

FINISHED FILE
ICANN
JUNE 20, 2017
12:00 A.M. CST

Services Provided By:

Caption First, Inc.
P.O Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-481-9835
Www.Captionfirst.com

This is being provided in a rough-draft 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.

(Beep.)

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hi. There Cheryl here.
>> YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay, Cheryl.
>> JORDAN CARTER: Hi all. Jordan here.
>> YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Hello, Jordan. You are kind of faint. We can barely hear you.
>> AVRI DORIA: Hello, everyone. This is Avri joining.
>> It seems like only hours since we spoke.
>> AVRI DORIA: It does, doesn't it? I don't know why it feels that way.
>> AVRI DORIA: Okay I would like to give it another minute to see if more people show. I would like to get at least one more, but I'm happy going with the five we have got. But let's give it another minute.
Okay. Let's get the recording started, please.
>> This meeting is now being recorded.
>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Hello everyone. We are here for our 23rd meeting on Thursday, 20 June at 5 UTC. I will start first with going through the agenda which will include the agenda. We will look at attendance and the SOI check. And we have one substantive issue for the week. That's the third

subgroup working. We had the second last time and although we didn't finish it, hence the draft in front of you has some changes based on some of the discussion from that second reading, I figured it was appropriate to call it a third. And then just a listing on the documents update and the revision numbers where they are at. We then got our schedule update. It says it needs updating but at the moment it really doesn't. But we will see what happens with this meeting. And then the meeting schedule this is the last meeting we have scheduled before the face to face. And then based upon where we are at we'll have other meetings afterwards. Any issues with the agenda?

Any other business that anybody would like to add at this point? Okay. In which case as there is no objections to the agenda we will proceed with it. Attendance will be taken based on the Adobe Connect list. Is there anybody on the phone only that needs to be included in the attendance? I do not hear anybody. So I'll assume there is not. Okay. Reminder on SOIs, if your working circumstance or other alignments change the material conditions related to this group, please be sure to tell us. We need to record any changes in the SOI but need to really announce those that are pertinent to this group at the beginning of the meeting. Does anybody have anything? Anybody join staff or leave staff? Okay. Then we'll assume that there are no changes to the SOI.

Okay. We are going to go through the third subgroup reading. This time I would like to start from the top and go through some of the things that we didn't go through the last time. And then when we get to the recommendations we'll get to the areas that have had changes since last week's reading.

I'll go through it change by change and ask if anybody has an issue. What I'm hoping to achieve today is consensus on the report or at least consensus on forwarding the report to the Plenary. I think it is important that we leave this meeting with our report to submit for first reading in Johannesburg. It would be a pity of all these weeks of forced march that we didn't. I will be looking on the Google doc itself. And hopefully we'll make any changes as it goes along. I'll accept any changes that you all accept. So the first change I come up to is the addition of the footnote that refers to the terminology that we agreed to use in WS2 that there is the ICANN organization, the ICANN board and the ICANN community and that that trinity is what we refer to as ICANN.

There was a long discussion on it. And that was the agreement we came down to.

So does anybody object to that footnote or how it is written? Seeing no objections, hearing no comments we will accept it.

Okay. The next one is -- the next paragraph discusses the supplement. And it says it is also being published which includes a record of the work done by the group. Can be used to further understand what went in to the definition of issues and recommendations. But indicates that there is no consensus determination on that supplement. Does anybody have an issue with that? Seeing none, hearing none, we'll accept it.

Okay. The next one -- I accidentally just accepted it because it was all one change. So let me go back. Because we are not accepting the next one yet. The next one was an indication and we can come back to this one at the end, that this report has the consensus or perhaps full consensus of staff accountability subgroup for submission to the workstream 2 Plenary. There are no minority reports. Obviously this is my guess. But it needs to be checked. If there are any pending issues that we don't quite have consensus on here, but we still want to send the report on, those can be listed here. If, for example, you know, 13.7 we don't have one, that's why I am using that number, if 13.7 is still not perfectly wordsmithed or still is giving people issues, we can indicate that here. But we will come back to this one once we have gone through the rest of the report but just wanted people to have it in mind for what the right wording is when we get there.

Okay. Then there is a few things here that I dealt with and we mentioned this in the second reading that when appropriate I put in the word organization. And this came out of a comment that Greg had put in asking about -- oh, no. This was on spelling. And since this one was being written for the American ICANN I made it consistent on American spelling. I am doing another report now for people that like British spelling. So I go back and forth, but I have tried to be consistent with the English spelling. Any issue with that? Okay. So I will say that Greg's is resolved.

Okay. Moving down, in issues from our previous discussion in No. 2 we had some issues about the structure of the sentences that were changed, concern was expressed and then in policy developments and other areas that touch on community decisions and function. So, first of all, is there any problem with adding -- let's see, which one am I at? There was one before. I'm sorry. 1A there was no clear forum. And clear was a word I had been asked to add. Any -- oh, okay. Any problem with that? And then I will go back and look at comments. Okay. I see there is a problem with something. No mic but trinity is a Christian term when referring to divine. I thought when it was capital and modified by divine, but if people don't want me to use the word divine that I have used in many, many context, tell me what word I use to trinity. Triad. No, troika would be

worse. Cheryl says keep trinity. I would go for triad if I had to pick a semi- neutral term. It is used in group dynamics and that would be an appropriate word.

Okay. Okay. So let me know, think about it during the meeting. Let me know if I need to change it to triad or something like that. I do want to indicate that it is three parts in one. That's kind of why I liked the trinity metaphor. Anyhow, okay, now going back to 1A. Any issue with clear forum? No. Okay. I'll accept that one. Then there was a couple of replacements, replace. There are concerns with concern was expressed. And any problem with that? That was pretty well agreed to by the group on that call. No? I will accept it. And policy development and other areas that touch on, I had asked a question if it was strong enough and got no areas. Then there had been an issue what about other areas and other areas was added. So any issue with that addition? And other areas that touch on community decisions and function? Seeing none I will accept that one and move on. Then we have -- okay. Yes. This was at one point when we had talked about it at the second reading had been when we decided I needed to put in the footnote and start tracking whether we are talking about ICANN or the organization or the community.

So I think that was resolved. Does anybody disagree with that issue, having been resolved? Mark it resolved. There are concerns asking whether that was the right usage there. Does anybody have an issue on that one? I see none. I hear none.

Mark it resolved. We can come back to everything sometime. Okay. Then the recommendations we made it through fairly cleanly, through 7 at the last reading. But then we got to 7 and such. And we had only what is now 7B and -- but we had a 7B that combined elements of the SLA that was spoken of for contracted parties. And the concerns of others in terms of services provided to members of the community. Trying to mix them in one seem to make it confusing. And I had concerns about weakening the requested statement from contracted parties, especially when we had no contracted parties in that meeting. So that one stands as it was. They have been split in two.

So there is an A that says develop and publish service level agreements. Going back to that term recognizing some of the complexity of defining agreements and actually coming to agreement on how those are actually structured but that would be implementation work, not something that we would decide on. We would just recommend SWA2 if it gets that far, that there be such thing and how they developed after that that would be an implementation issue. And then develop and service level definitions that clearly define services provided to members of the community and the affected service level targets of each

type of service. That is because there are so many services that are provided by the organization to the community that to try and create service level agreements there would be even harder than it would be on contracted parties issues. So ask people how they feel about that. Is that -- oh, sorry. I'm being told that I'm fading out. So sorry. I'll check and see if I need to raise my volume. I admit it is late in the day, but please if I am fading out again let me know.

So I have gone on for a bit. Anybody wish to comment or is that current construction okay? I still have the same headset on and the same microphone. So I'm not sure what I did to move. So seeing no hands any comment? I can -- okay. Jordan, please.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Avri. Can you hear me?

>> AVRI DORIA: Yes, I can.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Okay. Just checking. I have had audio issues. I think that those two as they are fine to put through to the Plenary. I look forward to seeing what it is that the Plenary makes of them. I think there would reasonably anticipate some questions about the scope of 8A just in a sense it feels like quite a big deal to us for that and people may ask some questions but I would rather they ask questions based on this being there than someone having to try and explain what had been there to get input from. In other words, whatever we end up with it is better to leave it in now and to see what the feedback is than to take it out and not have it in front of people when we ask them for feedback. So that's my recommendation.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you. I changed microphone and headset while you were speaking. So hopefully this makes it a little bit better. Yes, Cheryl. I thought you had your hand up, Cheryl. Sorry. Any other comments on it? In which case I will accept this change.

Okay. Going on to 8. This was reworded. I think the original rewording came from Patrick. I don't know, I may have tweaked it a little bit. ICANN organization should improve visibility and transparency of the organization's performance management system and process. Specifically in relation to how individual or department goals are identified and mapped to ICANN's strategic goals and objectives and that was replacing what had been there before about staff performance reviews and answered some of the issues but isn't a lot of that stuff private, et cetera. So any comments on that change or is that change acceptable? I see no hands. I hear nothing.

Okay. I'll accept it. And then we had ICANN organization should, again that was one of those changes that was made at the last meeting that is carrying through for approval this time. Does that wording help here? It does. Okay. I'll accept that.

And then there was replace -- oh. It was replace -- sorry, relevant community with appropriate community. And that had been a suggestion also that was made during the first reading. Anyone have a comment on that change or is that acceptable? Great. Accept that one.

Then in discussion of recommendations, we started the second reading with discussion of recommendations since we hadn't gotten to it in the first reading or had gotten very briefly to it. And I believe there was at least one change. Oh, yes. And that was in 9 where again the word relevant was replaced with appropriate. Does anybody object to that line, that change? I see no objection. Okay. That one is accepted. And at this point we have accepted all of the changes from the second reading and need to go back for one last thing which is this report. Now personally -- yes, Pam.

>> PAM LITTLE: Hi Avri. It is Pam Little speaking. I just have a suggestion about the nine recommendations we made. I was just wondering whether we could make it to 10, i.e., split 7A and 7B in to two. Just -- (Off microphone). And I would hope we could use both. Is it possible or appropriate to split in to two --

>> AVRI DORIA: I think it would require another reading. I guess I would wonder whether it would require another reading at this point and a fair bit of editing.

>> PAM LITTLE: It is not a standard change. Don't worry if it is going to require another reading. Leave it at that. I am happy with that. Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you. I'm not sure how much difference it would make. We can certainly, you know, make that change after our first reading in the Plenary if that still seems warranted, if that's okay.

>> PAM LITTLE: Sure. That's fine. Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you. Okay. So going back to the consensus statement. First of all, I think I would delete full because we have had enough disagreements. There is enough issues that people are being generous on. So I'm actually recommending the removal of full, especially since we are going in to it with a pending edit even though minor of 7A to 7B. So I'm thinking that it is better to say this report has consensus of the staff accountability subgroup for submission to the WS2 Plenary. So I'm not even going so far as to say there is a consensus on every word here. But there is a consensus on submitting the report. Because I know, you know, one of the nice things about the rotation we have a slightly different crowd at each of the meetings and rarely have everyone together. So I feel more comfortable saying that. I don't know if anybody thinks I should go stronger and remove the 4 submission to WS2

Plenary and say it has the full consensus, but I feel more comfortable with this more couched statement. And I would like to invite comment on that. I see the comment of Cheryl agreeing that it is better to leave it in the softer form of 4 submission, also Jordan.

Okay. And then the final sentences there are no minority reports. I haven't seen any yet. I don't know of anybody who plans to submit one. Do any of you plan to submit one? So I guess it is safe to say that. So I will remove the brackets and accept those changes. At this point I think we have a clean document that I will call draft 1.0 for the Plenary. And it is ready to submit. I just want to make sure that before we close that issue that anybody that's got another issue or a comment to make takes this chance to do so.

Okay. Does anybody object to submitting this as is for a first Plenary reading? We will get it back between the first and second Plenary reading. So we will be able to adjust anything that needs adjusting then. I see no objection. Great. We will go through with that. I will put this together and I will send it to Bernie as our submission for the Plenary.

I guess I send it to the whole Plenary to do that. And I'll do that tonight even. I got lots of time left. So the next thing is any other business. I have got one item of any other business which I really want to thank you all from this meeting and the various other rotations for doing this weekly march through the repeated discussions on this document to get us here. It was a fair amount of work and I really appreciate you all sticking to it. I appreciate all the comments and suggested edits you have made. And I want to thank you. Does anybody else have any other business? Fantastic. Yes, Jordan.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Avri, I want to thank you for all the work you have done as the persisting Rapporteur to drag it and massage it.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thanks. Without you having gotten it started it would have been tough to get this far. Thank you as well. Now that you are chair I have to be a little bit less polite but anyway...so anyhow. Thank you all. I will basically finish the cleanup on this and get it submitted before I turn in for the night. And I thank you for giving me a half hour spare to do it in. This call is adjourned. Thanks a lot. Thanks, Yvette. Thanks, Tina. Thanks, everyone. Bye-bye.

>> Thank you. Bye.

(Call concluded at 12:26 a.m. CST)

This is being provided in rough-draft 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.
