FINISHED TRANSCRIPT

ICANN
JUNE 13, 2017
2:00-3:00 PM CST

                        ***
   This text is being provided in a finished format.
Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is
provided in order to facilitate communication
accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record
of the proceedings.
                        ***

   >> Okay. It's one minute after, but we're still
waiting for more people. We have one. Oh, George.
   >> George: Hello.
   >> I got into it when you were talking to Bernie
about some document, but I don't know which one it is.
   >> It will probably get further pushed out on things
we should consider.
   >> We have one substantive issue and that's the
subject of the report. If we succeed in passing this
meeting, then we'll be able to send it on to the

plenary. Otherwise we -- for the first reading there in Johannesburg, otherwise we'll have to take one more crack at it and the late arrival in submission for Johannesburg. Then there's basically just the normal the sun -- the supplement is our recording and then there's the response to staff questions that we need to get back to, but not today. It will be on the agenda for next week, if we do get through this week. The action items for me was to produce a report for second reading. And for everyone else to view the report and make comments, edit some suggested text. The schedule update, if it needs updating, but hopefully it doesn't at the moment. Hopefully if we succeed this week or next week, we're still on that schedule. And then our updating meetings -- our updated meeting schedule, we have the 13th and the 20th and then it's Johannesburg and then we need to figure out what's next. And then any other business.

   So, does anybody have any other business -- hi.
   >> Hi. It's Bernie. I will interrupt just for a second because captioning is not working.
   >> And I guess also the host list. Is there anybody on by telephone alone? I don't hear anybody. So I'll assume not. Okay. SOI check. Has anybody upgraded their SOI in any way that it's material to this group? Like you just got suddenly hired by ICANN or your staff or something like that? If not, just to remind people that the SOIs are to be kept updated and if you do make an update to the material to the group, please let the group know at the beginning of the meeting.
   Okay. Now on to the next part of the document, if that can be shown. Now at the last meeting, even though he's not -- I saw an update version. It was 7 + was the previous version of the agenda that I had written. The one I just sent out an hour and a half ago, I thought I updated to 8. Maybe I forgot, but this is just -- this is just the latest update.
   >> Okay. I put some comments in over the last hour or two. So I'm not sure what version they went into.
   >> saw your comments in the supplement.
   >> Any comments on that discussion. On discussion 3,

did make some changes. Added a sentence at the bottom of the first paragraph that said and this is talking about the kernel and its functions. We had a fair amount of discussion at the last meeting about you gotta give more structure. You have to say a little bit more about what it can and can't do. So this is one of the things I add. It can share knowledge to help improve the remediation service provided. So they're all providing some sort of remediation service or responsible for dealing with those issues. So figuring that was something else that that kernel could do. Any objection on that change? The next change was establishing this group and required a certain amount of discussion among the staff board and community just so that putting this thing together and this comes into some of the Bernie's guidelines that we'll all seen soon. He's mentioned them to us the talk about is it implementable and this is required. Any objection on that change? Okay. Then the next change. I'm accepting the changing in the document as I got. And then there was in the fourth paragraph, it should not become another note in the bureaucratic mesh, but rather a mechanism that can be used when necessary to solve a situation. Didn't want to call it a problem issues burn overused. We called it a situation. Not sures the best word choice, but it's the one I came up with then. Anybody object to that? Okay. Then so that was 3. Any other comments on 3 before I move on? Okay. Ah, four. This did not -- oh, yes. There was one. There was a removal of the word sung. It was just extraneous word that didn't add anything to the meeting. Any comments on that change? Yes, Allen.

>> Allen: Not on the change. The first sentence has I think there's -- needs to be belongs and not have two periods.

>> Cultural issue belongs. Okay. Done. And two periods. I see. Okay. Thank you. I just did those. Oh, and then I need a space between by and the. Anything else on six? Okay. On seven, there was a larger change. And this was related to, I think, one of your issues. Allen? Basically among issues was

frustration among contracted parties with service
levels and almost all ever the interactions of
contracted parties, the contracted parties are held
with strict timing and standards. In many cases, there
are no performance criteria for those performing the
services. Similar issues, this is the new thing.
Similar issues were expressed by others in relation to
other services provided to community members such as
travel and general support for stakeholder processees.
Does anybody object to that sentence addition? Allen
doesn't cover what you were saying.
    >> I think so.
    >> AVRI: Okay. Green check. I'll accept the
change. Then there was a change in the last sentence.
This leads to misunderstanding and frustration -- oh,
no. Also without defined service level definitions,
it's more difficult to create metrics and improve
services. One of the things I did in response to I
think a fairly severe reaction to SLAs, which have a
very formal contractual notion attached to them was to
talk about service level definitions. Hopefully that
serves to bridge sort of community feeling that there
need to be some of these things, but ICANN organization
feeling that we're not doing a contract with you as
we're doing with registries and registrars. So SLA is
inappropriate. So try to bridge that here. And I've
tried to make that change consistent earlier in the
document. That's one of the things about starting at
the end. Is that change acceptable? I see a green
check. Allen, you have a hand up.
    >> Allen: I wanted to note that the reaction you
just described is part of the problem. Yes, service
level agreements and formal contracts may have
penalties and, you know, what happens if you violate
them don't need them, but the term is also used in a
much more generalized way. I ran a university service
operation and we had service level agreements. You
know? And there was no one objecting to it because
there was no contracted surrounding it. Just the fact
that we get pushed back saying well, we can't make
commitments like that just because you're volunteers

and no contract. It's part of the problem. I don't
know how to express it here, but I wanted to note it.
     >> AVRI: Okay. Thank you, Bernie. Your hand is up.
     >> Bernie: I'm also more in line with AVRI. There
is certainly concerns around the use of the word of the
SLAs. I'm sure back in the middle of SLAs through the
Iana transition is just -- I mean, if we can use any
other kind of word, I think it would be appreciated by
everyone.
     >> AVRI: This is AVRI again. Greg, go ahead before
I say what I was going to say. Yes, Greg.
     >> GREG: I might be being redundant, but
having spent a couple days working on an SLA on
something unrelated, it we're not actually
talking about an SLA that in the true sentence
of service level agreement as to various, you
know, service levels and metrics and failures
and credits and something along those lines, if
somehow we just mean, you know, a consulting
agreement or an agreement to deliver services,
then we shouldn't use the term SLA because it is
needlessly provocative. Of course, if we are
really referring to an SLA, then we need to
refer to the SLA. It is what it is, but it
seems to me that's not what it is. Thanks.
     >> AVRI: Allen?
     >> Allen: I was just noting that the visceral
reaction to service levels and making commitments to
the volunteer community or to the contracted community
is part of the problem. Not that we should be using
the word demanding a formal SLA here. Thank you.
     >> AVRI: I will accept the change and once again I
have to add a space.
     Greg, is that -- is that the previous raising of the
hand? Yes. Thank you. I'm trying not to say it's an
old hand.looked at my hands. They're old. I don't
want to accuse you people of having old hands. Maybe I
should spell that correctly. Okay. Any other comments
on 7 before I move on?
     8. I don't think I had any changes in 8. Any
comments on 8? Okay. We'll go on.

9. I did make changes. They include a required --
it should be a requirement 4 community input back in
the documentation. Often this step is -- and then I
delete a superfluous often. If you guys look at the
dock yule we got, there's a community for document
input. It is uncertain how that is implemented seeing
there's no objection to the changes, I'll accept both
of them. There's more going on the next page. Give us
feedback on interactions with the staff. Then this
activity fits both parts of the current evaluation
methodology that is defined in their document both in
terms of the goals and the behavior as defined in ICANN
organization performance management guidelines. So
this is basically just trying to anchor it into the
ICANN documentation better. Any -- any comment on
that? Yes, Bernie.
    >> Bernie: Thank you, AVRI: Two points. The first
one on 9. I did have all that extra text that you
mentioned. But, ah, when you're saying insuring
managers seek input from relevant community members
during staff's annual reviews, by relevant, you mean
people who would have knowledge of staffs actions.
That's a little fuzzy for me the way it's written right
now.
    >> AVRI: So you would recommend that I change --
I'll explain -- I thought the definition would be
rather broad. For each function, it could be different
people, you know? For travel, it could be travelers.
For registrars, you know, it would be people enforcing
the RAA. For those making changes in IANA, et cetera.
I want really quite certain, but if you have a
recommended change in word --
    >> Bernie: It is services provided to people as
users by the staff or people in the staff. I'll think
about it. My bigger concern is on point 8 that -- in
that, ah, our initial goals and that of responsible
staff are correlated and staff's goals and annual
review results are published. Im-- I believe that
publishing staff's annual reviews is against the law
because it's considered confidential information
between an employer and an employee.

>> AVRI: So there you're referring to the recommendation and not the (inaudible)?

>> Bernie: Yes. That's correct.

>> AVRI: Okay. We either have to deal with it today or we fail our second reading. Let's think about how to deal with that once we get back to the recommendations because there's none of that in the explanation.

>> Bernie: No. I understand that. I wanted to make sure I put a flag on that one. Thank you.

>> AVRI: Okay. And we're already at 25 minutes. So we may not make it in any case. So, ah, no issue with the changes that I made in 9. There's the editorials. And the other two existing recommendations I had no changes on which is there's already the complaints officer and a discussion of it, but it also related to issues. And hopefully people other than me have checked the mapping of issues to requirements. I think they're fairly good, but, of course, I never completely trust myself.

Okay. Let's go to the recommendation and from Patrick's, we need to clarify what we intend in that recommendation. Yes. I think that the intention and I guess it's not there and it needs to be added to the discussion perhaps is that there's a suspicion on the part of at least some in the community that, ah, people -- people's reviews are based not on the level of support they give to the volunteers, but on how they manage to meet various staff goals that may or may not be consistent with the policies, et cetera, being set by the community. So I think that's -- that's -- that's that gap and knowledge that I think had people concerned. Yes, Cheryl.

>> Cheryl: Thanks. Just so we're talking on that. Is it perhaps a difference we might be able to manage in that particular recommendation and the concerns publishing and I will certainly say his point on that. And that can we could have a report on the reviews as opposed to the reviews. In a volunteer organization a million years ago, yes, that is (inaudible) to prove our continual improvement program was operational and

meeting your needs. We produced statistics where we
had baseline data or starting points established and in
this year, we have found the general, you know, our use
of happiness increased by 2 points whatever. You see
what I mean? There might be a way of getting it to
meet our needs in terms of community understanding and
trust and still not violate the privacy issues.

   >> AVRI: That makes a lot of sense. If you can word
in mind -- in mind words and tell me the type when we
get to that one, perhaps we can fix it here and now.
Okay. Now moving to the recommendations, which is
where these issues actually come out.

   And there were a bunch of changes. Jordan went
through and changed a lot of it and things that started
with verbs to ones that started with mounds indicating
with who should and it did seem like a good idea. So
as oppose said to continue, it's ICANN organization
that should continue developing because -- and one of
the thins I tried to do in doing this is get the right
ICANN want to do it now that we're (inaudible). So
look not only at the words, but make sure I got the
right ICANN listed. ICANN trinity or ICANN
sub-section. So the first one was replacing that. Any
objection to that one? Any objection to recommendation
1? Okay.

   The next one the amendment was again adding a verb --
I mean, adding a subject instead of starting with a
verb. Then fixing the regular published detailed ICANN
organizational chart and that should be of all
employees. Of all employees with their reporting lines
so that contracted parties and other community members
are aware of the different levels of decision making
within each department and the point of contact for
escalation or otherwise. Anybody object to the
changes, which is subject, adding a detailed and that
was because people had issues with it or some that
outline the department, but they don't tell you who is
who and who's where and such. Any objection to those?
Seeing none. Any objection to the detailed -- I mean,
to the amended recommendation? Seeing none, I'll move
on to 3. And 3, there were several changes adding a

noun and there was panel review and there were issues raised by the community. Ombudsman, staff or board. I had left ombudsman accidently that cannot be left unresolved to other means. And then means had a note on it and I just put a myself for myself to add the option of confidentiality. While this panel should work, it will work and be able to treat issues that require it as confidential. So, ah, any issue with those amendments to it? Yes, Bernie.

   >> Bernie: Sorry. I don't want to rain on your parade here, but I'm thinking back to those best practices for recommendation. The thing that jumps out at me on this one is issues that are not resolved through other means. That cannot be resolved through other means and -- that -- that's sort of in a way it's nice because you give yourself some flexibility. In another way, it's the size of a barn door. I mean, if someone went to the ombudsman and the thing was not resolved, that's one mean. Is that enough because the thing couldn't be resolved there. So my concern, I will tell you the base concern when reading this, is that all of a sudden people will start bringing truck loads of things here. And you're going to swamp this. So that's all I'm trying to avoid because the way it's written, there's no gating as far as I can see unless you say the group can decide which cases it's going to handle. But if it's got no gating and all you have is could not be resolved through other means, it -- thank you.

   >> AVRI: I think the same meaning could be achieved or the same intent and issues that cannot be resolved by any single one of them. Or -- and it could that they believe they go through their own office or something like that. Yes, Allen, maybe you have good word for me.

   >> Allen: No. I don't. I'll make it even worse. It cannot be resolved is a judgment call. Who's judgment call is it that reached a point of no return cannot be resolved. You know? The ombudsman can say if I try a little bit harder, maybe I can do it. Or maybe I can talk to them again. The whole thing I'm

not quite sure. I guess I'm raising a parallel issue to what Bernie is raising of exactly how and when things go to this group as oh posed to somewhere else or this group can turn it away is not clear.

   >> AVRI: How about things that require further effort? Does that help?

   >> Allen: Might make the barn door even larger.

   >> Bernie: If I may, AVRI, in an attempt to help here. I fully understand the objective. The objective is pretty good, but the means are just too wide, I guess is what we're saying. Could we have -- I haven't thought this through. So don't shoot me, but could the gating function be two of the panel members have to agree that a case should be taken on?

   >> AVRI: Works for me. I put at least two panel members require further effort.

   >> Bernie: You've identified the panel members. They're trusted by the community. If you as a complainant can convince two panel members that this is not going elsewhere, then you have a nice clear gating function and you won't flood this thing and it will only deal with things that should go there. Thank you.

   >> AVRI: I see a green check. Does anybody object to that amendment? Seeing none, I will accept ombudsman. And the transparency line at the end is okay. As it's now written, any objections? Any comments? Bernie, is that, ah, further comment? Okay. Thank you. Okay. So moving on to 4.

   The only change was noun and this was ICANN and it was specifically not just ICANN organization, but it was ICANN because it would at least involve the board, could well involve the community for methods and such. ICANN should develop and change and resolve any issues they have in working with community members. So, I don't know. Maybe it should just be ICANN organization and board to be more specific, but it seemed to me that it could require a complete community effort because you don't want to create a met that then the community feels that they're being black balled by staff by this new methodology. So it really does seem to require a conversation amongst all. Any objection to the

addition of the ICANN should? Yes, Bernie.

   >> Bernie: Again, referring to the best practices.
Again, I am trying to understand what you will do about
ICANN being appropriate. I would suggest you are
creating uncertainty as to how this thing is going to
get approved as being adequate. And if you just say
ICANN and let me illustrate my concern, ah, is it that
you're going to require each Soh O to have a formal
vote on it and to approve it. If you go to that
level -- I'm sorry. I'm not trying to be silly here.
I'm trying to be practical. If end up going to that
level, this thing will never get done. So, I would
almost think that you might want to say ICANN ORG, but
it has to consult the community on this would seem to
be a lot more practical and in line with sort of giving
it a bit of wiggle room. The reality is if ICANN is
going to implement something like this, there's no
point in doing cheaping out on it. Let's talk to the
community. I'm just concerned that there not be a tug
of war on the approval of the thing. Thank you.

   >> AVRI: So if we take Bernie's suggestion here,
that should be a capital organization. In corporation
with the community and the board, should develop
appropriate internal processees, et cetera. Does
anybody object to that variant? I got a green check
from Cheryl. So I will accept those. Any other issues
on this point? Obviously there will be further reading
fist we get it as far as the plenary and we'll be
dealing with this, et cetera.

   Okay. Next one. Once again adding a noun. ICANN
should. Institute information on the program to the
ICANN organization to better ascertain it's better
overall performance to relevant stakeholders. I'm sure
this has the same problem with relevant, and if
probably could have the same thing of who should do
this. So --

   >> Bernie: I absolutely agree. It's got the same
issue the previous one had. If we can restructure it
the same way, that would be a solution.

   >> AVRI: Okay. I've added that same phrase. Now,
we have not found a better term for relevant and I'm

suggesting -- unless somebody's got a better term --
that we leave that for now and perhaps the word
relevant deserves a definition somewhere or something.

>> Bernie: I think in this case, it actually works.
So I'm not fussed about it here.

>> AVRI: Okay. Thanks. I was just being paranoid.
Any objection to the amended text? I have a green
check. Okay.

In 6 again, ICANN should and another differentiated
ICANN. It's the trinity should continue to focus on
ICANN organization as an effective support system for
the bottom up model to championing a culture that is
high performance, transparency, responsiveness and
ICANN ability. Yes, Bernie.

>> Bernie: Okay. Which could have been one of my
key examples of what not to do in an organization. Is
this is the one that got me is to writing that whole
text, AVRI.

>> AVRI: I see.

>> Bernie: A would have no idea how to implement
this effectively. B, I would have no idea how to
measure it's been implemented. And C, I would have a
hard time figuring out a system to identify how
effective it was if it could be implemented.

>> AVRI: If I can answer. That's one of the reasons
of asking ICANN to do it. It is about our overall
culture. It is something that will be in constant
conversation. So I actually think that in defines this
and it's for the community -- we're not asking the
staff to implement it. We're saying as a
community board and staff together effort, we need to
keep working on this. I think Jordan was the one that
originally produced this one and I wish he was here,
but that's how I read it.

>> Bernie: I understand that and what I say in my
document is these things could be used to frame the
discussion around recommendations, but I mean the
reality of what you're doing by including something
like this, I know that this is a good thing. I
understand that. But it's mom and apple pie. And the
reality is that we will come two years down the road if

this gets approved and we will say did we get there. I
can tell you with like a 95% certainty, if not more,
that the answer is going to be we'll come up with
something that says it does, but we really didn't.
That's my only concern. It's not that it's a bad idea,
but as a recommendation in my mind anyway, and I'm a
mathematician and I apologize for that part right
away -- you know, in my mind, you know, it's got to be
something that you can do about it. Otherwise this is
aspirational. And I think we're passed the point of
aspirational in this sense, but that's a personal
feeling. I made my comment. You heard it. That's it.
   >> AVRI: One thing we can add is that the APRT as
part of itself periodic review determines how well this
is working. With that, make it better to make it. If
this is something we should continue doing since we're
doing it, but we should continue doing it and that we
should ask the APRT to basically as part of this
periodic review to confirm that this effort is
continuing or something like that. Does that make a
difference on the charts?
   >> Bernie: I would push it almost there. I think it
makes it a lot better, but I would push it not that the
effort is continuing, but that the ATRT has a
responsibility to say if it's doing better, worse or
not. To perform some evaluation and then I think we
can sort of live with it instead of just and is it
ongoing.
   >> AVRI: How about the ATRT should be asked to
consider periodic review. The progress in achieving
this goal or progress made in achieving this goal.
How's that work? Does that work for order people? You
ask Allen. Not sure we got there yet. Allen, please.
   >> Allen: Couple of points. Number 1, I really
don't like the idea of adding things to the
ITRT agenda. But I'm not sure we want to pre-judge
that. I agree with the original intervention in that
this is not something that we're going to easily be
able to assign a scorecard to. On the other hand,
periodically evaluate how are we doing and is ICANN
being responsive and being responsible in what we're

supposed to be doing and in supporting the volunteer community is a reasonable thing to do. It's a very subjective thing, but I think it's a reasonable periodic review. I think we should say this must be reviewed periodically. The ITRT may be (inaudible) but there may be some other vehicle which is a better place for it. I would like to keep the recommendation a little bit more general, but this is something we have to assess periodically.

>> AVRI: We have two comments. I think in some ways it is already in the ATRT and part of the reason it is phrased as it is because it is the ATRT at each one of its reviews that actually determines who what it's going to do a deep dive on. We're not adding it and I don't think it is outside of the ATRTs pursue or its assigned work. It is putting a focus on it and then the Patrick wrote should it not be part -- should it be part of ATRT or is it a stand alone ORG issue of what is being assessed, but we don't have one of those. And are we suggesting that there be an organization review which is a must bigger ask. Bernie, I see your hand up with a check and I'm not sure what you're checking support of.

>> Bernie: Say one of the possibilities for doing this is the ATRT. Thank you.

>> AVRI: Allen? Go back to you.

>> Allen: You're pointing out that it is probably within the scope of the ATRT and under the current, ATRT can decide on doing in any incarnation is exactly why I do. Think we should designate the ATRT. It can choose to ignore it if it decides there are bigger fish to fry. I think this is something that should be done periodically. My preference is to make it more general and we still have a problem deciding where its home is, but I don't think it needs to be a problem we're resolving today.

>> AVRI: This is part where I had problems with Bernie. Be specific, but not that specific. And I often have trouble. So there should be a regular evaluation process made regarding this goal. While this may fall within the ATRT per view, it may also be

done. Something like that? While this may fall
within -- should be within the ATRT per view, it may be
done in a different manner. Did I get too unspecific,
Bernie? I got a green check. (multiple speakers at
once)

    >> Bernie: Yeah.

    >> AVRI: That's what we're doing. So Allen, is that
skill -- okay. Your hand is up. That's why I was
asking.

    >> Allen: We're no longer calling it an old hand.

    >> AVRI: You can call it an old hand. I just
decided I didn't want to. No prejudice against other
people referring to old hands. If they're looking at
mine, I know that they're telling the truth. So any
other issues with 6? Okay. Then go on to 7.

    >> Bernie: Yes. I would strongly encourage you to
remove the parenthetical.

    >> AVRI: As I read it, I was sure you would say
that.

    >> Bernie: It's going to set off trip wires. Just
trying to avoid setting fires. And -- the second one,
it clearly defines all the services provided by ICANN
to contracted parties. Now, I've only read the
registrar and registrar agreement a few times, but they
are very, very specific about the services they provide
them and how. So I'm a little concerned about that.

    >> AVRI. It is rather important to the people that
brought up this issue, which was certainly for the
contracted parties was an incredibly significant issue
because sometimes the year they wait for a reply does
affects them materially likewise with other, you know,
with other members of the community and their issues.
I think having clear definitions and yes. You know,
ICANN has taught us that if you want a service level
defined by someone, you need to be specific and, ah,
so, um, in this case, I would argue and I don't know.
George has his hand up, but I would argue it may
indeed, be appropriate. Yes, George.

    >> George: Thanks, AVRI. I would say this whole
recommendation bothers me and I think I made some
comments in an earlier version. For the same reason

that Bernie is concerned about it. Why not say
services provided by ICANN to members of the community.
Why differentiate contracted parties there. It's not
appropriate the behavior, the behavior response you
are.
   >> AVRI: Okay.
   >> George: Is there a way of softening that for each
type of service? You will be tied up for weeks, if not
months in a progress of trying to define this and to
keep it current will be very difficult. I just see
this as a bottomless pit of argument and people trying
to figure out exactly what level to define this, but I
would want to --
   >> AVRI: Yeah. I'm kind of insecure about watering
it down because the points made by the people who have
a bottomless pitted of frustration, you know, need
this. And yes. It could well take time to do it, but
it really does seem necessary to a lot of members of
the community. So we've already watered it down quite
a bit from service level agreements, which is what the
contracted parties have asked for. And we've watered
it down to definitions and we've made it specifically
not about them, but everybody. I still think they have
a good reason to still want something that is, you
know, a fairly clear definition of expected service
levels and such. And, of course, it varies per type of
service. So yes, Allen.
   >> Allen: I think our problem is trying to merge the
contract services to contracted parties that are
essentially related to contracts and services that the
volunteer community. By merging them into one, we end
up not being able to apply common terms. Service level
agreement may well be the appropriate term in reaction
to some of the complaints of the contracted parties.
So if I can merge them together into a single issue, I
think is where the real problem is.
   >> AVRI: We fit the hour. We failed at our second
reading. I think it will be something we will need to
continue to reading on the list. Yes, Bernie.
   >> Bernie: Yes. I'll agree to that. In part, I
agree with Allen and I will leave you with this point.

I mean, this is a staff account ability group. When
you're talking about implementing service level
definitions or agreements with respect to the
contracted parties, to me at least, it sounds like
you're trying to make recommendations with respect to
ICANN's contracting practices. And I fear that if we
don't restructure this, I understand the objective.
Okay? I really do, but if you dent restructure this to
focus on what's our mandate in this group, we may get
some serious pushback at another level. Anyways, thank
you.
    >> AVRI: But this has to do with how the staff
treats them. It has to do with staff's accountability
in responding to the contracted parties. So dividing
them too just means I'll just SLAs back in the one that
refers to contracted parties and that's what they asked
for. So, you know, I think that's what we'll have to
do.
    >> Bernie: Yeah. I understand what you're saying.
What I'm saying is -- yeah. I understand. I'll I'm
saying is I want to avoid this recommendation getting
pushback because it drifts more into changes
contracting the practices versus recommendations of how
staff treats the contracted parties. That's all I'm
trying to do here.
    >> AVRI: I think the mistake was trying to answer
Allen's point by trying to make it a common statement.
I'll separate it into two and we'll try for a second
reading next week. Cheryl, you had your hand up and
you didn't get to speak.
    >> Cheryl: I wanted to draw your attention to some
proposed takes on the recommendation 8 ending that it's
just very much rough drafting. Then Patrick asked
whether or not it is something that could be addressed
in the report. Yes, it could be or it could be part of
a dashboard that's kind of the implementation level
there.
    >> AVRI: You mean for 7?
    >> Cheryl: I mean for 8.
    >> AVRI: Thank you. I got confused. Okay. So
hopefully those of you that care will touch the

document and help all. I will try to come up with
something and we'll try again for next week. But if we
fail for next week, then we won't have anything to
present in Johannesburg, but that's okay.

    >> AVRI, may I make a quick statement? It seems
we'll -- perhaps in not responding to contracted
parties properly as opposed to ICANN's staff the
individuals, which is a large part of what we're
focusing on here. And merging the two together may be
part of what is getting us into this problem. Just a
thought.

    >> AVRI: I don't think we ever know that. I don't
think we ever think especially from the recommendations
and the reviews and up. I don't knowledge we know when
something is done by an individual staff member or at
the organization's behalf. I think that's always going
to be hidden from us until there's much more
transparency into what commands are coming down from
CEO through the various management levels. We can't
know that. There's no way to judge that a staff member
is ignoring me because staff member just is too busy or
the staff member has been told to ignore me because I'm
a pain in the neck. There's just absolute no way to
know that. And so I don't know how we would do that
differentiation. So, ah, please let's try and resolve
these things on the list and in the document before
next week. I would really hate not having -- as I say,
I'm sure once the plenary gets it, we will go through
the discussions again. I do want to get is it fixed as
well as we can, but please try and help me with
wordings that work over the next week so that we can
have something to deliver. With that at 4:04, I thank
you all. Amount we never got a transcript. I don't
know if one was being written and just not displayed.
I kind of hope that's the case. But have a great --
and also, Patrick, I think that you had some
recommendations for rewordings like I saw relevance as
appropriate, which to my seemed the same. But I am
more than willing to change it if other people agree.
I'll look through chat and make sure I get them to the
next revision w that at --

>> On the captioning, we'll try to get the captioning people to listen to the recording and get that out as soon as possible.

>> AVRI: Okay. Thank you very much. And with that, thank you all. It was actually very productive. Sometimes we don't really get to the full productive until we're trying to finish something. I very much appreciate the comments and such. I just really want to meet this schedule. Thank you.

>> Bye.

>> AVRI: Meeting adjourned.