EN

CCWG-STAFF ACCOUNTABILITY SUBGROUP MEETING
Wednesday, August 30, 2017 - 19:00 to 20:00

>> AVRI DORIA: Hi, this is Avri. I've been told that we've met the starting conditions, so please can we get the recording going?

[This meeting is now being recorded]

>> AVRI DORIA: Hi, this is Avri Doria for Meeting 26 of WS2 Staff Accountability, 30 August, 19:00 UTC. To go through the agenda, it's the standard agenda. The intro stuff, then the substantive issue is report 1.2 which is to discuss the open edits, all of which have been made by Patrick at our request at the last meeting. We have an update of the documents and where they are all at. And there is work to be done on them, but getting this report to a working state is what is most important. The action items had been for Patrick to update draft based on his comments, which he did. And then we'll have to look at the schedule update and see how we're doing and then looking at the updated meeting schedule, depending where we are at the end of this meeting, though it may seem suicidal to say so, we might have to try and meet more frequently. But unfortunately so many groups are starting to meet weekly, I expect we are going to start to see diminishing returns on that move at this point. So let's hope that we don't need to. And then there's any other business.

EN

Does anybody have any other business at this point? Okay, I see none, I'll ask again at the end. Any objection to moving forward with this basic agenda? Seeing none, let's start.

Okay, so that was the agenda review. Attendance, it will be taken based on the participants list and the host list in the Adobe Connect.

Are there any people on telephone alone? Okay, I don't hear any. So thank you for that. Okay, Patrick has moved to host. Okay, we'll yeah, we started.

Okay, then SOI check, does anyone have any changes to their SOI that would affect their participation in this group? Okay, if you do, please update your form and please let the list and/or the call know at your earliest opportunity.

So now moving to the substantive part of the meeting. We have the report and Brenda, if you can bring that up, the 1.2, it's all still in suggest mode. And what I'd like to do is walk through it and basically discuss acceptance or not. My goal for this, if we can achieve it, is that this be the working draft with the changes accepted by the end of this meeting and then we can start to prepare for any wordsmithing and such we need to do in order to be ready to send it to the Plenary for its readings.

On the other hand, if we find that we're in a state at the end where we can't accept this as the working draft, ready for the last steps before Plenary, then we will need to decide what we do next.

Okay, any comments before I start on the plan for the day? Seeing none, okay. So I'm basically, I'm looking at the list on drive so that I can go through. And I'm basically going to look at it in

EN

changes. So the first change was paragraphs 2 and 4 and I would like to open   of the introduction. No, you have gone beyond it. Sorry, sorry. Yeah it's paragraphs, of introduction, paragraphs 2 and 3, marked as a simple change. So does anybody have any comments on those or can I accept those? Seeing no objection to my accepting one

>> Avri, it would be easier to know if we object or not if the document stops moving. Thank you. [Laughter].

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay, thanks. I do recommend that following through is easier on the drive doc, but if you can't, I understand. I'm not moving it

>> If someone gives us the URL, I would be glad to look at it myself.

>> AVRI DORIA: It's at the top of the document, but I'll paste it into the chat. Give me a second.

>> I see it in the agenda. It's all right. Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: All right. But since I have already copied it, let me put it there just in case. So I'll ask my question again, I saw one green check, okay to accept that. If there's wordsmithing, we can certainly go back and do wordsmithing. I'm looking for the general tenor, but please come up with any word changes, should you have some. Okay, I'll accept it.

The next change is basically there's a set of them in the next paragraph. And basically it adds a phrase and it subtracts two sentences. Are there any objections to accepting that one? Any comments on that? Okay, seeing none, I will make those changes. Okay, and that also did effect a footnote down at the bottom which had been about the report being agreed upon usage for ICANN organization.

EN

Okay, so then the next set of changes comes in the next paragraph, which is at the beginning of the next page, page two. Yes, thank you. So it's that first full paragraph there. And there are several changes in that. There's basically the addition of a sentence. And describing the efforts and the accountability system existing within ICANN. Is there any comment or objection to accepting that change? Fantastic! There's some comments in the document that we'll go back to after, but at the moment I want to work on the changes. So no objection on the first paragraph.

Then the group has identified a few and it was basically discussing issues and changes that ICANN can make, so there are several edits. There's one, two, three more edits four more edits in that paragraph. Anybody object or have a comment on any of those?

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Avri, it's Alan, do we want to say that we have identified changes that will enhance or that the group believes will enhance? I'm just asking, do we want to .

>> AVRI DORIA: I'm fine. Does anyone care? We can add the

>> ALAN GREENBERG: I don't much care, I'm just pointing it out that we might be accused of making claims we cannot defend at this point.

>> AVRI DORIA: So you would say, we identified a few changes we believe that ICANN can make. Or, we believe could make

>> [Overlapping conversation]

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Which we believe will further enhance.

EN

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: I don't feel strongly about it, but I like eliminating ways people can discredit us.

>> AVRI DORIA: Does anybody object to that change? Which we believe will further enhance okay. And the rest of it is acceptable to folks? Okay, so I will accept those. Accept those. And establish to support. Okay, great.

The next paragraph remained unchanged. Then there was a paragraph thanking the ICANN organization for collaboration. That whole paragraph has been stricken, so you can only see that, I guess, in the other one. But anyone that is looking at the drive document can see the struck paragraph. Okay, I will strike that.

And then the supplement is written. Now there's a comment earlier about likely need to evaluate the language in the supplement to align it with the final text we determine is in this document. That's very true. At least we will need to add a description of the process we went through and such and indicate that. But we can get to that part later. That's for the historical treatment.

Okay, then   okay, I see   I'll accept that deletion paragraph. That puts us through the introduction. Does anybody have any further comment they would like to make on the introduction before I proceed? Seeing none, I'll keep moving on.

Okay, and I see a note from Patrick, the thanks paragraph is moved to the end of the document, it wasn't removed completely. Okay, thank you for that.

EN

Roles and responsibilities, I don't believe was changed at all. That was left as it was.

And so then we move down to page three for the issues section. All right, and there was a change there in the first paragraph that is as staff accountability process about improving the processes and culture [Reading] departmental and organizational level. Is that acceptable? Okay, accept.

And then there was just some   then the next sentence, the next one was largely an additional paragraph, after the elements involved in the groups assessment were collected and discussed, the following themes emerged which the group determined which is of systemic nature and should be addressed by the community. I'm reading some of these out on issues and stuff because I figure they are important and anyone that isn't looking can see them. Is that one accepted? Okay.

Then the next one that included identifying issues or concerns. And then on page four there was no change   wait a second. Am I looking at the right   I'm seeing here, it's indicating that the first one is changed and yet in the copy here I'm looking at the change as already being accepted. I'll have to go through it just to make sure. So on paragraph A, lack of broadened [indiscernible] understanding, that certainly was changed, so I don't know what happened. Is that paragraph A acceptable? I see somehow or another it's already been accepted, I'm not sure what happened, but I can always unwind if I needed to. Does anybody have any comment on A? Okay, I'll go to B, which was the lack of effective diagnostic mechanism to clearly identify and address accountability concerns between community and organizations. And then it goes into two specific bullets. One of the overriding themes of the group's work was addressing the

EN

challenge that much of the evidence provided was general and anecdotal in nature. There was a broad consensus that there were concerns in the community, but it was difficult to single out the key sources of the concern. The group noted in its discussions there was no established approach for measuring the satisfaction or relationship health of the overall community and of its representative components with respect to serve delivery of the departmental or organizational level. And then a second bullet, and I'm sorry I didn't read the one before, but probably should have, the work of the group identified a consistent theme of the desire for safe forum, for expresses concerns regarding organizational performance in a less formal or alarmist fashion than the current mechanisms. And then a highlighted thing, of sending formal [Reading] another consistent theme was the concern about how to best address perceived inconsistencies or concerns regarding implementation of community. Ignoring my comment on that for the moment, is that paragraph okay? It says it's already been accepted, but that's beside the point.

Yes, Klaus?

>> KLAUS STOLL: Thank you, Klaus for the record. I see us open to the criticism or the question, what do you base that on? I really see it as a very quick step to come to there and I just want to [indiscernible] criticism and I just see people asking us, what are you basing that on? Maybe it's not the right place to bring that point, but it's just, as I say, on one side I like the text, I agree with the text, but I see the text open to criticism. Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. And that's because we don't mention   is that covered though in the first paragraph or do we make   this is Avri, again   or do we need to make that the first

EN

paragraph? Because it says we reached out to the community to occasioned concerns. Perhaps we need to add a sentence in there that says, several documents, e mails, and other contributions were made discussing issues that people had. Does that kind of sentence in there, and obviously it would need to be wordsmithed better than what I just said, so this is back on, this is the first paragraph of issues on page three. Because here it says that we reached out to the larger to identify, but it doesn't say that we received, you know, and I'm not suggesting we catalog them, but received, you know, a copy of a letter that had been sent to the Board, we received various individual e mail statements of issues, and various, you know, verbal discussions in some of the earlier meetings. And so do we want to make some indication there that it wasn't just that we reached out, but that the community did respond? Any comment? And, Klaus, does that ameliorate at all the issue for you?

>> KLAUS STOLL: Yes, this is Klaus for the record. Yes, it does, especially in the form you put the last one where we actually name the different things what happened so that people know we are not skating on very thin ice.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay, so I'll just put a comment in here now and then we can put the text in later. Basically describe documents and other things received. Okay, I've added a comment there just as a marker to do it. We can certainly come back to it at the end of the meeting if we wanted to do the wordsmithing here and still have the time.

The comment I had here, and now that I read it, I'm not sure I care, but I cared when I was first reading this, is that basically some of the alarmist fashion other than current mechanisms and the current mechanisms are formal correspondence directly to Complaints Office, CEO, or

EN

Board, but there is also all the public methods of blogs, circa ID, industry press. And I think we would like to avoid those, too, but I don't know if it's worth mentioning it here. So it was my comment when I was first reading it, but on reading it now, I leave it there, if people think it's worth putting in an extra bit there, then we can, or we can just ignore the comment. Do any of you have a comment?   Well, seeing no support for amplifying further, I'll just ignore the comment. I actually get a kick out of ignoring my own comments.

Okay, now we move to the critical piece which is the recommendations. And so this I'll just mark as resolved. Okay. Recommendations. And I want to take that one line by line at this point. So based on these underlying issues or concerns the group is proposing the following recommendations. Oh, I see what I did before in accepting, some of the addition blocks are rather large, so if I accepted it at the beginning of something, I've accepted the rest. I see what I did. Okay. So we'll just move through it. I don't assume there's much to argue with in that first one.

Then next point, next sentence, to address the lack of understanding of the existence and/or nature of existing staff accountability mechanisms. First bullet, ICANN organization should improve visibility and transparency by posting on ICANN org [Reading] and process, description of how the departmental goals mapped to ICANN's strategic goals and objectives, description of the Complaints Office and how it relates to Ombudsman's Office [Reading] during the WS2 work, the ICANN delegation document, the roles and descriptions included in this overall report, and finally expectations and guidelines regarding the development of staff reports for public comments or staff response to community correspondence. Any comment or objection? You probably want to roll up a little bit because you are not seeing the whole

EN

recommendation. You probably want to roll up recommendations to the top. Okay and it crosses the page break. Okay, so there's the beginning and then it continues below the page break.

So does anybody have any comment or is this acceptable? Okay, we'll move on seeing no hands and seeing Cheryl's check. Thank you very much for the green checks. They are good. Oh, the document has scroll for all. Thank you, Brenda, that's probably the best solution.

Okay, then the next bullet, ICANN organization should also evaluate what other communication mechanisms should be utilized to further increase awareness and understanding of these existing and new accountability mechanisms. And I guess I added a comment there, again, easily ignorable, would this be an activity for just the ICANN organization? In other words, asking whether the ICANN organization alone should be doing this or whether there should be a solicitation or something. And as I say, unless somebody supports doing something further, I'm happy with having asked the question and resolving it for now unless someone thinks there's something important there that should be continued. So does anybody want to argue for further developing that notion? I see and hear nothing and, therefore, will mark it as resolved.

Okay, then continuing down. To address the lack of a clearly defined or broadly understood lack of   okay, there's a grammatical   to address the lack of a clearly defined or broadly understood mechanism to address accountability concerns between community members and staff members regarding accountability or behavior. So it's either we move the "a clearly"

EN

or to singularize the word "mechanisms." And either fix is fine for me. Does anybody care? Okay, why don't I remember the "a" and leave it as mechanisms?

Okay, then first bullet, I'm assuming there's no objection to that. And we are almost half way through our allotted time. First bullet, ICANN organization should enhance existing accountability mechanisms to include a regular information acquisition mechanism which might include surveys, focus groups, reports in the Complaints Office to allow ICANN organization to better ascertain its overall performance and accountability to relevant take holders. There are two bullets under this bullet. And please, I'll keep looking up to see if there's a hand if anybody wants to stop me. The group notes that several new mechanisms are now established, but have not yet been exercised enough to determine effectiveness or potential adjustments. The evaluation mechanism proposed here would be helpful in determining effectiveness of these recent mechanisms before creating yet more mechanisms that may turn out to be duplicative or confusing for the organization or community.

And the second bullet, results of these evaluations should be made available to the community. So I'll stop at this bullet, any comments? And we're at currently on the middle essentially of page five. Right? Yes. Any comments on that? Okay. Yes and I see Patrick agreed with removing "A."

Okay, next bullet, [Reading] requests made by the community and for responding with a resolution or updated timeframe for when a response can be delivered. How is that? There's obviously an expression of one of the recommendations we had. Is that acceptable to all?

EN

Seeing no hands, not even seeing that green check I've come to rely on, but, okay, I'll continue on.

The next bullet   oh, a Smiley face, that's as good as a check any time. ICANN organization should include language in the performance management guidelines for Managers that recommend people Managers of community facing staff seek input from the appropriate community members during the organizations twice annual performance reviews. That is obviously another one of the organize recommendations we had put in different language and making a guideline. Is that acceptable to all? Okay. Then that whole batch of things there has been accepted, basically up to that. And now I'll move on to the next. Still see no hands.

Then basically what we have here was a deletion of one and of two. And what we got to is here it says two. There it says three. So we will need to do something about cleaning up numbering since we didn't have any numbering up to that point, I'm suggesting that this would become a bullet as opposed to a number for what is currently number three in the drive document and number two on the PDF. Okay, so I just turned it into a bullet. Okay, and that one remains as it was.

Now we'll have to come back to it, and it says, and Patrick has a note, this recommendation, as well as [indiscernible] might need further scrutiny to address [Reading] related to staff accountability. Or determine if these may benefit from a bit more specificity or direct language. And we also know that we had some comments pending from the discussion we had previously that are in that table that was discussed last time, that may warrant an edit on this. Does anybody have any comment on any of that at the moment?   So we are leaving this

EN

recommendation per this, but we may want to, we may want to shift, we may want to reword somewhat and we may want to explain better because people were saying, why a panel? Why does one even need to be created? Can't these guys just talk to each other? Are we creating another level of bureaucracy? Et cetera. And also the concern people had about this being a development of some new powers for these folks, which was not the intention. So we probably need to add language to this one based on the comments we got from that previous attempted reading.

Okay, then the next ones were all eliminated until we got down to   and where does this show on the PDF? Let's check that. So basically, okay, the PDF does not have it. So then the next one is, it starts with "what is for" it becomes a bullet, ICANN organization should work with the community to, A   oh, and this was the service level ones and that remains unchanged. But it has a comment, if we keep this recommendation, can we specify the elements were clear expectations should be established? The term SLA will be challenged throughout this process based on current usage in the community.   But if we can specify which elements need established guidelines for expectations, that might be more agreeable. So we've left these in, but we need further work on them. Any comments from anyone?

Do people think they're fine? Do people think we should change service level agreement? That was specifically was requested by at least one of the contracted parties.

Yes, Cheryl.

>> CHERYL LANGDON ORR: [Audio mumbled] I see the point [indiscernible] to the term [indiscernible] so I'm happy to suggest that we do make some clarification or at least, you know

EN

a clarifying definition, you know, be it a footnote or whatever, but I do think it is likely to cause some [indiscernible] that we could do that basically.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay. Now there's one responsibility   thank you for that. This is Avri, again. There's one possibility to just put in a footnote that discusses that the details of any such service level agreement, we could even be optimistic and say service level guidelines have taken it out of existing language and add a footnote that these are similar to service level agreement it's for [indiscernible] as is in there and the footnote develop that these are guidelines, et cetera. That would be softening the language. It would take it out of the, sort of, automatic reaction that people have to SOAs and SOAs being of a contractual nature and take it back to a process guideline. So that's one way to do it. I see a green check from Cheryl, which sort of says that taking that path would be sort of an acceptable softening.

Patrick, would that satisfy your comment? If we changed the word "agreements" to "guidelines" and then perhaps explained it in a footnote? Okay, oh, you are typing, not talking, okay. I think it would. Okay, thanks. So I've got the change in there. And if there's no objection, I'll change that now. I'll accept the change I just made. And I can then basically accept that which we have accepted the edits. I can mark   I'll just put changed levels   I mean, changed agreements to guidelines and call it resolved, just for the record.

Okay, there's still the recommendation to consider dividing 7A and 7B into separate. I put this in there because somebody said it. I just as soon leave the two of them together. What does anybody else think? Does anybody else think we should, you know, it would then be, ICANN organization should work with community to and then append A and then ICANN organization

EN

should work with the community to and append B. We can go either way, but does anybody think it's important to do that? Perhaps it's important to do that just because it shows, you know, cooperation with comments. What does anybody else think? I don't want to be too cynical about making the edits. No opinions? So we can just leave it as it is? Does anyone object to leaving it as it is? We got a hmm. And then Patrick says in the reworking, might these two items collapse into a single ask? Well, they started out as that and then people   and then they started out as separate, they have been together once and then they got separated. But if you are saying the service level guidelines come out the same as service level definitions and perhaps we want to change definitions also to guidelines   but, no, I think they can't be combined in a sense because there was the specific contracted parties ask and there was specific other things ask and they never quote overlapped. So my feeling is we leave them separate, eat as two separate bullets or as A and B of the same bullet. How about I leave them as they are for the moment and we can come back to this later? So I'll leave the comment unresolved.

Okay. Then the next two were deleted. And that we've got some good bullet remnants. Okay.

And then we get to the thank you to the ICANN organization for their collaboration in preparing this work. Staff accountability is a vital concern to the leaders of any organization, the recommendations here are designed to be enhancements of a system that is generally working well. And then I had on my first reading made a comment that said, I would recommend this statement be a little less absolute and rather be something like is generally believed by many to be working well. Basically the same solution that Alan provided earlier for a slightly different purpose. Is my change going too far? Or is that acceptable? Is   so it would be, is generally

EN

believed   is generally believed by many to be working well. So other than collecting my standard misspelling of believed. Which should we go with? The original one there or the one with "is believed"? Any comments from anyone? I'm talking a lot in this meeting.

>> Avri [indiscernible] here. My chat may not be clear, but [indiscernible] would be better.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you. And I see Klaus has written something and Patrick accepts it as well. So good, I'll accept that. And I'll accept that.

Then basically the whole table at the end there is nixed. So any objection to deleting that one since what we've got now is much more dispersive and doesn't need this level of table discussion? Anyone object?

Okay, so at this point I think we have a new working base. We have a couple comments to deal with and we need to go back and look at some of the comments we got just to make sure that we hit everything.

Does anybody disagree with that description of what we've got? I don't see anything, so we've got a new working base. This is revision, I'll probably call it 1.3. That one is resolved now. Okay, let me go back to the comments. We've got about 17 minutes left. Oh, okay, I didn't clean that one up. I've got a bunch of spaces to clean up. And let me go to our first pending comment here, which is back at the top. Okay, this is the description of the process. So basically I'll just leave this note here to remind me that I need to go back to the process document and update the process we've gone through subsequent to our first attempted reading. So I'll leave that comment there to remind me to get that done unless somebody truly wants to do it instead of me.

EN

Okay, then here we had, and maybe we can do a little wordsmithing on this one while we're here so it's not pending, is under issues in the first paragraph, we decided we would describe document and other response. So something like, so we had the community reached out to the larger community. The sub team received copies of various issues including copies of messages sent to the Board, individual written statements, and verbal comments during meetings. That was a first attempt. Probably badly typed. So the sub team received copies of various received no descriptions of various issues including sorry about this including copies of messages sent to the Board, individual written statements, and verbal comments during the meeting. Does that work for people? Once I correct all the typos. Does anybody have any edits on that one? Objections? Comments? I see a check from Cheryl. Does anybody else have any comment? It is in suggest mode, so it's not there yet. Okay, in which case I'll accept that if there's no objection.

Okay, then let me go to the next comment. Okay, the next comment, that was just a cleanup. There's a footnote here that does not have a body. I'll have to figure out why that is. I think it just oh it's not a footnote at all. It was just a [indiscernible] one there.

Okay, then we're down to the next one, what do we do about the four member panel on five? Does anybody have any recommendations for how we amplify that, explain it better, deal with the issues? We knew that the issues were this is bureaucracy, does this add power? Should we just craft a sentence? Explaining I'm kind of at a loss of what I should do next here. I'm fine leaving it as it is, but I think we have some pending questions there that we need to respond to.

EN

Yes, Klaus.

>> KLAUS STOLL: Klaus for the record. Avri, whatever we do on that one, it is very wide open and we can't answer all the questions and critiques. One way out for us, should we say, we should explore and raise how to implement and present to the community methodology on how that group should be implemented and then can be further discussed by the community and decided. Is that one way out? I mean it's the coward's way out, but is that the best?

>> AVRI DORIA: That certainly is a way out, but that does formalize it further. And I think what we had said was sort of an informal gathering. You know? But creating a four member panel, and perhaps, so that is one way. And Patrick says, can we define a scenario that would require the exercising of the panel?

The first things that come to my mind are complaints about fairness is one thing where you get both the complaint office, but it's a complaint, and it's an issue of fairness so you have the Ombudsman turf. If the complaint was coming from an SO or AC, then you have pulled in the EC or some representative of those communities into that discussion. And I see what you are saying. You fear without a use case we would lose validity. And a use case would probably need to go   would it go in the recommendations or would it go in the underlying issues? We would have to create an issue on occasions things might fall through the cracks, for example. Or, on occasion, an issue may be complex and require the interaction of several groups. And then come up with a scenario. How will the empowered community choose its Representatives, Klaus asks? I fear I don't know how the empowered community does anything. At this point, I think they are still figuring it out.

EN

Time check, nine minutes left, thank you.

Yes, Cheryl, please.

>> CHERYL LANGDON ORR: Thanks, Avri. Cheryl for the record. I [indiscernible] on occasion to using it, particularly the one that talked about complexity. I think that would lead into a line that would say such as the creation as a panel [indiscernible] for example.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay, so in other words

>> [Overlapping conversation]

>> AVRI DORIA: In this one you would say, start the bullet out with, occasionally there may be complex issues that involve more than just one mechanism or more than just one accountability group. In those cases

>> CHERYL LANGDON ORR: Yes. There could be

>> [Overlapping conversation]

>> AVRI DORIA: So would that be an ad hoc panel that would be created just for that case? And, therefore, we've avoided this   creating a body that exists and looks for things to do, which I think was part of the complaint with the process.

>> CHERYL LANGDON ORR: And [indiscernible] as required.

>> AVRI DORIA: Right, as required. Okay, yeah, people hate the word "ad hoc" for some reason. So, yeah, as required. So that would be one way to deal with that one. What do other people

EN

think? I won't try to wordsmith it in these seven minutes. I'll put it in there as a suggest after the meeting and then we can deal with it. But what do people think? Or maybe I'll start. On occasion, occasion an issue may be complex or otherwise require participation of several accountability mechanisms. In these sorts of cases, ICANN, and then at that point are we going to say should or could, create a four person panel to investigate to deal with the issue. Perhaps that's not the best way. So then the panel will review the concern, in this case, raised by the [indiscernible]. No, that last sentence there would be deleted in this construction. What do people think? We've got six minute left, what do people think?

Let me read am so of the comments. Okay, Klaus liked the idea and I'm not sure whether he was speaking of this change I started making. And then Patrick said, I think it would be more welcomed if we framed the need and asked the organization to evaluate and propose a solution. Okay, so that means unwinding this and unwinding that and unwinding that. And basically writing something up about the need. Okay, so that's one action item we have before we can take this document to a decision for reading.

Okay and then we're back to the other one that I think for now we decided to leave as a single bullet with two sub bullets. Okay, we had one that we liked the edit on the panel point, so I'll have to try and balance this and I'll see what I can do on it afterwards.

But if anybody has any suggestions, please just type it into the text. It doesn't need to be me and we see what great work was done by Patrick and it wasn't me doing it. So I encourage others to take the pen, as it will.

EN

Okay, let's stop there. And going back to the agenda quickly, so we're close, and I think people still agree, we have a working document with a couple tweaks and things we need to add. We need to come back now.

Bernie, I've gotten confused in our process. Do we need to read it twice in the Subgroup to then decide to go and read it twice in the Plenary? And if so, we may need some more meetings. If somebody can put up the   if Brenda can put up the agenda again so we can look at the schedule.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: It's really

>> AVRI DORIA: We have 3 minutes.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Can you hear me?

>> AVRI DORIA: Yep, I can hear you.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: It's really up to the Subgroup. It's a formal requirement of the Plenary to have two readings. It's been common practice in the Subgroups to have two readings of the document, but exactly what two readings means, there is some flexibility in there. I mean, technically the way you have gone through it today could certainly qualify as a first reading with some requirements for some edits and you could say that the next meeting could be the second reading of the document.

>> AVRI DORIA: Fantastic, I love that. Does anybody object to say we had a first reading with some required comments and work of this in the Subgroup? I see Cheryl has agreed. Does anybody disagree? Oh, Klaus has an agree. Does anybody disagree? Please put that red

EN

marker if you disagree. Fantastic! So with two minutes left, I'm going to say that we've had our first reading.

Now looking at the schedule, we need to do it again. Yes, having a successful first reading in this group is truly an applause worthy thing, so thank you, Cheryl, for applauding the group on its efforts.

Now our next meeting is the 13th of September. Do we want to wait until then for   the 13th of September would still be enough for us to get into a Plenary reading, in fact, sooner than we originally planned, so I suggest that we don't need to schedule another meeting between now and 13, but I do suggest that everybody read the document and think about, especially those areas we need to fix. Does that sound reasonable? Can we skip the next week and just go to 13 September? And that would still leave us one more meeting and we can clean up other stuff and we can also go back to the checklist that Klaus started once we've done our second reading of this doc. I see no objection and nobody is saying anything. I see a wonderful first reading, all. Thank you, Greg, I feel definitely elated. And with one minute to go   oh, yes, any other business? Does anybody have any? I don't.

>> Hell no.

>> AVRI DORIA: Hell no. Hell no extra business. Okay, in which case, I thank you all for going through this reading. And I most of all thank you, Patrick, for your contribution to today's efforts with the writing you did. I don't think we would be where we are at the moment if you hadn't. So thank you very much.

And with that, the meeting adjourned.

EN

>> Thanks, Avri, everyone.

[Meeting concluded]