

Staff Accountability Subgroup Meeting #26 – 9 August 2017 @ 13:00 UTC

Raw Captioning Notes

Disclaimer: This rough edit transcript, which may contain missing, misspelled or paraphrased words, is only provided for your immediate review and is not certified as verbatim and is not to be cited in any way.

Can we start recording [this meeting is now being recorded]

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. And welcome to meeting 25. Of the WS 2 staff accountability on 9 August, 13, UTC.

Start out by going through the agenda. First we review the agenda then we will check on attendance and statisticians OIs.

The substantive issues on if the week is basically continue talking about the comment processing on our document. And see what we can get. We have got the board, WS 2 caucuses comments. And so which we talked about quite a bit at the last meeting. But I want to make sure that we don't have more to discuss.

We have the comments from the face-to-face session. That our in a file and so we are a couple can comments beyond George's. And then Patrick sent us a document on some thoughts for subgroup consideration. Being that I'm searching for a solution, I think that's probably at this point one of the more important documents to go through today. So, I want to make sure that we get time for it.

We also have staff accountability checklist that Klaus had suggested and Klaus did submit a first draft of that. And then hopefully we will have a little bit of time to talk about next steps. We won't be meeting for, I think it's two or three weeks after this. So I'd really love to get some volunteers who are actually working on the solutions, for example, if we decide to sort of be supportive of Patrick's then how do we get them into the document and flush it out. I don't be able to do too much during the three weeks. So hopefully we will be in.

The other thing, we have the document update which is just listing the documents. We have action items. And we are going to have to talk about the schedule. Because at the moment, we are in risk space. So we're going to have to, we are on our second try at doing this. If and in my moments of desperation, I think this is another try that may fail. And if that is the case I'm not sure how we will meet our goal. And I even had a talk with Jordan as one of the chairs. You know maybe we just have to accept that there's nothing we can do about staff accountability. That what is there is what's there. And we move on. And send that back as a report. He cautioned me against my pessimism and said he believed we will get something. But hopefully we will. We really need to talk about schedule, because it's really getting scary. Then there's the list of updated meetings.

So, does anybody have any comment on the agenda? And how we want go about it?

Now anything I need to change? Any other business that anybody knows of or ready? That should be mentioned?

Okay. Hearing, seeing nothing, let's go on with it.

Okay. And in terms of attendance, we will use the list of participants in the Adobe connect room. Is there anybody just on the phone that needs to list themselves as being here whose name does not appear? Of course you wouldn't know if your name appeared. There's someone called audio link, but I guess that's the link to the phone call, is that correct.

>> BRENDA BREWER: That's correct.

>> AVRI DORIA: That's the one with the mysterious number in shore call yesterday.

>> BRENDA BREWER: Exactly.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay thank you.

Okay. Then we will proceed with that. Does anybody have an update to their SOI that they wish to mention meanings at this point? SOIs need to be kept updated and if you are a material change in your employment type status that effects the work in this group, you are asked to please let the group know. So especially important if you joined the staff or left the staff.

Anybody with an SOI? I hear nothing.

Okay.

Let me see, is there anything? Can we get the whole width of the page in the browser screen?

Okay, now the next thing is to move to our topic, our substantive issue of the week.

Which is basically dealing with comments. So first thing is -- is and I'll ask George or perhaps Akanori is there's something that needs to be added to the board comments. You sent them in and we did go through them. We never got through going three them specifically but during the conversation I had the impression you thought you were repeating yourself and you were not all that eager to continue going through them one by one. Happy to do so but I please want to check with you, who comments is how you want to proceed with this. Or are you happy that the point has gotten across?

Yes George, please, I see your hand.

Yes George, I do not hear you.

Do others hear George and it's just me?

>> No we're not hearing George.

>> Nothing here.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay.

And yet I see his microphone making noise, but I don't hear him.

[Mute off]

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay.

George?

Okay perhaps we should move on. George maybe you need to type it.

I don't know what to do.

And George says he doesn't know what to do.

Perhaps somebody can help George. We can come back to it.

Okay, so Brenda is going the try to call George.

Let's actually move to the comments from the face-to-face session. Just so we can get them discussed and we will come back to George's. If you can put up this second document, the text from ICANN 59.

Document. I also did create a table for this. Which actually might have been a better thing to bring up. Oh, there's the table. Oh good.

So anyhow, what you see is a table here that I built with all of comments that came in. And what I did is I went through the dialogue and cut them out. So, we had one which is in looking at recommendation 3, where you're proposing a 4 member panel compromising the Ombudsman I have a resist setting up more bureaucracy and Hans and entities. To help my understanding can you give me what kind of issue might go. And surely as professionals can interact on such issues without having to be seen as a panel as such.

So that was one comment. I don't know if anyone wants to comment on that one.

Now, they do make a good point. We had had suggestion, of formalizing it, but that could bureaucratise it. So we need to discuss that and have an answer for this. And perhaps we want to eliminate the panel, since it's perhaps a superfluous piece of bureaucracy.

Seeing no comment I'll move on.

But does your report on dealing with staff, does it get to contractors as staff? Do all the recommendations apply.

And I think our situation was that we said yes.

I hear echo, that must mean George has joined usnea.

>> Yes it is.

On mute.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay, good, we will get back to you George. I want to get these read in and I'll come back to you since I started this.

And does anybody want to comment on that second one? Which I believe we did include contractors, so we just need to be more clear and I think that was also part of what comes out in Patrick's document.

Over the fast felt that staff overstepped their bounds in a process that ultimately lead to board approval something based on that staff action where the group filed requests for consideration to no good affect.

So thinking about what it would be like if something like that aroads in the future that I feel more independent and objective and have enforcement capabilities. And I'm sorry to say I don't see that here. I see a 4 member panel that is is noted elsewhere that has no powers. It's a discussion group and members of the Om ombudsman is under staffed it's independent and paid by ICANN and the staff member of ICANN representative of empowered community which is the only one possible -- possibly independent person where at least a person more sensitive to community concerns than others on this panel and the board member and my experience in watching board in these situation is that the board tens to be protective of staff. I don't get a real -- there's a lot of other things in this recommendation. I think a good idea is useful and make it out ahead and present conflicts. But when there's a real conflict between and prevent conflicts is I think it was meant. And there's a real conflict between that community and staff has either overstepped boundary or failed in their authority. I don't get a real good feeling.

That's basically saying there's this one problem and we do not solve that at all.

And therefore we would need to add something to deal with that kind of ventality.

Anyone wish to comment on that one?

These are just initial comments.

Okay.

The next one is that the goal of which is to make ICANN more accountable would be evaluating when existing mechanisms for holding staff accountable and intervening when staff acts in this a non accountable way is evaluating whether the present avenues were sufficient and if not, what could be put in place that would be more effective.

I think that is in what we are attempting. But there has been comments and I think they come out both in George, some of George's comments and some of Patrick's solution that perhaps there is more to be explored in the current mechanisms.

So I'd like to see that discussion develop.

Does anybody have comments on that one?

Okay, then the last one before I get to -- I reproduced the board caucus ones in there. It's a whole issue which I think comes to the core of a lot of the complaint is staff performance tied to community performance. And should it be. I mean I think that's the bottom line for a lot of things. And particularly when you hear staff appreciating are community leaders to get done by a certain -- I think it means by a certain time, not thing.

That creates a lot of the anxiety.

I suspect that 8 and 9 were exactly like you said. Attempt to address the issue but I would still advocate for not supply -- okay, for not supply making it. As I say, I just cut and paste. It may be submating it. To talipots in a way that you not file privacy. You don't need individuals, you just need information. You adopt need tied to a group or person but just general information that provided with that in my opinion. I would also say, I come from an organization where staff support is evaluated and the issues I support get an evaluation on. It can be done and it can be done without violating. I would be happy to share those questions.

And anybody want the comment on that one?

So those were the comments I picked out from the dialogue. I don't know if anybody else finds anybody else in their reading. I do have the acceptor of the comments in one of the documents. And when I read through it I basically highlighted or height lit -- highlighted, I think, it seems applicable.

So since nobody has any comments on that, I'll come back to George. Because now I'm back to I basically took the board's comments and laid them in the top comment issue 1, issue 3, issue 4, 5, 6, 8., etc.

So, George, I'll give you the floor if you would like to speak to any of these further.

>> This is George. Thanks Avri. I really don't, I think that the thrust of the -- of the caucus groups comments was delivered over the last meeting. And I I'd really like to hear you and the group go on and see if you can make some head way, if you have specific questions, maybe I can try to answer them. Ikanori who is my backup on this, is on the call also. And he may feel free to say whatever he wishes at any time.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you on that. I have one question and I want to give people the opportunity to raise hands and ask any questions that they have. Who is on this WS 2 caucus? Is this basically the collection of all of you that have volunteered to be liaisons in the various groups?

>> Yeah in effect that's right. More or less. There may be one or two exceptions. I'm not sure. But that was the intent.

Okay, and this is -- is this a group that actually meets is periodically, straight the board? And or just sort of curious about it.

>> It's a group that meets separately from the board and not all of us are on every call. Some of the MMSI staff are on the calls. And essentially we meet when there seems to be reason to meet.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you. That was just because this was -- this had been the first I heard of the WS 2 caucus, so I appreciate the board's I appreciate the update.

Does anyone have any questions for George?

I see none. So, I guess the feeling that the board's issues are well understood. So in which case I'd like to take this opportunity to go the Patrick if he's willing to sort of talk us through his contribution which is a really good piece of work of helping us to make some progress. And Brenda, if you can put Patrick's document up, and Patrick, if you would like, would you like to take the floor.

>> Yeah thank you Avri, this is Patrick, director, good morning and good evening, good afternoon everybody.

I don't -- happy to go through this of course. Hopefully everybody has had a chance to peruse it. I don't want to read the document at anybody. But just by way of setting some context, these were observations and notes I had been taking beginning back at the face-to-face in Johannesburg and then as the discussions have come forth and feedback has been brought up and other observations, trying to take a bit of a step back view of all the different topics and issues that were going. Also had some discussions with other group members and a discussion with Jordan while we were in Johannesburg to identify ways we might be able to address some feedback that the board is bringing up. I think some of the feedback that has been brought up by others is also pertinent. But trying to take a look at really just a sense of trying to simplify and, also, identify where we probably have more evidence in areas than other areas. Just taking a fair and balanced look at the evidence from our issues table and see which ones might be more in the context of one or two people, with one or two situations, versus others where I think everybody on the call probably more naturally gravitate towards as concerns or areas to evaluate.

The other thing I will say is that a few of my suggestions are more just about the positioning of the document and introducing some of the other areas, acknowledgements around the mechanisms that are in place or some of the newer mechanisms that are in place and have not been fully evaluated yet.

And the other, I think, observation that I have and have had in discussions with other folks is also that -- this idea around the diagnostic tool. And that one of the insights we might be having as a group is actually the conclusion that it is very difficult for us to -- get into a very specific, here's an issue, so let's go resolve it in this way. And knowing there's a variance of experience with staff and with staff with community around areas of trust and communication and good working relationships and healthy dynamics and all of these types of things.

So putting some more emphasis on you know a recommendation that is more -- to go forward with rather than jumping to any premature conclusions that then necessary state building out a mechanism that may or may not work. Thinking empathically for the board I only imagine

through the 8 different groups and cross community groups plus all of the other advice and policy processes that are happening I can appreciate the scrutiny that the board puts on whether or not the implementation that then has to happen for the organization and or the community, we want to make sure it's commensurate and appropriate for all the [indiscernible] issue and make sure we all have clarity on that. And a number of different pieces here that I thought we might be able to evaluate and move the document forward by providing a bit more context and then eventually simplifying or grouping some of these issues and then providing a corresponding solution that seems on balanced to that. And I was very consciously careful to not throw anything out. So I did make note where the formulation of issues or corresponding recommendations didn't cover all of the pieces we had in the document, but made my notations there as well.

So apologies for the bit of the meandering context this morning and then probably the length of the document. But I would at this point like to put it back to the group to see if there's any questions or comments or observations that the group has as far as this being something you might consider as we continue to formulate the draft document. Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you for the explanation, the discussion. I saw that very often you went to extra bit of work to basically put it in the separate document instead of just sort of sticking these things as suggestions and comments [indiscernible] and I understand the sensitivity in doing that. Now I half wish they were in the document but I really do understand and appreciate the sensitivity to which you treated it, given all things considered.

But, okay. I'd like to open it up. Is there anybody that read it or is in the quick read, that people do, in meetings that would like to comment? Are there others that just wish, yeah, we should edit the document, basically following this pattern? I kind of like to get some feedback.

I mean my instinct is it's all good stuff. There might be things that I can bicker about a little.

But you know, I would love to see it and suggest itself in this the document. Okay I have some hands up. George first then it's Klaus.

>> Thank you Avri, can you hear me?

Okay, [mute off]

>> George if you are speaking, we are not hearing you at this point.

>> AVRI DORIA: And he is marked as mute.

>> Is this better? Can you hear me now.

>> AVRI DORIA: Yeah we hear you now.

>> This is a real confusion.

So I've read the document and I think there's some good suggestions in it. And I think it's worthy of discussion. I don't want to comment on any of the individual things because I think the group needs to discuss. There's a lot there. Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Okay Klaus.

>> Okay this is Klaus. As George said I think this is a very valuable document and we need A, to discuss it and B, find a way out to merge and development the next document and, also, you mentioned at the beginning there's a timeline and we should be absolutely clear of the call, how we go forward and can who does what and really get the stuff done. Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay thank you.

So, well we are at the point of discussing it. I don't know if people want to discuss particular recommendations? But that's why I was thinking that if there aren't large objectives to it,

actually putting this overlaying this as suggestions on a document that would allow us to then walk through that document and get buy ins or we walk through this document, you know, either today though I don't think we are ready to do is that. Or at our next meeting.

Some comments? I would like to leave some time for you Bernie to go over the timeline in some detail. But if it's okay, I'd like the sort of wait until we have gotten through this. And I know we are at the halfway point, half hour point.

Okay, I'd like to suggest. And I want to see if there's any objections. And it doesn't mean that Patrick has to do it. One or the other of us can do it if Patrick does not want to or does not feel comfortable or doesn't have time, but basically put in the recommended changes as suggested changes into our document. And see how that looks and then do a walk through of that reformed document there.

Now there's also a couple of places in here where it tells us we need to think a little bit more and we need to develop things a little bit more. And those things probably should be picked up, some of the suggestions like the -- like the tool for, you know, discovery, etc.

So, I think there's a lot of work that we can pull out of this. But, is that a way to go with it? Should we, sort of, accept this with gratitude from a staff member of our group and start basically weaving it into the document?

Does anybody object to doing that?

Yes Klaus.

>> This is Klaus for the record. I don't know if you read, Patrick basically volunteered to put the document -- overlay the document and --

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

>> Suggested that we go line by line through it.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay, let me see, thank you for pointing out. I keep coming to the chat but I don't read it constantly.

I don't see anybody objecting to that. and I would certainly be very appreciative. And then at our next meeting, we can walk through that document. And if everybody else in the group also went through it and made suggestions, for dealing with some of these issues, if other people in the group perhaps put some of the content in the discuss part of that table, that might help us move it forward for the next meeting.

So, if that's acceptable as a plan, I will gratefully except Patrick's offer. I willen treat the rest of you to spend some time in the document over the next week. Even if it's only the hour you would of devoted to this meeting.

And please, try to get some edits, some suggested edits in there that we can then start walking through.

If that's that. Then before going to the time line and practical, I would like the give -- and thank you again very much Patrick for this. Because I think it does move us forward and coming from the staff perspective, is incredibly helpful in the whole notion of how this group should work. So very much appreciated.

I'd like to move to Klaus' document and give him a which is to just talk a little bit about the checklist idea. And get a little bit of feedback from the rest of the group, whether this checklist is an idea that we want to carry through with and whether it's something that should be integrated into our report plan recommendation.

So, once that document's up, I'd like to turn the floor over to Klaus. And we have 25 minutes left on this. So if you could take like 10 minutes or so at most. At least to get us started on it. Because I do want to get the discussion of the schedule in. So please, Klaus if you would like to.

>> Thank you very much. This is Klaus for the record. What you see there is just basically a model and a beginning and very much a draft of a draft of a draft for possible checklist. Why I suggested the checklist is quite shrimp because there's that desire to have very concrete examples issues to address. On the other hand there's a strong need to keep specific cases and allegations out of the discussion. That's why basically as a compromise mode I suggested the way of the checklist. And looking at Patrick's suggestions and existing document, basically I think a exist can checklist would be complimentary and helpful for staff and community to have to see what is going on. Again, these checklists what you see in front of you is just a model of a model of a model. It's just the idea of to demonstrate what the idea of the checklist is. If that checklist you feel is not helpful and should not be further developed I completely understand that. And I'm more than happy, if you think it's just more work for not justified outcome. Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you Klaus. Any comments? On both the idea of a checklist and it's inclusion and the report and or the content of this draft of a draft of a draft. I have more trouble with model of a model of a model. That level of abstraction does confuse me. Yes George.

>> Well, I find this interesting in part because the checklist is so simple and yet so important. If you don't know it, apparently the one thing that has resulted in the safety of the airline industry is the checklist. And but this checklist looks like it's written as if it's a performance review at the end of a process as opposed to a checklist of things to do. For example let me try to rephrase this. A, identify stakeholder groups concerns. B, clearly communicate with all of them., etc., etc.

And in other words, something to be done as a process goes on.

I have a problem with it because in general, as I understand it, what we have been talking about is the performance of staff as a whole and not necessarily the performance of an individual. So that goes against, I think, what we -- what I think I have heard you all saying.

The -- there's a fundamental issue here, what is an issue? In a it says, the specific issue on hand. You start a checklist like this with every issue? Every small issue? Every medium issue? What defines the granularity with which the checklist will be used. And in fact, I guess I could also make a segue to using this checklists as just as a means of good behavior. A way in which staff and community should interact together to be internalized and perhaps not even regarded as a checklist. Just something you do as a matter of course in dealing with your work. So while I think the ideas are good, I'm not sure how it should be implemented.

Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you George. Anyone else wish to comment? Klaus do you wish to respond at all to any of that?

>> No, I think the suggestion of a George make had a lot of sense. But as I see now no further responses from the group, I think this is -- was a suggestion and that doesn't seem to have too much uptake. So we just bury it quietly.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay thanks. I don't want to bury it. Okay Patrick please.

>> Yeah, just wanted to point to something I made the comment in the chat but I'll verbalize it as well, this is Patrick. Many of these questions and understanding that they are draft of a draft. Not too concerned about any words that the this stage but it seemed to me in reading through this that this might be the types of ideas and questions posed in in the diagnostic tool that we are talking about. So if it were to come out that within implementation it becomes a customer or community satisfaction surveyor something of that nature, these types of questions formulated appropriately, would I think reach out to the community and get you input and feedback on this. And help actually reflect back to the organization and potentially with more specificity. So we know if the service or more specific department level we could maybe incorporate it there. So that's something else we can think on and think through as we go through the document.

Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you. If great comments. I do want to indicate that this is on the drive document. It is open as all the rest for comments and suggestions. So, while thinking through this, and thinking through whether this can evolve into what Patrick was mentioning, I think it would be a good idea for people to comment on it and suggest wording changes. Especially perhaps moving it to that, you know, and then we can come back to it.

I don't want to -- and this is what I was starting to say before I saw Patrick's hand, I didn't want to bury it after one meeting or one discussion. I want to give people a chance to mull it over.

And I sometimes think the editing fingers on a drive document somehow can speak as eloquently or more so than the comments we make in these meetings. So we really do intrigue people to spend a little bit of time in documents and seize what comes out.

Anybody else have any other comment on this?

Any objection to sort of keeping it acon live? Keeping it there and asking you all to take a look at it. Yes please Greg.

>> Thanks, this is Greg Shatan for the record. I think it would be interesting to see it rephrased as a pro expectative checklist that might get more traction or given alternative. For example, the first one could be staff should identify all stakeholder groups that are concerned with the specific issue on hand. Staff should clearly communicate with all concerned stakeholders. Whatever. Kind of see it in its totality, it's note very long, and see if kind of a beginning of cycle look to it, you know helps our process.

Thanks.

>> AVRI DORIA: Fantastic, thank you, and perhaps your typing hand will have a chance to give that a try over the next couple of weeks. If not, perhaps someone else can.

Anybody else have comments? So I think we can keep this alive, take a look at it. Look at how you would edit it and then we will come back to it in had the next meeting, once we have a updated report based on Patrick's recommended responses to comments we have gotten.

Anything else that the rest of you put in and hopefully we will have take a gigantic step forward. Because now I'm going to ask if -- if Bernie would like the on take us through the schedule and show us how much trouble we are in, in terms of meeting the end goal, if we don't get a acceptable first reading out soon.

So Bernie I turn it over to you.

>> We had thank you. the reality of the schedule that was proposed and shared CCWG, thank you Brenda, is now up on your screen. This is not new. And has been presented a number of times including at the join first meeting again.

The top line of that slide is what we call a single public consultation. The bottom line is doing two public consultations. At this point, two public consultations for the group is not an option in any way, shape or form.

So really what we are talking about is the top line. And the bottom line is what we need to do to get finished by June. Which means we have to start consolidating things and writing a final report. Because you will remember that what we have agreed to for a final report is that all our groups that are doing recommendations, such as this one will run through a public comment. They have to. And we are asking the chartering organizations and the board to be very forthcoming with any major issues they have with those recommendations at the time of a public consultation. And that hopefully we get those addressed after the public consultation. And then when they get included in the final report, we are only looking at comments of interdependencies between recommendations of groups. And we are not readdressing things from scratch.

So that's the game plan for us.

So, in this case, what we are looking at is the -- you will see the yellow vertical bar marked 60 that's ICANN 60. So basically by the end of ICANN 60, we need plan re-approval to go to public consultation on a document. So basically the first week of November staff has to get the document and has to do all the administrative backing and filling out forms and getting it ready to go out for public comment. There is no choice in that the length of the public comment is set and that will take us to almost mid January. Staff will then plow all the comments together. And the team has to come up with an updated version by mid March that will respond to all questions.

Now what this means in reality, if we are looking at the top line is right now we are almost in the middle of the August blue line. That gives you until we need to get this two readings of the plenary that gives you about 10 weeks from now. Let's not forget, going through a plenary to do a first reading is not a simple e simple thing. Because of ICANN 60, if we look at the actual schedule of plenaries. What we will see is that we have a bit of an advantage. I have done this with another group of diversity, and what that means is that although the September plenary is on 27, September, the October plenary is on 18 October because the week after we will travel to ICANN 60. Is really the official timeline forgetting something in to be a fitter reading on 18th of October would be that a document is delivered for plenary consideration by 11 October. And then it's goes flew a first reading on 18 October. And then it will go through a second reading at the face-to-face on 27 October.

So that is about the latest we can do. In extremist we can do a first reading at the face-to-face meeting. And we can do a second reading with one week's notice on the list as we have done before. But after an ICANN meeting we know it's really rough. The document has to be 11 October. First reading 18 October. And second reading 27 October. Face-to-face.

So really, about 10 weeks to get all of that done. And if you go to middle of October, I'm saying 11 October to get a document in, it really means you have about 8 weeks to get a document done and in.

And as I mentioned this is a single public consultation. So you will want to -- and I've given this advice to other groups. And I think they have been receptive. Is given the lateness of the process you want to try to brief this as much as possible to have a smooth public hearing. Because you're going to be in a situation when the public comment period is over and you have to propose changes that if your changes are really significant it's going to be a dice role as they go into the consolidated final report. That's my presentation. I'll be glad to take questions. Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I have, this is while others are getting their questions up, I started making notations in the part of our agenda. So, the first reading is latest is 18th October or delivered by 11 October. If the second reading is 27 October, after that 18th reading any changes, what is the delivery date on that one?

Or basically it has to be a unchanged document?

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: No I think there can be changes, if we look at it. I'll pull it up on my schedule.

>> AVRI DORIA: I would say, I was very surprised we didn't already have a first reading. But I accept the judgment of the chairs, that we -- because I thought a first reading could get, gee, you need to change a lot. So we have not had one so we still need to have our first.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Correct.

>> AVRI DORIA: Right.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: And if there are any changes, I would say, given it's a face-to-face meeting given it's a special creature for us. I believe, well, let's look at the facts. The face-to-face meeting is on the any. And basically we say if we get it a week ahead of time, we are good. So we would respect the deadline if any changes to the documents were in by the 20th of October. But let's be clear, the 20th is a Friday afternoon. So I do not see any problem given traveling and people will be focusing on ICANN activities a lot to stretching that to the 23rd I'm fairly certain the cochairs would approve that. So basically that would give you 5 days to make any significant edits to the documents for reading. Let's be clear what I mean by second edits. If something requires too many changes it's not accepted as a first reading. And if something is accepted as a first reading, and I would call it suggestions and moderate changes to improve the document, then it gets accepted as a first read asking those changes can get made in the next few days. Usually they are not earth shaking changes. And you can submit those fairly quickly.

If there are really significant changes that are being looked for, it's uncertain that the plenary would approve it as a first reading.

Thank you. I'll pass my --

>> AVRI DORIA: Yeah, it does. One other question I had, I don't know if anyone else has questions, what do you mean by grease the skids. You said things we would do because there's only one public comment and you said grease the skids and I don't know what you mean as an activity, as a --

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Apologies for using that colloquialism. Really what I mean is that in those groups that had the opportunity -- that have the opportunity to do two public comments, you can be a bit more risque in your recommendations. And you will see how the community reacts to them in your first public comment. And then you can sort of gauge how that went and go for any cleanup in the second publication. In this case as I said there will be only be one. So

by greasing the skids what I really meant is it reduces your margin for presenting high or risk strategies in your recommendations.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: So if you do that, by lowering that risk, then you're greasing the skids and things should go smoother. I hope that helps.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Yes. Thank you. So basically we having failed twice, to put together something, we are obviously going to be as conservative as we possibly can be. As I say, I've been ready to say there's nothing we can do. So, but I think Patrick has at least breathed an air of there's a possibility still in the discussion.

Because after the last meeting I must admit I was feeling it was pretty hopeless. So anyone else have any other comments? Okay. So I have put this information in about the dates. Basically 18 October delivered by 11. 27 October delivered by 20. With 23 stretch in parentheses. The public comment period have in December. If, etc.

So our next meeting is the 30th. And hopefully I think the 30th of August and then we basically have September to finalize so hopefully people can take time in the second half of this month to put some work on it, some consideration. Patrick is going to be doing his edits which I think will take us a long way.

With that, I ask is there any other comments o comment? Any other business? Fun fact. 23 tons of tallow were used on the grease the skids to get the Titanic out of dry dock.

Oh, that helps my optimism to a great extent. So we can --

>> Avri, given where we are in the documents and Patrick's suggestions, my personal opinion is that I think there's still a good possibility that we can actually get this done. I really do. I think people know I'm rather rough in my estimates but I usually deliver.

And I think part of it's going to be based on the fact that Patrick has offered to have incorporated his proposed changes in the document early next week. And if people could actually do work on the Google doc other ask questions on the list so that when we hit the meeting on the 30th of August, if we hit the ground running, I think that would be great.

Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I will echo your optimism. I think you have rolls and responsibilities to require an optimistic attitude and I will ignore what people are saying about icebergs. If nobody else has any other comments at this point, thank you for the meeting and contributions. Especially Patrick and Klaus. And the board for this consideration of our report.

And with that, I end the meeting. Bye.

Bye.