank you.

EN

JORDAN CARTER:	Thanks, George. I think that's the right question to ask. Given that there are no examples that have been provided on the subgroup so far anyway, Cheryl has got an example: [to have] slow responses on requests for information back in ATRT1 days. So I think I might say no to specific examples provided by the subgroup to start examples of slow staff responses to information needs [inaudible]. We could just say that and ask for the bigger – there's about 40 or 50 or 60 people on the full CCWG call. We might get more input there. Having that wider group give an impression about that will help us prioritize these, I think.
GEORGE SADOWSKY:	Okay. I agree.
JORDAN CARTER:	Thanks, George. Cool. All right. I think that that sort of consequence or impact statement is fair; that if it was validated, there might be perception that arose that people were focused on something else.

Let's move onto our next line, which is about: no institutionalized route for community feedback to include staff performance and accountability systems. The suggestion there was that the causes are [bad] or causes of contributions. That might be that it had never been asked for, that a traditional strict-line-of-management approach may not have sought feedback outside the organization. There's a possibility that community input might be unconstructive or negative. Related to that, there might be the possibility that there's a fear of community input being [that]. |

Then there's the idea of presenting. Patrick raised the question of the idea of presenting to specific staff member feedback; things around [inaudible] issues that are functional and not individual staff level. There's a concern here that there's no [inaudible] providing input or if staff was to input and the effectiveness of the org at a functional level.

I want to come back to that comment in a moment. The impact that seems evident from no route for feedback might be that the absence of that being taken into account might be low confidence in the organization otherwise and a feeling of a lack of voice on those [inaudible] outside the organization.

Patrick asked whether it was counter to a systemic issues focus, and I just wanted to say that, from my point of view as a co-rapporteur, in this table and the process, we're trying not to get hung up on any individual concerns. There's certainly to be no targeting of individual staff in the work of this subgroup of the CCWG. But I think that should be distinguished from whether there might be systemic or process changes that do seek input on the performance of individuals.

I just said that in the comments and Patrick said, "Thanks for the clarification." I think that if there are any process adjustments like this – and they would be ones that are negotiated by and implemented by the ICANN organization – and so it's pretty clear that that would have appropriate and – I don't know what the right word is – it might be safety built into it so that constructive feedback from community members could be taken on board and staff that was – if there's anything that was less appropriate than that – kind of people with a grudge or an historic thing that they didn't like or personality clash or

some kind of vendetta or something else inappropriate would be discounted and ignored.

I'm sure that you can build systems like this. We try and do it in my own organization. But how do people sit with that one? Patrick, I don't know if I've fairly represented your comment. And George, I see your hand up. So are there comments on this one?

GEORGE SADOWSKY: It's an old hand. Sorry. It's going down.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay. Thanks, George.

Patrick, did I get the sense right of that comment, the back and forth that we had?

PATRICK DODSON: You did. That was very helpful, keeping me mindful of how we want to use examples or not. I think I'm curious, this one feels very much related to, from an issues perspective, the first issue in the table. I think it's speaking more to I think the need from the community to have a forum for feedback either directly because of situational things and then more along the course of being able to make sure that input from the community is reflected in managerial performance evaluations of staff members and even their functions as you get up into the exec level and Göran.

JORDAN CARTER: I for one completely agree with you. I think they're well-connected. In the Google Docs I'm just numbering these issues. I might make a note that just says "connection with issue one."

I don't see any other hands up there so why don't we move on to the next line which is now called issue five, and, "Staff may not be [meaning] ICANN's accountability comments and the way they summarize and substantively respond to recommendations or concerns expressed in public comments [but] submitted by community members." And that [kind of at] the face-to-face meeting.

And in terms of the contributions to that I just said that it was uncertain because no one had explained it to me and I wrote the table, whether it was unclear expectations, resource constraints, difference of view about requirements, and I thought that if that was happening – they weren't consistently meeting quality on responding to public comments – the impact of that might be [in] inadequate consideration of public comments during consultation processes.

So again, I kind of feel like this is one that came up in Plenary that no one has sort of evidenced appropriately and should be floated back up to Plenary to see if people think that it's a realistic issue or an historic one or it's something that should be dealt with systemically, some kind of look at that question.

Avri, your hand is up.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah. This is another one where the ATRT 2 had [to] put out one of its recommendations which I believe the Board had supported for there being a method or a mechanism by which, when the synthesis of comment came out, that those that had made the comments had opportunity to comment on them and ask for clarification, corrections, what have you. I'm not sure that I've actually seen that mechanism in effect. Now this was a recommendation that was made I guess five years ago and so it is something that I definitely should have seen and perhaps I missed it, but I'm not sure that we ever got that "implemented."

So looking at that ATRT 2 recommendation and as we move on, I'll dig it out so that there's a reference, may also be a useful part of the consideration [part]. [Because] was that implemented as was recommended and approved by the Board?

JORDAN CARTER: Great. Thanks, Avri. That's really helpful. And I've just added a note there to say we should check it against ATRT 2 Review recommendation the [method] to ask commenters to comment back on the summary and ask for clarifications, corrections, etc.

I'm conscious that we're halfway through the call. Patrick notes that there is a wide variation in how different staff departments in other parts of the community handle the comments and having gone through Work Stream 1 of this effort, I certainly know that we had widely different approaches to how we were dealing with comments from time to time.

The next one is interesting, and actually Patrick, since you jotted it in I think I'd like to ask you to speak to it if you might [inaudible].

PATRICK DODSON: [Inaudible] That's fine, Jordan. I'm happy to. I think I was looking at this and part of this is reflected in one instance within Annex 12 guidance for Work Stream 2 for this group in looking at bidirectional forums for feedback, even though the predominant focus of this is on staff accountability I know and have heard expressed within the org over time that there at times also lacks the same level of clarity on how to formally or informally – regardless appropriately – focus on feedback of any issues that the staff members have with community folks.

So putting this in here and Jordan, I think you have some very valid comments on it so if anything I'm raising it from the perspective of being mindful of it, especially as we're having the discussion very much about staff accountability and making sure that that doesn't feel like solely a one-way street.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Patrick. That's a helpful suggestion. My suggestion back and comments and it wasn't actually quite on this comment per se, but I actually made it in response to [inaudible] Patrick added in issue four about [institutionalized your] community feedback which was I think that if there is a feeling for a need for that it would be totally reasonable for [us of] ICANN as a corporation, the organization if that's the word we're calling it, to develop a process and then start working with the community leadership to talk about it.

EN

My quizzical question was whether we as a small working group within the Accountability Work Stream 2 work would be appropriate for that or whether it was beyond our pay grade whether that's a big picture issue of the community's relationship with the organization and how it's doing its work might best be done at a more senior level maybe with the SO/AC leadership and so on. But still encouraging this is an issue that the organization and staff face and they should totally feel at liberty to address it [inaudible].

PATRICK DODSON: Thank you, Jordan. That's helpful and I think without running the risk of obviously extending beyond the scope of this group, I think that it would be seen as helpful by the organization if the CCWG on Accountability – while maybe not directly addressing it – does raise it as something for future consideration or that the organization and community leadership should look at this I think would be helpful just as a nod toward it being something that's appropriate and welcome if there's a need there.

JORDAN CARTER: Great. Thanks, Patrick.

Herb, your hand is up. Go ahead.

HERB WAYE: Yes. Thank you. Just to continue on that final point you raised and the previous one it links to in the other direction, I can confirm to you that those issues are valid concerns. I had a meeting today with several of the managers of the various complaint intake units and one of the

concerns that we discussed was exactly that – the lack of a clear process for that communication to be conducted in both directions. Feel free to continue in this direction with this type of discussion because it is something that is on the radar of the organization and myself, and your input will definitely be constructive and helpful. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER: Great. Thanks, Herb. So I think we should leave it in with just noting that it might be out of scope and comments and just see what feedback we get from the full CCWG.

And so that's where through the issues that are there. I'm going to – because we're low on time at this point; we've only got 20 minutes left – quickly, are there any other big issues that people have been sitting on and not sharing with the group at this point?

I'm assuming that the answer to this is no, but you never know. And if you still have one and you don't want to talk about it but you want to type it, please go and type it into that table in the next day or [two].

George, your hand is up.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Yeah. It's not a big issue. It's sort of a meta issue. I'm impressed by how you could categorize almost all of these issues as a lack of adequate communication with a corollary that there is a lack of a space in which to have it that's sometimes needed. Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, George, and I share that analysis and think that might go to the heart of the solutioneering process that we're going to need to launch very shortly, and I think we're going to talk about that later in the agenda.

On that note, I think we'll wrap this agenda item up. Thank you all for that work through and I think we've got a bit of validation that what we've got there is worthwhile, recognizing that some people who were opinionated on some of these questions aren't on the call. And that's okay. Not everyone can come on every call but they may come back with some different issues at the CCWG Plenary which is why we work through these things more than once.

Thank you. Could we please pop the agenda item – actually we might not need it – agenda item next is Document A "Goals of Board, Staff, Community."

This is the time frame that we're under. What I want to just do is make a proposal that's slightly different to what was in the agenda. It's important I guess to state my understanding of ICANN's history in delegating powers from the Board to the staff is one of which you might call evolutionary. The organization is still developing. The guidelines that were agreed by the Board in November last year have already been updated I think quite recently, and so what you see is a nascent and improving set of clarities about Board and staff responsibilities, and that's what the existing document that was linked in the agenda does quite well. And it may be that as you read that document you can see some gaps or some questions and I'm going to invite you – and I'll start a thread on the sub-group e-mail list – to invite you to share some

thoughts. If the staff could note that as an action point for me, for Jordan, to start a thread on the existing delegations document.

You'll recall we had our long, multi-hundred-thousand page document about the Doc A stuff. And the proposal I wanted to get your feedback on in this call was whether we could have a link to this delegation document that talks about mainly relationship between the ICAN Board, staff, and CEO, and have a short one-page paper which I'm happy to draft – knowing me, it might end up being a two-page paper – that just contextualizes that document and adds in a bit of the story about the community's role as well. And that might be that Document A that we had been working through previously. I just wanted to see how that suggestion fit with you. We don't have time now to work through this whole document.

George has identified the fact that I've skipped a bullet point in the agenda and –

GEORGE SADOWSKY: I think it's telling because that's part of the communication issue. The staff has given us some questions and I think they're relevant questions and the answers should be interesting. I'm wondering has there been any action taken on that? What's the status of that item? Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER: The reason that I'm struggling is I don't have the [inaudible] me. Right. And what you are talking about, George, is the staff response to questions that we asked them. And that's the third bullet point in the

Issues Analysis table. And the reason that I skipped over that was because I didn't see it in the soft copy of the agenda or [inaudible] because I skipped over it. And I didn't mean to skip over it. We've got a draft document that we've started where we started drafting responses to those staff questions. And it has slipped off the agenda, is I think the short way to put it and we should pull it back onto the agenda and have the courtesy of a reply even though at this point it's getting on for four months late because answering those questions is actually material to keeping [being] polite and it is kind of relevant to the work.

Avri, I see your hand is up on this one.

AVRI DORIA: Yes. I don't actually think that it's slipped off. I think that [one] and a question I would have to what extent have the issues in these questions [get] included in the staff contribution to the issues that we've got on the table and I'm not sure.

We also basically have two different documents on this. There is one where we started with a set of answers but then we went into the halt on taking both Document A and this document forward while we went back to look at the issues. So it isn't that it was abandoned or in any sense forgotten. It was basically put aside while we started this discussion with the org and started to have the discussion.

One of the things that I had been hoping but I haven't gone back to check is that in the discussion with staff now, the concerns that prompted these questions would indeed become rows on the issues table we're looking at. But yes, agreed completely that part of our

complete package of output does have to include an answer to these questions. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Avri. When I scan them I think they are mostly covered and they're asking for concrete examples of concerns that people have and we've done that by working through the issues table. They've asked for examples of people inside the organization reluctant to speak with the community, and we need to get into that one a bit. Respect to the community was asked, what are the expectations for how the community will deal with the organization? I think that's one we should say something about and it hasn't really come up in our work. And are there areas where people in the ICANN organization should be directly accountable to the community? I haven't actually seen that come up in our work and generally some of [inaudible] my answer would be no, but we need to discuss and sort it out. So it may be worth putting that back on the agenda now that the halt is off and making sure that we've got some contributions to make.

Thanks for pulling me up on that one, George. I was skipping too quickly through the agenda.

I want to circle back, if I could, to that proposal so to start a thread and ask for input on this delegation of authority guidelines. I can give a little bit of a context about it. And to draft a one-pager for the group to look at that adds in the community thing, and that being the what the real Doc A is. A light touch approach using existing documentation where possible.

Does anyone has any problems or challenges with that, please sing out now? Otherwise, you'll have a doc to look at some time next week.

While you're thinking about that, we might skip on to item five which is the next steps. And we've kind of talked about those all a little bit already. On the issues table we can't put it in front of the next Plenary meeting because we've missed the 10-day deadline but I think we should shoot at for the following Plenary meeting to get some input on it unless we can catch up and put the whole package of solutions together for the next full Plenary after that. But we need to develop some possible responses to those issues, is the next thing.

There's a hint of how I was going to offer to draft a document that suggests for us a sense of priority of the problems that have been identified in the table and sketches out some possible ways to resolve them at a very short, high-level, conceptual, way for us to talk through as a group at our next call which I don't know whether it's next week or two weeks away. But either way, I'll be able to manage that deadline. I realize that I'm volunteering for a bit of writing in the context of this call but I've allocated time to be able to do that if that's helpful.

That's one way ahead on the issues table, and on Doc A we've just spoken about that – the one-pager that characterizes those delegation guidelines [inaudible] thread going on the list to ask for input on them. And then the one-pager being about the Board-community-staff relation and putting that out for you to look at as well.

And on the Document B work, Avri needs to have that follow-up call with the ICANN staff sometime next week. Avri, do you want to talk a bit more about next steps on that?

AVRI DORIA: Sure. Not that much to say on it, but basically we have collected some of the document through the delivery that was made. There may be some others that still might be helpful, for example, when we talk about the reviews and is there any opportunity within reviews for staff to contribute should that be not part of what we had is summarizing what exists, and that part of the document is there to the extent that it is known. Part of what I hoped out of the discussion with ICANN org is just to make sure that all the possibilities are there.

Then the second step on that is to take the general recommendations that come out of the Doc A discussion – things like there should be communication at point X, there should be a process that handles Y, etc. – and then look at the process definitions in documents that exist for places where amendments to those may be considered as a follow-on as a way to bring these processes in. And that's really very much the part that needs in-depth discussion with ICANN org whose documents these are, whose processes these are, that we're talking about asking them to look into changes or additions or process modifications.

So part of it comes from the discussion and part of it builds off of the possible solutions we posit in the Document A work. Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Avri. I think that's really helpful. So you can see a kind of conversation information being validated and explained and then being shared with the group for assessment. That's kind of a useful methodology here, I think. We've got our next call coming up in a week or so on 13th of April at 19:00 UTC.

So that's the kind of next steps that we need to take and then at the end of the agenda we presented the slightly frightening schedule update which is that we need to get our docs drafted through late April and make sure we can sign them off by early May and then get things through Plenary readings first reading start of May, second reading end of May, to get some stuff out for public comment before the next ICANN meeting.

I don't know about you guys but I thought it was helpful at the Copenhagen meeting that there were some open public comments that we could organize people to talk about stuff that we could remind people in person face-to-face to make submissions, we could be available to answer questions if SOs or ACs had them, and I think we should be aiming at that kind of thing as well. So we would want a public comment period covering the ICANN meeting in Johannesburg at the end of June and then take the summertime in the northern hemisphere, wintertime in the southern hemisphere, to absorb the comments and adjust them and get everything finalized for Abu Dhabi.

So workable. Requires a bit of frontloading of work in the next six weeks or so to get things moving but we seem to be making progress.

Does anyone have any questions or issues about that schedule update?

No. That's probably a good sign, and if it isn't I'm sure you'll let me know.

Are there any items of other business?

No. Not at the moment. So the next meeting is on the 13th. I think we're on a weekly cycle at the moment. Avri, is that correct?

AVRI DORIA: Close to it. I think we tried to set up for April but we may have [skipped] one week. I'm not certain. But yes, we're either on a weekly though there may be one week between now and the middle of May where for some reason there can't be a weekly meeting but I think the idea is we're setting it up for weekly between now and the [end of] May.

JORDAN CARTER: Right. Okay.

AVRI DORIA: [Inaudible] schedule [I'm pretty sure].

JORDAN CARTER: That's okay. At least we know when the next meeting is which is the 13th – Easter Good Friday morning for us here in New Zealand but that's do-able.

So it just remains for me to say thank you everyone for coming. Good to be making some progress on this stuff. I think we've got [to mode] of

working that staff to the reset before that Copenhagen. I hope you all have a fantastic weekend whenever that comes up in your part of the world, and we will no doubt speak soon.

Thank you very much and at 05:56, let's call this one closed.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]