ICANN
STAFF ACCOUNTABILITY SUBGROUP MEETING #17
THURSDAY, 8 MAY 2017
1900 UTC

        >> AVRI DORIA: Okay. This is Avri Doria starting off the
meeting here, co-rapporteur of this group. We only have three
non-staff participants, and we have three staff participants
plus the captioner, but I am asking if it's okay with everyone
else, and if there is no objection, to following through on this
meeting even though we do not meet the standard of five by five,
which is five minutes after -- though we are not quite at five
minutes yet -- but five minutes after that there's at least five
people. So I'd like to still go through the conversation,
though we may do it more quickly and, of course, it will be in
the record.
        Does anybody object to that? I see Patrick agreeing. I
see no one objecting. Okay. So I will go through it.
Hopefully more people will join, but we'll see.
        The agenda review, basically it's the same structure
agenda, so go through the intro, talk about staff engagement,
though at this point, you know, let's talk about that.
Substantive issues of the week, and there's basically a couple
bullets there. I wanted to get review on the edits that I had
made to the table just to make sure that I had put things in

correctly and gotten everything. Obviously, we can only do a very limited amount of that. Then discuss the next steps for the solution space.

Jordan did put out his one-pager on roles, so I thought it would be good to take a quick look at that, and then Patrick introduced a mechanisms table that I'd also like to talk about, at least get introduced into the body of work. Then we have the documents update. The only thing that's special in that part of the agenda -- actually, there's nothing in that part of the agenda that's changed.

Then in next steps is where there is one additional item down at the bottom that I want to talk about, which is the starting to assemble the first draft of the doc for submission, and that's rudimentary, but we have to start building that, so I would love to get that started, and I love the idea of talking to even a smaller group about what should be in that.

There are some action items that were from last time, both of which have been met, which is co-rapporteurs updating the table based on the comments from the call, and my invitation to the -- to Krista, the complaints officer, who couldn't join us this week. Perhaps that's why no one came. But we are looking for another date.

And then the schedule update and any other business.

So it's a lot of agenda, but a lot of it we can get through quickly. Any changes or objections to the agenda? No. Okay. We'll record attendance and perhaps lack thereof based on the Adobe Connect list, and I don't think there's anyone on the call-in bridge, but is there anyone on a call-in bridge?

(No audible response)

No, okay, there isn't.

And remind us all about our SLIs and keep them updated. Did anybody change anything since last time? Nope? Okay.

So on staff engagement, we've been having ongoing discussions about it. We've certainly had a form of staff engagement through Patrick and through the conversations that Jordan and I had with Diane and Teresa and others. We have never quite gotten to the point of having people participate in the meeting other than Patrick and invited folks and to the extent that he's staff, Herb. And at this point, as we are trying to wind down, I kind of like to get an update on that, but also decide whether at this point, you know, how we are going to handle that.

Patrick, do you have anything to add on the staff engagement?

Oh, hello, Greg. Welcome.

>> PATRICK DODSON: Hi, Avri. It's Patrick for the record.

No further updates, but after our last call I did submit the latest version of the issues tracker, so she had that content, but I don't know that they've regrouped in executive team there. There's quite a bit of travel, and they just finished up a board workshop. I am sure it did not make the agenda for them. So I am hoping that they will continue to evaluate that. I think in the meantime, efforts to engage Krista I think are good, and Herb has been a fairly consistent participant as well. So depending upon how we want to proceed and how much we want to push -- I know we've have a few volunteer folks join on the calls as well in their own capacity, but I don't have any other formal updates as far as any other volunteers that have come forward.

    >> AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you. I was really quite happy when I saw Adiel on the line the other day.

    Yes, George.

    >> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Yeah, we just finished -- the Board, that is -- just finished a meeting, a workshop meeting, in Geneva. I am in Budapest, and a bunch of Board members are here too.

    What I want to report is the following. I recommended strongly to Diane and even to Goran that they meet with as many of the members of the Committee and the Working Group as could be found as a special time and place, perhaps a meal in Budapest -- sorry, I am getting my cities confused -- in Johannesburg. And I told them an informal meeting where you could really hash out some of the problems and issues would be really useful and you should try to do it.

    Now, I recognize that the timing is not good and that if it happens it's going to happen five or six weeks from now. That's a long time. And it's also not a meeting in the sense that it's totally open and totally reported and all the rest. I still recommend you do it because I think a lot of the concerns and conceptions -- conceptions and/or misconceptions -- could be addressed directly by such an informal gathering.

    Thanks.

    >> AVRI DORIA: Thank you for that, George.

    I know I'd be happy to meet with them anytime, anywhere, and if somebody had been flying me to Budapest for lunch day after tomorrow, I would have done it joyfully.

    But yes, no, I think that that's good.

    Now, one of the things is in my most optimistic moments, we'll have at least a draft of our report recommendations ready before Johannesburg, so that would be a good thing to be able to talk to them as a checkpoint and find out whether we are heading in the right direction or not. I still hope we get more

involvement between now and then, but I think your suggestion for us to sit and talk is a good idea, especially since we will have a certain amount of well-defined stuff to talk about by then. So I think it's great.

Okay. So we'll leave staff engagement and go to the substantive issues. So okay, if we can have the solutions document up, basically, but people can also go to it in the drive document. And basically what I was going to do is I made additions that they are still in suggest form, and those additions are -- there was one made in row 1. There was -- actually, several made in row 1, and those things actually show up three times, some of them. There were changes made to 2. No changes made to 3. There were changes made to 4. No changes made to 5. And changes made to 6 and none to 7. So I recommend that we just take a quick look at the ones in each of the row that were made and just see if they approach what other people think was there. I used the captioning, but obviously I didn't want to just quote long bits, though I did cut and paste pieces. And see if people think I got it sort of right or not.

In the first case, where I had "add this note to the ombuds function," I did take into account Herb's statement that the role would exclude Human Resources accountability or performance as those are outside of the -- I shouldn't repeat that twice -- outside of the ombuds role. So that was a point he made several times, and I have included that. Just basically put your hand up or check objection if I say anything that seems wrong. And obviously, I am going to ask the list to check these too, since there are so few of us.

Oh, and Greg, just to let you know, at the beginning of the meeting, I asked everybody's acceptance of us going ahead, even in breach of the five by five rule. So I am glad you brought it to four by eight, and you know, thank you, but just in case you were wondering why we were continuing.

Okay. I also added in 1 possible part of a 360 review process that includes the community, and didn't get into the variations of how many degrees that would really be since used 360 review as a term of art as opposed to a degree of measurement. So put that in there.

And then put in the suggestion that I think was made by Herb, which was having a potentially triparty and third person elected by the Committee to review issues that are brought up, whether it be in some form of disciplinary and/or -- or to review issues that happened, either in the community or that involved one of the three, which would also offer the option of one of the three recusing if there's any type of conflict of interest. I know it can be worded better, but that was actually

cut from the captioning, and I thought it explained what was wanted.

So I've got those there. Does it seem like I captured them correctly? Does anyone think I got them wrong and want to say something at this point?

Yes, Jordan.

>> JORDAN CARTER: I just don't understand what a triparty is. Can you explain what it is?

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay. That's good. I will add to that. It was complaint officer, ombuds, and a community-selected person. Without definition of how the community selected the person.

>> JORDAN CARTER: And that would provide the forum to deal with community participants raising issues.

>> AVRI DORIA: Right. Issues that sort of fell out any other known method of handling or some of these that, you know, these category one issues, and then it shows up later. So yeah, that was the idea that was discussed at the last meeting.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Okay.

>> AVRI DORIA: I'll take the note that I have to wordsmith that a bit better.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Okay. Yes, so just explaining what it is is fine. May I make a comment about the merits of that idea? Is that all right?

>> AVRI DORIA: Yeah.

>> JORDAN CARTER: I think the problem with that is that it doesn't include management, and so given that management drive internal staff accountability and culture, if there isn't someone from the senior executive leadership team in the group like that, I think it's rendered less effective than it would be if its idea is to fix things or improve things. That's the only comment I'd make.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you. Whether you want to add a note on this in the file or I add it later, that's a good note to add, and the triparty may end up a quad. Okay?

>> JORDAN CARTER: Yep, yep.

>> AVRI DORIA: Anyone else have a comment on that? Okay. In which case, on 2, basically the triparty or quad was included as possibly one of the responses in this as well. That acknowledging that there are some methods in some of the SOs for dealing with implementation issues, you know, the point was made that that is certainly not consistent across the whole organization, so taking into account there may be issues that fall outside of any existing method, so this quad, this tripartite/quad idea was applicable to these issues as well. I'll make the same changes to this one that I make to the other one.

Anybody have a comment on having added it there? And I will assume the same comments about its content.

Okay. Then 3, as I said, there were no -- I didn't catch any suggested methods forward for this culture item. In the comments, I don't know if I missed any, but that one sits as it is for the moment. People obviously are welcome to go into the document and add stuff. Anybody want to comment here?

Okay. 4, which was community feedback, that one basically also, as 1, includes the possibility of the 360 review being relevant, and it also includes the tripartite/quad mechanism. As I say, we'll make the same edits to the wording.

5, I see no comments. Maybe inconsistently meeting accountability, that one there were no comments on. And that one I still believe is very much a way of finding a mechanism that we can use pretty much across the board -- and this is my personal view -- pretty much across the board in the commenting methodology that allows for such an edit period. You know? Perhaps -- and I can write this in, perhaps, but something even like of a each one of the analyses is written, that the syntheses is written to give a one-week, you know, ability for any of the commenters to comment on how their comment was represented or some such would be the kind of mechanism I think could easily be applied in a general way. So that would kind of be my recommendation, and may add that specific to the list, but haven't done it yet because I was more concerned with getting other people's recommendations in.

Any comments on that or the idea I just put forward?

Okay. No?

6, that one, the 360 review process was also added. It should also probably include the tripartite/quadpartite mechanism as a possibility. Just made a note there to remind myself.

Yes, Jordan?

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Avri. And you know, these comments would have been more helpful on the last call if I hadn't slept through it, so I apologize for that.

On the staff raising one, I think that whether there was a community role in this staff 360, if staff are doing those, I think encouraging ICANN to make a sort of appropriate place for people to raise issues they are having with the community, so like just instead of having that as a step that happens in the ordinary course of performance review, whether or not the community is all in the 360, that would so help address the problem.

(Overlapping speakers)

>> AVRI DORIA: It doesn't necessarily need the full 360;

there could just be a step in the performance review that did one as part of the performance review? Is that what you meant?

     >> JORDAN CARTER: Yeah, yeah. Include the community perspective in the 360, make sure you are getting community perspectives on the performance and the accountability framework. But you don't actually need to be doing that in order to give staff a safe and primary way to raise issues with the community.

     >> AVRI DORIA: Okay. Any other comments?

     Okay. On 7, there were none. On 8 there were none. And on 9 there were none. So I didn't make any changes to those. I still invite people to come up with more possible solutions, but I think this can kind of conclude the sort of brainstorming part of it. I will add some extra content to it. Jordan, is that a repeat hand -- I mean, is that a re-raised hand or -- no, it was a remainder. Okay. Thanks. I am trying not to call things "old hands." I decided after a bit that that was bugging me, so I am looking for other ways to refer to them.

     So okay, so basically talking about the next steps, we'll look at this as brainstorming is complete. Obviously, we can still add to it. And this comes with part of the later stuff we want to talk about. What I want to do, and I think as co-rapporteur it's something to get started on, is I want to start assembling from the bits and pieces here the document that we would submit for consideration to the plenary and then eventually for comment. I doubt I have all the pieces yet, but I'd like to get that structured and perhaps start cutting and pasting pieces from other things. I think this table would, indeed, be part of that document. I am not sure at the moment whether it's something that's carried forward in an appendix or an addenda as proof of work or it's actually carried through in the main section because, you know, when I look at some of the stuff that's going -- I just don't know what the right place is for it. So that's something.

     Yes, Jordan?

     >> JORDAN CARTER: I was just taking myself off mute. Thanks, Avri.

     I wanted to ask a question of Patrick and George without putting them on the spot too much, which was to ask were there any kind of solutions that are sitting there in the list that have so far what they think might raise eyebrows or concerns? I think it would be good to just have a sense of are there any sort of alarm bells ringing among that solution set. That would be useful to know that now as you start to pull it together from a list of brainstorms into a more concrete proposal.

     >> AVRI DORIA: Okay. While this is not a binding question,

George and Patrick, any clue? George, I see your hand.

>> PATRICK DODSON: Go ahead, George.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: I don't see anything that's terrible here, that is going to be rejected out of hand. I think there's going to be discussion on item 6. I think it's item 6 -- I have lost count -- the issue about community involvement in staff review. I think that we discussed that a little bit when I was in Geneva. I discussed it with, you know, both Goran and with Diane. And I think that a talk with them is going to be helpful in letting you know exactly how that input in effect goes into the staff review right now.

So my sense is you are spending a lot of time polishing this table and as a result of a conversation two or three weeks ago, I thought that the point was to get the table out so that the full plenary could look at it and then provide evidence -- that's not quite the right word -- provide input into the various issues that were posed. I think the sooner you get to that stage the better. And let me editorial --

>> AVRI DORIA: We've done that. We took it to the plenary and asked for people to look through it and to give us any indicators of, you know, issues that they had with it. So we have taken the step of taking the table to the plenary.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Have they given you information that you've incorporated already or not?

>> AVRI DORIA: Nope, did not get feedback from it, but we did do the exercise of taking it to them.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: My sense is this -- and I am speaking more generally than just the question you asked -- there's a lot of lost interest in this topic. Part of it may be that there's less there than you thought. I don't know. Part of it may be that it's spring in the northern hemisphere, and people are just getting out and doing other things. So rather than continue to work on the table, get feedback from the plenary, talk with Goran and Diane, and finalize it. There's no point in waiting for people who aren't able to show up and contribute to it, but with your own instincts about what the appropriate thing is to do. Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Yeah, no, I mean, I want to get the table as clean as possible, but also I don't want to stop at this point along the way. So -- because you know, we could delay forever.

Yes, Patrick.

>> PATRICK DODSON: Yeah, I was just going to echo a few points and then add a couple.

As George mentioned, I don't think there's anything that's overly eyebrow raising. I think if anything you will encounter

some feedback on the specifics around the mechanism of community input in staff review. There's some HR sensitivities there, I think, that I think a conversation with Diane and Goran might help there. Not to say that that input is not valuable and that there are ways that we should be doing that better -- whether that's overly formal or not, I don't know -- the concerns that they might have there.

The other is the idea of the trifecta or the quadfecta. I don't think that's a huge issue, but we might see some pushback, just as it relates to the broader topic of is that yet another mechanism that we have to then try and figure out how to establish, maintain, promote, measure, evaluate, execute, et cetera? To that, the table, I know it's later in the agenda, but the exercise I went through of just compiling all the mechanisms, not a defense mechanism from staff perspective, but more the current mechanisms in place, whether they are sufficient, effective, well understood, or some of them in the case of the complaints office is fairly new, what are they intended to do and looking at that as an evaluation filter for us as we take this issues tracker which has been an opening and exploring exercise and start to think about how to close down into concrete recommendations that aren't going to get, I think, the feedback of we have those mechanisms or that's already addressed, et cetera. But get more into where the gaps truly are in either understanding our effectiveness or scope and address them that way.

So that was the attempt with that table, knowing that it's yet another way to look at the content, but put it out there for the group to review. Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you very much for that. In fact, the way I looked at that table is I saw it as becoming almost the core of the third part, which was the mechanisms and the additional recommendations, that basically it lays it out quite clearly what's in that. That which was called the Document B at the moment is kind of just a laundry list of what rules we've read through are, but I think what you've produced is a very good thing to build, then, the solution so that in that fourth column we would take any of these sort of brainstormy ideas that are in this one and put forward an actual hopefully well-formed proposal where, you know, what the quad thing or whatever, if we are putting that forward, was, indeed, discussed in terms of the performance reviews. For example, I haven't talked to Diane about it, but I have talked to a couple of your managers that do these reviews and have found out that there are, indeed, slots when they are doing their part that they could reach out to the people that were involved with the person being revolved or the

activities. So have sort of an idea of what we can talk about there, and then yeah, I am sure there's a lot of discussion and details.

Greg, you have your hand up. Oh, but Jordan has his hand up before you. Sorry. So I have Patrick's hand.

>> PATRICK DODSON: I would like to defer to Greg because I have already had a chance at this. So can I follow Greg, please?

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay. Greg.

>> GREG SHATAN: Thanks, Patrick, Avri. This is Greg Shatan for the record. A couple of points. First regarding the point that there's been a loss of interest in this topic. I think there's been a loss of interest in every topic, or just too many topics, too few people. I think some subgroups are suffering in particular. But maybe that's an indication that subgroups are not intended to be the only place where work got done. I think in part we maybe take that as a sign here, at least, that we are getting close to the end of what our subgroup can do versus what the plenary can do.

Second and separately on the concept of 360 reviews or other input, my first question is are we not ICANN? Is not the community ICANN as well? Are we not working directly with members of staff, not merely as customers -- and customers, in fact, do get included in some 360 reviews, but it's more of a sui generis relationship between the community and the organization staff. So I think we need to explore, perhaps, the reasons for the discomfort. But the idea -- and also explore the ways in which community input already figures into staff review and accountability generally. But to my mind, once we get this done -- and it may take some tweaking -- people will wonder why it was ever such an issue. So I always feel some pushback when we come to this point. Maybe people feel concern that there are going to be vendettas played out or we are not reliable sources of our perception of a person's work. You know, evaluation that can be given is really only that of what your experience or your subgroup's experience is with that person. So it's really nothing beyond at major part of their job description.

And the last thing is the very general comment is to think about whether there are places -- and this is one of them -- where we can make things sound a bit more positive. Reviews and the like are not just intended to be criticism sessions; they are also intended to be discussions of positive aspects and of growth and of innovations made by the person and other things. There's always an issue in any process like the one we are currently under in this subgroup of sounding like we are always

going to be harshing everybody's mellow, and that we are really only looking here to find ways to be critical in the negative sense. So not that I want to, you know, send this table on another, you know, one- to three-week go-around, but if as we go forward we can think about ways not to make it sound like we are just pulling out the hammer and tongs, but that we may also, perhaps an equal or even greater measure, be pulling at the comfy chair and the soft pillow and other more positive things, just so we don't sound like we are always getting ready to beat people up. If we do, that's why people may not want to be so positively inclined toward getting another person in the beat-up. But that's not what it should be. Thanks.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you. In fact, you had mentioned that several times, and indeed, I think that's part of what comes out in the description that we write up of the mechanisms. And you did mention several times, you know, including kudos and stuff. I am not sure I got it into the table, but indeed, I think that that is right.

I don't know why there are people who are as head-shy as they are, but you know, it is the case, so we do have to deal with that.

Okay. Now Jordan, and then I have George. Patrick, your hand is still up. Does that mean you want me to come back to you? But Jordan.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Avri. Several points, I guess. I think that the whole (Inaudible) -- also by splitting things into nine topics and doing detailed work in all of them. It's hard to keep your head around all of it. So that's part of the thing.

The other thing is that having given the plenary some options for feedback, I think we need to stop regarding staff accountability as a problem that needs to be fixed. It isn't a problem that needs to be fixed, and there is evidence of that. There are some gaps in processes in one of the customer groups in the organization, (Inaudible) maybe could be included a little bit more. So I think if I can to take a bet where we will land, it's through tweaks in existing processes, and request the organization to monitor this stuff over time and improve it if required. And I think that's all fine.

I think if you read the table with a suspicion about this effort, you could find a lot of concerning things in it, but I haven't heard anyone on any of these calls trying to suggest that approach. So I think in a positive culture, an organization should be interested in how its stakeholders are finding its performance. So I think Goran is trying to build a positive culture in the ICANN organization. I think some tweaks

here that help get feedback in the process from the community, discuss the right way, will be positive, and I guess that's the last one I want to make. We said earlier on in this effort that any kind of imposition of new processes or changes (Inaudible) we have to have buy-in. So a subset has to be walking through with Diane and whoever it needs to go to. And getting (Inaudible) why do we do it this way kind of stuff?

That's all.

>> AVRI DORIA: Sorry, I muted myself. George. Thank you.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Yeah, thanks. I will say it more briefly. You guys are effectively done. There's no point in massaging that table a lot further because there's no definition of perfection. You are as close as you are going to get. You kicked it upstairs to other people for input. You got a meeting with Goran and Diane, possibly, that will help you a little bit further. Grab that pillow that Greg talked about, setting back in the easy chair, and consider the job appropriately done to the point where you can do it.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you, George. I will consider myself as having gotten there when I have produced the document that's the overall document as the completion of the work. But yes, I was mentioning to Jordan the other day that I looked down the tunnel and I saw the train coming, and I hoped it was a light.

Okay. So moving on from that, then, I guess we've done that. I will add the stuff to the table we talked about. I will do the editing. I will go through all of the things and make sure that while the content remains the same, if there is harshness in the language, it's toned down, and the sort of equivalent set of talking about problems as well as talking about kudos is, indeed, visible. So I will make sure that that's in there, and I will certainly make sure that's in there as we start drafting any suggested new things.

And I do understand the sort of concern that Patrick brought up about creating yet another mechanism because that does seem to be -- you know, we seem to have followed the rule of computer science that says any problem can be solved by adding another layer of indirection. So I want to be careful that if we are suggesting something, it is, indeed, explained why it is needed.

Okay. I see some comments in the Chat before moving on. Jordan is saying: I would really like us to get a doc together and get it through first and second reading ASAP.

Okay. At the moment, I must admit I am focused on getting it together and getting through a first reading. And then I think we end up with one outcome document, and I think the table doesn't go in it. It's basically one page that summarizes some

issues raised and proposes two or three -- yes, Jordan, and that was kind of the thing that I was thinking of, that perhaps the table needed to be part of an appendix or something. We can decide that later in the effort of saving our work and the details and all the issues of why this is important and what its impacts are. But yes, I think doing something similar as you've done with roles and responsibilities might, indeed, be the right solution for the next step of the table.

Yes, but the short paper needs to be short and clear. So that's what I want to try and work through in my abundance spare time between now and our next meeting to sort of get that document scoped out, even if it still has TBD sections in it. I know we need to get to our first reading, but I can only get there so fast.

So to move on to the agenda -- because we now only have 17 minutes left, as far as I can tell. Okay. The next thing was we have two more documents. I wanted to get Patrick's document, and I wanted to get Jordan's document mentioned. Everything else, you know, we don't have to worry about.

So Jordan, if you'd like to quickly talk through your document, which was the roles and responsibilities. That document is one I would import directly into this document.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Okay. Thanks, Avri, and I am sorry about the noise from the airport location I am in. I will just import the Google Doc into the chat. You might remember a version of document A, quote unquote. This is my interpretation of what I was asked to do, which was to write a one-page cover for the ICANN delegation's document, the one that, Greg, you offered some comments on before. It's an evolving document. And all I tried to do is try and do exactly what it said, to characterize the role of the ICANN staff vis-a-vis the Board and the community and the general assertion that ICANN staff referenced in the document.

So it was very short, tried to be quite neutral and, you know, in Microsoft Word, it looks like it was on one page, but in Google Doc it just spilled over.

So that's all I want to say by way of introduction.

>> AVRI DORIA: Yes, George, I see your hand.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: I looked at it. I think it's quite reasonable. I think it's several orders of magnitude better than what we started with, and I think that if there are no comments on the document from the working group, we should just move it to the next stage.

>> AVRI DORIA: And even once we move it to the next stage, obviously people will still be able to comment.

Okay. Anyone else wish to comment? And as I say, I plan

to import this in with proper, you know, explaining what it is and explaining its relationship to the other and such. That the outline of this doc is still forming in my mind, but okay.

    Then if there's no more comment on that one, I'd like to go to Patrick's table. Brenda, I didn't make a PDF of it, but I don't know if you were able to. It was sent in email on the list. I didn't include it.

    No, not the remuneration practices. Sorry. And I got that one and will read through. It was the document Patrick sent through, and I could quickly do a PDF if necessary. I think I have it even open in one of my windows. If I can find all my windows. No, I don't. Bummer.

    >> BRENDA BREWER: I will get it, Avri. Just hold on one moment, please.

    >> AVRI DORIA: Then Patrick, why don't you start. We can all bring it up from our email while Brenda is getting it in the screen. You already talked about it a little in terms of what you were trying to put together. I thought it was a great piece of work and such. And I think that the question that was asked in the list about can it refer to the problems instead of by number or the issues instead of by number, I think we will already have that in the paper for you to refer back to, so I don't know that you'll need to re-discuss it there, but see how that works out. But please.

    >> PATRICK DODSON: Sure. Thanks, Avri. This is Patrick. What I was trying to do, it started to occur to me there were a lot of mechanisms already out there and being used to various degrees, and some of them not at all until just recently because they had been created and just announced with Krista in the Complaints Office. But also thinking about some of the other mechanisms that the community and the organization can use, either formally or informally. So I just wanted to compile all of those because I also was anticipating that whatever the recommendations are that are proposed through, the organization always looks at them, and first and foremost -- well, not first or foremost -- but high up on the list for them is the ability to implement these things and what's it going to do to add to the task load, as we have all talked about, the fatigue that's both in the community and within the organization. So wanted to make sure that we had a clear working glossary of the mechanisms as they are intended today and thought that might be an interesting place.

    The other thing that spurred a thought was many of the issues in the Issues table in the rows tended to overlap a bit. So I wanted to see where they might overlap on mechanisms as well.

So the Mechanisms is the first column. The Ombudsman, the Complaints Office. I also included in the Expected Standards of Behavior. It's a mechanism in so much as it's a common framework for understanding and alignment so that it's organizably the more we promote that to everybody, including in the organization, it provides a way to diagnose or focus in on the areas where complaints might be coming up and what behavior is not in line with expectations, it also gives everybody a framework for having that dialogue with whatever appropriate party they need to. And then I also listed out the different layers of interaction that can happen within staff, just within the normal course of how we should do conflict or issue resolution, not the least of which is actually talking to the individual that you feel is the source of your complaint and not avoiding a respectful but direct confrontation or discussion about things that may or may not be working well for you in whatever your interaction might be.

Then there's, of course, their manager and all the way up to the department lead and/or executive sponsor, and then ultimately Goran.

The language in here is all pulled from the language that's publicly available regarding the Complaints Office or the ombudsman, and then some of my own just articulations around the individuals and the staff elements of it.

And then the performance management process, which we are still working to get information to you guys on that, and I hope to have that here sooner rather than later, that's also, obviously, an area where there's, I think, opportunity for some of the discussion we have already been having as far as the -- how best to address getting more and structured input in from the community for those individuals or departments that are engaging externally with the community more than others. And then just a list of all the other policies.

And then the last here is the efforts that are currently under way that Goran mentioned before about the process mapping of most of the key processes that cross over between the organization and the community and looking at those as a mechanism for us to continue to find alignment or areas of maybe preexisting confusion or misunderstanding or disagreement that will also help the community and the organization more clearly understand roles, responsibilities, remits, scope, et cetera.

So just put those all together with some description there that we can talk through, and then I did my own assessment. I don't consider this to be exhaustive or inclusive, but just taking a look at of the issues table, which rows do I think are relevant to the scope of any particular mechanism. And then the

last column is just the area where I started to put in some thoughts, so this one is very synonymous with the end column on the issues table as far as potential brainstorm solutions idea area.

I don't know that anything other to add, but I will take any other questions. I just humbly submit it to the group for thought and consideration, and I think as Avri mentioned, it's the potential framework for incorporating the brainstorming that's been happening and the discovery that's been happening and turning it into parts that need to address the mechanisms. Thank you.

>> Avri, if you are speaking, you are speaking into a muted mic.

>> AVRI DORIA: Sorry, I was muted. I was basically saying how grateful, as a lazy person, I was to see this table created and immediately looked at how it could fit into the final report, so very, very grateful. I have read through it once quickly. I think we should talk about its contents more at the next meeting. I will look at how I can start folding it into the final report that -- not the final, but the first draft of the report that I put out for next week. And I really am putting myself on the hook for that, so I hope I deliver, although I am also hoping that next week's meeting is one with Krista and her discussing, you know, some of the issues and the surrounding solutions. But anyhow.

Okay. So going back, if there's anything else on this -- I see no hands, and in a small group, I am sure somebody would have sung out already.

So then basically, as I mentioned, that was the last of the substantive issues. There's really nothing in the documents to update that changed, other than the one-pager is done and is no longer pending.

As I say, on the next issues, I still have the on all docs people to do reading passes, and I put in what we already talked about was assemble the first doc for next week, so that's my task for the week.

I did not change the schedule update, but we are -- we are almost in mid-May. I guess it starts in another couple days. I don't know that we will make our first reading at plenary by mid-May. I am sure that will come up in this week's discussions with the CCWG chairs. Still going to try to get it for May, but basically, if I am only going to have the first incomplete draft next week, which is the 17th, I doubt we can have two readings of it or have it complete by the 24th, so I am assuming that we wouldn't make it before the 31st at the moment for a first reading or in that time frame. But I am not sure. But that's

just -- we are not making it by the earlier date. But we are getting closer. Our slippage is slowing.

Yes, Bernie.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Just a note, the plenaries -- the one this week is canceled, as you probably all know. You are quite correct on your timing of the one after that, which would be Wednesday, the 24th of May. But we do have two scheduled before Johannesburg, and the first one is the 7th, so basically, materials for that one would be due last day of May, and we have a late one on 21 June. So the materials for that one would be due 14th of June. So we could conceivably get one in. If you can get the documents in for a first reading on the 14th of June, it could be looked at at the 21st of June meeting. Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Okay. That's hopeful. Because I really want to try and be where we thought we'd be for Johannesburg, even if we get there at the last minute.

Okay. So that's pretty much what I've got. For the upcoming meetings, I haven't gotten a confirmation from Krista yet for the 17th, but if she can't do the 17th, what I propose doing is trying to schedule yet another meeting, another definition of the YAM acronym, for some time that same week, just to have that discussion because don't want to keep delaying these discussions. But we'll see what happens.

Bernie, is that a remainder hand, or is that a new comment? Thank you.

And so with that, I think we come to any other business. Did anyone have anything else that they wanted to say before we ended this one? Yes, Jordan.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Just a quick one. To say that I have enjoyed co-rapporteuring with you, Avri, and working on this topic the last two months or however long it's been. And I will step down as the co-rapporteur around the next time as the next plenary in the next couple of weeks. So I am sorry to leave you alone, Avri, but thanks, all, for letting me do this job with you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thanks. I appreciate that, and I appreciate especially that you said you are not stepping down until the next plenary, which means hopefully you'll help me still over the next couple of weeks with getting some of these things done. But I very much enjoyed co-rapporteuring with you as well. And you know, if you are staying until just before the next plenary, we will hopefully make it except for the end game, which would be wonderful.

Anybody else have anything else to say in this last minute.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Fingers crossed.

>> AVRI DORIA: Fingers crossed. It depends really on how much work we do more than fingers crossed.

So anybody else have anything else to say?

Thank you. Even though we were short of people, I very much appreciate that you all stayed on and that we were able to keep moving forward. So thanks a lot, and meeting is adjourned.

(End of session, 2000 UTC.)