

ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
February 5, 2017
9:00 am CT

Jimson Olufuye: Good evening everyone and it would be a good morning to some that are remote, wherever you are, or afternoon, so you're welcome. My name is Jimson Olufuye. Welcome to this session. I'd like to really congratulate everyone for being very, very attentive and engaging. And I'm hopeful that this last session and we get adequate participation.

Rafik Dammak is sharing this with me, I'll looking at the Workstream II discussion, just discussing a few of the five works in two topics. Out of the two SGs feel about the recommendations. We just spoke about transparency.

Well, this is how we're going to work in this session. We will look at four subgroups topics and then, we'll break it into four sections. The 5 minutes of the session will be general presentation and then 10 minutes of for members of the community to intervene. And then, we will move onto another session of the four sessions. So, 15 minutes for the four subgroup topics we'll be looking at.

Again, my name is Jimson Olufuye, I'm the CEO of Contemporary Consulting based in Abuja, Nigeria. I'm a member of the Africa Capital

Alliance that represents of city businesses, people, users, companies on Africa, Member of the City and I'm the Vice Chair for Finance for Operations. Rafik, we all know, I don't think doesn't need any introduction, Vice Chair of GNSO.

Okay. Can we move to the second slide please? We'll be talking about the Workstreams II subgroups as I mentioned. We'll review four of the subgroup comments. I'll take comments from the floor, that is, from the two sides of the House and that's where well conclude.

Okay. Next? So, just a reminder, this are the nine of group topics, diversity, guidelines for good faith conduct, human rights, jurisdiction, and staff accountabilities. Next please? And then, review of our cooperative given process and then, there's (unintelligible) accountabilities, transparency that we just talked about in the last session.

Next, please? So, these are four subgroup topics we'll be dealing with, diversity, jurisdiction, (unintelligible), and staff accountability. Okay. Next? On diversity, all the Houses, the subgroups, they all agree on recommendation one on the seven diversity elements of job graphic, regional representation, language, gender, age, physical disability, diverse skills, and subgroup on massive transit.

Interesting to know, NCIH has just done an expansion of the seven diversity elements to include risks. I think it's inter, not I-N-T-A?

Rafik Dammak: And interdisciplinary.

Jimson Olufuye: It's inter.

Rafik Dammak: Oh, okay. Yes. And so, inti, okay, inter. All right. Thank you.

Jimson Olufuye: Oh, that's a glitch okay. Okay. Our recommendation two, (unintelligible) as the discretion of elements of diversity. I just feel that's because the importance of staff supports, and SAG says that all sure of dates and recommendations elements. And just beginning to put flexible ICANN importance, they said that could citation a bit constrained by bylaws and privacy law.

Next please? Our recommendation three, four, five, six, everyone was happy. Recommendation three talking about SOCs, the initial assessment of diversity. And recommendation for talks about SOC initial publication objectives of the (unintelligible) and recommendation five, talked about SOC annual update of assessment on the diversity, and recommendation six, sort of an ICANN to provide support and tool.

Next please? And the SOC, in particular, said they would be interested in what ICANN can do with respect to capacity development, awareness, training, brining eternal ex-pats to support. Our recommendation seven, looking at process for dealing with diversity complaints. Everyone was happy with this process and with that, the Board news with possible start was not constrained, and instead with other functions. Once guidance and explanation of implementation were with respect to privacy law.

Okay? Next? Our recommendation eight, talking about ICANN to capture and publish diversity information. This is where ICANN can get statistics from all lines of registration for meetings, truly improved SOI form, remote position footprints as predicted from onsite, remote users.

Next please? Then on (unintelligible) slide, ICANN of diversity or disagreement of office in ICANN diversity issue. All of us supported that.

Next? And then on orders, we got to languages. This is the view of limited resources. Of course, the language translation should be based on UN languages where particular on local languages where ICANN meeting take place.

Next please? And then on membership, this also supports more diversity as a mean of attending group eligibility.

Next please? And this also says, with respect to timing, that it might be need to be indicated timing during the year in which the diversity culture shall have been published and omitted on the SOAC Websites. And to also be useful to note that a minimum, any updates will be made to the SOAC Website after the initial publication.

Next? And still on timing, this is said of the fulfillment of the Board may be tied to an important ICANN event for which SOAC active participants and/or beneficiaries, such as the AGM would revise the date where known to the full ICANN community well ahead of time.

Okay. So, that is brief overview of all views of diversity. Perhaps we could get some comment on that. Would you, Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Sorry, this Rafik speaking. So, maybe just one clarification about the office of diversity. That was not a recommendation from the subgroup. There was no concerns that mattered but was put as not a question. And I don't think there was support within the CIG or NCIG on that matter. So, it's more like, there is agreement that can done in ICANN and if you look at recommendation eight,

it's describing several tasks or what can ICANN staff do. From NCIG, we said maybe if there is any internal or external resources, that's okay if we need some external expertise that's okay. I hope it's just to clarify, the Slide 13, can be confusing there.

But any questions or comments on the, I mean, yes, yes, Remmy.

Remmy Nweke: Yes. Remmy Nweke for direct, Vice President of Information (unintelligible). My question or rather concern goes around the issue that there was raised by enter recommendation two over additional item on the diversity. And I was wondering what exactly was the, what was the contention for them to seek the additional raise and something to be added. Because who justly wants to discuss diversity or see diversity, generally that's also for us being raised to ethnic aspects. So, I don't know if there is any specific concern regarding to that for them to make any special requests for it to be added. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Remmy. So, what the subgroup tried to do is to think about the different element of diversity and to see where we have concerns that can be useful for the different SOC and ACM groups. And there was agreement that, if I can find the list, that geographical regional language and/or a physical disability diverse skill and stakeholder group opportunity are the elements of diversity. So, probably they are covering like, let's say, and to extent to raise and admits these.

So, for now, we, the subgroup is in kind of reviewing the comments and we didn't, I think, we are going through the recommendations, by recommendation. So, we will see how we'll take those comments in consideration and see if we need to make some changes. But there is some consensus that what we have, it's probably enough for now and not sure to

how much extent we can go to be detailed. So, I mean, guys, I know, it's a lot of session, but it would help if you have any questions or comments.

Apparently, nothing, yes?

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Renata, yes, one, a bit of revival of the diversity working group.

One of the, the discussions we had, was part, was around the gender survey conducted by the PID. Is that, sorry. The diversity working group had input from ICANN, ICANN to go into discussions, for instance, the gender survey as well. How much of this other work in diversity in ICANN was included in this reporting in the groups here?

Rafik Dammak: Okay. That's a good question, Rafik, question. So, yes, the subgroup was kind of concerned about, I think it's the gender diversity survey. Yes, we were, we gave some input, I'm not sure, don't know how to, how much, but we gave, and the report was shared with us. But I don't think that we had moved, we thought that there is some of that staff recommendations that we may use. So, yes, and so, also, I think the timing, it was at late stage for us when we are finalizing our comments that it can go to the plan at the end. We can make it for the public comments, so if I recall the timeline.

But, I mean, I'm not sure, do you think that there was anything useful of that survey that we should have used in the subgroup?

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Returning the question. Yes, well, I, one of the things was discussed too was exactly how close is ICANN staff to the community and how much it can assess diversity? So, I'm wondering if, for instance, one of the reasons why the gender survey, even its process or its results, might not have any sort of synergy with the final report. It could be because we are talking about two different worlds. ICANN staff is worried about engagement

and matrix of participation and the diversity work is, which is fundamentally linked to accountability, is more, I wouldn't say prescriptive. But the recommendations are very straightforward for SOACs to follow.

So, yes, I was wondering that, and can we trust, in the future, that ICANN staff will help community follow these recommendations in diversity or not, in your opinion? Can I trust that ICANN staff can help the community follow the recommendations in the diversity report?

Rafik Dammak: Well, I think, in some of the recommendations, we are asking that ICANN staff to support the SOAC and the groups and the different activities related to diversity. Like the very few or, what you call it exactly, or like setting the strategy and so on and even maybe even bringing external expertise. But I think it's what we are expecting is more like support role. I don't think we are looking for the ICANN staff to tell us how do things or what to do. So, hope that's a response to your questions.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, absolutely. And the expectation is that the SOC and SOAC may need to integrate some of this provisioning to their charter so that staff accountability can be, at least the outcome, of the whole diversity exercise. Okay. Thank you very much. We through with the first part, we'll quickly move to the second part. And then, that is on the jurisdiction. The first recommendation is on the choice of law and this is, was alternative five, that is the status quo. And SOC supports has indicated that it should be disclosed with the ICANN organization, GSO, and the contracted party. So, that should be a consultation.

Next slide? And they, oh, back one more? Okay. Advance more? Okay. Yes. So, (unintelligible), which is CSG support and noted that the subgroup properly frames the conversation. Here the Board supports by requirement and

analysis of scenarios with respect to productivity and increased, you know, for documenting costs.

Next please? Then, the insight indicates possible risk to brand owners. But limited choices of menu will address this. Because in the recommendation, there are options for menu, differentiation, different topic, different menu that may suit the jurisdiction. Still on recommendation two, we saw introduction of menu that's supported but Board noted the need for visibility studies on all scenarios to assess impact, predictability, and enforcement costs. And internal meeting, a wait and see position until this substance of the menu for venue is made available for assessment. That is on recommendation two, choice of venue.

Next? Recommendation three, that is continued discussion of the jurisdictional issue. That says CID supports this, (unintelligible) says sufficient time as three years has been devoted to the discussion.

Next please? And recommendation five, respect to official control of facts applicable to REA, BCSLG integration intersupport. ICANN Board says, "They need clarity on the (unintelligible) to remind registrars to understand the applicable the law under which they operate and to accurately reflect this area, customary relationship."

Next slide? On recommendation six on fact of general license or any support. Board indicates there's a process for this if pursued, not grant for success. On recommendation seven, on (unintelligible) licenses for GDLP, all license of support. Board indicated that this is already an ongoing practice. On recommendation eight, that is on fact licenses for registrars. Board indicated that this is already an ongoing process. Recommendation nine, with respect to U.S. functions, this is asked for generalization of waiver with EU

(unintelligible) as agreed policy. Recommendation 10 is with respect to the scope of work, (unintelligible), and ISCP disagree, disagree with minority reports.

Next? Below that, stress testing recommendation related to sections. This to develop, propose three stress tests on sections recommendation and can apply to optimal ICANN accountability on that is status quo option.

Okay. So, now...

Man 1: Is not optimal, but it said it was an improvement, over the status quo, right?
By no means did the stress test say that we're optimal.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay. Improvement. Okay. So, language and adjustment there.

Okay. So, Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Jimson. Maybe one way to get understanding what the different situation, so to others with recommendations. I can go maybe, Steve, if you want to explain like, does he know, present about any new position? I mean, from IPC or ISCP, anybody want to, to intervene?

Okay. We can go first with Francis Genora.

Francis Genora: Thank you, Jimson Olufuye, about this speaking. So, as regards to the choice of law, NCIG decided to support their recommendation is should be discussed with the GNS line, the contracted party. So, we did not a position on that. however, I see that at the NCIG if I am not wrong, they went, supporting the steps. Can we go back to the, Jimson, can we go back to the choice of law?
Okay. So, I think it's the next slide?

Okay. So, I think we see actually some points on such and they decided not this support this recommendation, am I right?

Jimson Olufuye: That is the slide before this? Yes.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay. So, I just had a question from the business constituency. But you do not have to answer but I would like to know why, why do you think this suggestion, this choice of law, might be problematic?

Jimson Olufuye: Because I think we want to respond to that. Yes. Steve, you want to respond?

Steve DelBianco: Farzaneh, it's Steve DelBianco. When it came to the question of choice of law and choice of venue, I'll send you a copy of our comment. But we suggested that status quo approach, we opted for status quo approach, which would retain the current practice of having no governing law clause. And the status quo is a result of over 10 years of negotiation and amendment, agreed to by ICANN and the contract parties. So, it presumably represents an appropriate balance when a balance has been achieved through experience and adversity.

Moreover, the status quo agreements are also apparently acceptable to many of the new entrants who signed on to the new detailed program, 1,000 of them, frankly. And so, on principle, we favor retaining the status quo in order to maintain certainty and predictability for businesses.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you very much. This was, I just, I wanted to know, so that for the next steps, we consider this comment as well. So, okay, for the OFAC, I have to say that the jurisdiction group really achieved a lot of good recommendations to kind of relieve the people that residents in sanctioned countries. And I'm very glad that, that the CSG also agrees with most of the, and I think all of them, all of the recommendations with regards to OFAC. We know the OFAC

has been an issue, OFAC is a U.S. sanctions against certain countries that limit doing business with those countries. And because ICANN is incorporated in the U.S., it has to follow their regulations.

So, some of the problems that people in sanctioned countries faced was that sometimes their domain names would be just cancelled without any, any information why. And they would say, "Oh, because we, the registrar uses that because we have to follow the U.S. law, although they were not incorporated in the U.S." So, they had this impression that they have to follow the U.S. sanctions because ICANN's incorporated there. So, this was one of the examples, so we asked in the recommendation to advise that registrars are not incorporated in the U.S. They do have to follow the OFAC rules.

And a couple of other ones which are very important, one is the general OFAC license for ICANN suggests for registries and registrars to be able to do business. And this is a problem that some of the registry applicants faced before that they applied for and needed TLD and ICANN did not, was not really, well, it's not like that. So, ICANN was not clear whether they are going to apply for an OFAC license for them and it would take a long time and the process was not really transparent. So, one of the other recommendation was that they be able to get a general OFAC license so that they can actually be able to do business with ICANN.

And this is something that's been happening for the past, I would say, the in session of ICANN and I'm very glad and very thankful to the CSG for supporting these recommendations because they, well, they will allow and enhance global access to the DNS.

Steve DelBianco: Steve DelBianco, Farzaneh, I'm glad that that will be helpful to you. We know that it effected it personally and hopefully that experience is reflected in

the recommendations that we supported. It also effected BC and CSG members from time to time. One thing the BC said there, though, is that OFAC is only one country sanctioned. There are sanctions imposed by other regimes in Europe and elsewhere. And so, we had asked that the report include OFAC, but also mention that ICANN should make the same efforts to obtain relief from sanctions from other regime whose sanctions are deemed to impact the ability of people to participate. Or, of entities to become a new registrar or bid for a new TLD.

I also wanted to alert everyone that the jurisdiction group is currently assessing the public comments. The next session is on Wednesday, the 7th of February, at 1900 UTC and the discussion will pick up where we left off on the conversation 2 days ago. And that is, what is it that ICANN has to do to try to get relief from sanctions? Does it have to be best efforts or reasonable efforts? Is there any notion that ICANN can come back and say, "That's too expensive."

We need to finish that conversation so far as, I've told you about this along with some of your colleagues last night and do hope that you'll be able to join that call Wednesday to help push that along. Thank you.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, this is Jimson. I just would like to ask this question to the NCSG. You did say that this is going to continue, that is with respect to recommendation three. After three years of discussing this issue, is this to continue and why?

Steve DelBianco: Hello Jimson, this is Workstream two. Workstream two has been active for a little over a year, one year. And Workstream two is now digesting public comments that just came in on jurisdiction. So, this exactly where we're supposed to be, not three years later but only three weeks after we closed the public comment period.

Jimson Olufuye: All right. Thank you. Thanks. So, let's see if there any further comment or question because we should go and move to the next? Okay. So, who is there, let's start with Paul then.

Paul Andersen: Thank you. Just a quick comment on the best efforts or reasonable efforts standard. I hope that a good law dictionary is handy when the group is reading that. So, for example, best efforts may imply an obligation to exhaust ICANN's entire budget, suing whomever it needs to sue, in order to get a license. A lot of us don't think that's a great idea. Reasonable efforts is a lower standard, that might be a place to end up. But anyway, just highly recommend that as that's looked at, that the appropriate legal standards are fully understood before you pick one. Thanks.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay. thanks Paul. I guess, would have the last words on this before we go to the next.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes. So, the recommendation said that there has to be a study before ICANN goes and gets their general OFAC license. And so, I think their risks in everything else will be assessed there, whatever is a little concerning is that the more interpret this, the less committed ICANN can be to get the OFAC license or do anything towards it. And we have extensively changed the language of the recommendation to say, "ICANN should do its best effort. It should do a study before they get the OFAC license before triggering the process."

So, the measures are there to be taken, so we are not really putting ICANN at risk. And I think, I don't know, I have to look at the language, but I think, I think we need ICANN to be committed to at least take some steps towards getting a general OFAC license. So, this is where I want to end. And also, I

wanted to say that the business constituency comments on other sanction laws around the world is very valid and with release for that. And I think no one else actually raised that, so, that's very good. Thank you.

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you for your interventions. Next, will be on Ombudsman. Can we resort head to Ombudsman slide? Okay.

All right. SSG does not support Ombudsman presentation, but an external office with a fixed term. Indicated that the report is missing independence and accountability of the Ombudsman's office. Few Ombudsman should not socialize with the community. Well, this is, by the way, just out there and we leave with them.

All right. Then, (unintelligible) reports says Ombudsman ready for effective improvement using blog post to create more awareness, publishing more widely to reports. Other recommendation from Ombudsman's office may be affected by budget constraints and trade off maybe underway.

Next one? That was general and then, recommendation one, that is Ombudsman office shall have a more strategic focus, everyone agreed. Both said that subgroup rejects bylaws amendment, many of the conditions need more clarity. On the recommendation two and three, that is (unintelligible) and then soft launch. We all agreed to that.

Next slide? On recommendation four, where we talk about timely response, the CFIC support. SSD supports both with extension that more than 50 days if requested. And interface, it needs to see our information is linked to appropriate bodies. On recommendation six, formal training. SSD, BC support. This is the space where whoever will be employed, shall have relevant training anyway. And recommendation seven, the point for gender

diversity. BC for six, that's for Ombudsman, what is key is qualification, expertise, and experience and as such, does not support gender diversity as main consideration. With respect to the Board says that other ways within the system, ecosystems, we engage to achieve gender diversity without additional cost element. For requests for clarity on the scope of recommendation.

Then recommendation eight, Ombudsman (unintelligible), this has BC support, the Board does not support this phase until corrected information may not be implemented until current implementation. So, there is very discretion raised. We need to review questions raised by the Board. There were a lot of questions raised in that response. The on recommendation nine, revised input on employment contracts to five years. This emphasis supports where the prior review by the panel and feedback from community to be in the process. Recommendation 10, communications planning, including another port. BC and SSD support. Recommendation 11, ICANN to lead policy on Ombudsman involvement in non-compliance work, from compliant work, non-compliant work. This has BC support.

Okay. That is about the Ombudsman. What about you, Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Hey, thanks Jimson. So, that's Tatiana, I guess.

Tatiana Trapina: Thank you Rafik, I thought you forgot my name. Tatiana Trapina speaking for the record. I would to provide weekly summarization on our comments because there was short overview of them. I mean, we have a Ombudsman decision behind me but he's not listening so he'll not comply to Ombudsman. So, about the fixed term five-years contract. We believe that such a recommendation, even if it might be considered as good, cannot ensure that in dependence of the Ombudsman office. It's a bit like using a hammer when you need a drill. If it's about the external office of Ombudsman, yes, five term

contacts can be okay. But if it's about the individual person restricting the contract to five years just makes nothing for independence because the person can still end up in the domain industry or be employed by ICANN.

Then we also believe or at least many of us believe that it would be better -- and by the way I'm sorry that I'm saying ombudsman - old habit. Should be ombudsperson -- that the office of ombudsperson shall not be an individual person but should be better given to the external organization.

One of the recommendations and proposal we make was about ombudsman socializing with the community. It doesn't mean that we want to put ombudsman in the cage, you know, or lock him or her somewhere – ombudsperson.

But we do believe that it might be hard for someone who submitted a complaint especially about sexual harassment for example to see the ombudsperson talking to, you know, someone whom you're complaining about and smiling and socializing and so on.

And also I will not go through the details. We actually submit quite a few more comments. Maybe Farzaneh would like to comment later. But also what we supported was actually the mistake in the final report because the CCWG-Accountability Plenary agreed to change the words, and we didn't find it in the final report so we were actually wondering where did it get lost?

And yes the last point – we are still spinning our heads around as to – with regard to how to ensure - and what are the process actually for the ombudsman decisions and we didn't say any clarity in the report. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks Tatiana. I see yes Elsa and then Stephanie. I'm not sure if I'm missing anyone.

Farzaneh Badii: Farzi.

Rafik Dammak: And Farzaneh. Okay.

Elsa Saade: Thank you Rafik. Elsa for the record. I'd just like to know that - based on several studies that are already online about women reporting sexual harassment or sexual assault issues it's really important.

The point on gender diversity is super important and it's not highlighted neither in the anti-harassment policy nor has it been projected in the actual processes that we've seen in the ombudsperson's office.

We believe that – I personally think that it's very important that we have gender diversity because it's proven that women for instance who are mostly the ones being sexually harassed and sexually assaulted would prefer talking to a woman ombudsperson for instance.

So it's really important that we have this highlighted and take – be taken into consideration. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks Elsa. Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks. Stephanie Perrin for the record and I'm – I apologize for making this comment when I didn't participate in the drafting of our comments at all, but just would like to point out that while five years' contract is an improvement, as long as the ombudsman reports to the board it seems to me that he's not

truly independent and I would've been a lot happier if we'd come up with some way of having him report to the community.

I don't have a mechanism for that but there could be a way of coming up with a committee that he could report to. Unfortunately in the situation he's in right now he's also relying on ICANN Council for advice, so he should have his own independent council. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks Stephanie. Yes Farzaneh and just saying if there is - anyone want maybe from the CSG side, okay. No? Yes Farzaneh.

Farzaneh Badii: Actually Elsa said what I wanted to say. I just wanted to point out that gender diversity especially when the Ombuds office is the one receives the sexual harassment complaints is a must.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks Farzaneh. You want...?

Elsa Saade: Yes. Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so Elsa do you want to add a comment? Yes.

Elsa Saade: Yes sorry. I'm back on the mic. Elsa for the record. There's also an issue about the process of the ombudsperson mechanism, like the details on the informal discussions that happen in the reporting mechanism when the harassment incidents firstly happens.

There's a consideration on the culture or background of the harasser that – rather than on the harassed person so I think there should be also considerations on the anti-harassment policy from the ombudsperson's side if that makes sense.

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible).

Elsa Saade: No I'm not asking. I'm just putting a comment out there; just putting everything I have on the table for now. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay right. Okay thanks Elsa. I'm checking if there is any comment – any further comments or question. Okay. Jimson I guess we can move to the last section.

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you very much. Now to the last section oh that is tough accountability. BC supports the staff recognition mechanism. If there would be further review BCs are just looking at staff empowerment including whether staff feel meaningfully engaged in their work, and have the resources and decisional latitude to effectively carry out their roles and the relationship between community needs a staff growth and distribution.

BC also supports the recent push taken by the working group and addresses tough accountability in terms of broad concerns and service delivery and organizational and departments' accountability objectives without scrutinizing individual personnel or specific incident.

They also believe that the recommendations adopted as part of this work track would be similarly balanced to provide the ICANN community with reasonable accountability and transparency improvement, while allowing ICANN to operate efficiently as an organization and is staffed to perform their roles comfortably and confidently.

Next slide. The board says it requests consideration for ICANN budget and the challenge of keeping ongoing projects running when providing a recommendation.

Okay specifically Recommendation 1, which is provide transparency into assisting staff accountability mechanisms, BC and IPC support. Board also support.

Do – since many of - parts of this recommendation already been implemented it's indicated that it can be improved. The board further requested clarity on the statement.

Could open – the reference to expectations and guidelines regarding the development of staff report for public comment so one is more clarity on that. Board Recommendation 2A, enhancing assistant accountability mechanisms.

BC support but pointed out that new mechanism to assess community efficient staff should enable staff to independently perform their roles and responsibility without fear of retribution from the position taken in a somewhat divisive scenario.

And BC also supports and raises the need for ICANN to recognize staff for exemplary service. Board indicated a need to review ongoing mechanism before new ones are put in place, plans to use the outcome of treaty or survey on service satisfaction to improve the process where necessary.

Our Recommendation 3 – that is explore creation of four-person ad hoc panel. IPC supports. Okay oh ALAC is – yes support as well. Board seeks clarity on scope limits and an example of what the ad hoc panel will do, and to be sure it is not cutting Empowered Community responsibility beyond its scope.

Recommendation 4, creation of service level definitions and guidelines. BC supports but suggest the need for flexibility on some services. Example: summarizing public comments to ensure quality instead of rush to meet a two-week target.

I feel our Recommendation 4 - IPC supports but emphasizes the need for flexibility in processing – in processes guided by balance and transparency predictability. That's all about staff accountability. Can we – over to Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: And thanks Jimson. Okay so any comment or question on this? And maybe I can ask you a question and – oh. Okay Remi. But yes please ago first. Yes.

Remi Ferland: Remi for the records. Remi for the records. Yes there was a – one of the references there that I think we needed to either elaborate or take up as a discussion, especially with the area where the board was asking for additional or something.

Maybe you did. If you can take the slides back. So can we take the slides back? Move – yes well. Yes. There it was making reference about staff performance reporting. Rafik go back – yes.

Rafik Dammak: Yes here.

Remi Ferland: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Remi Ferland: Oh no, no. You passed it. Yes where the board requested further clarification.

Rafik Dammak: Please use the mic.

Remi Ferland: Okay sorry. Where the board requested further clarification with respect to the reference and made the expectation and guidelines regarding the development of staff report for public comment.

I think it required a little more elaboration for those who understand it or more discussion for me. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks Remi. Maybe we need someone who was in the subgroup to elaborate on this. It was not myself so I cannot. I don't know (Theresa) if someone around here who was involved or was participate in that subgroup so...

Remi Ferland: Okay well my feelings is that well no the quality of reports that would be published. There is some form of expectation about it and so the board is asking for clarity regard to – in what you measure the quality of the reports – put the full public comment.

So I think that is what it's talking about. Okay so Rafik – sorry. In that case do we have any metrics to suggest to them respect to what they are requesting there or – because I know the – almost every organization have their own in-house metrics for measuring staff performance or something like that.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks Remi. I think maybe in term of process we have to recall that now, I mean, there was the public comment to our recommendation so – from the staff accountability subgroup.

That was in - I think in the 15th so - of last month and now the subgroups is reviewing those comments. Yes the slides are summarizing the comments received.

So it's up to subgroup I think to make a decision about the comments and how to respond to them. Okay let's – any further question or comments? I guess maybe Jimson we are reaching the end here. Everyone is tired and...

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: But maybe what we can do as we're up – there – the – what seemed a – in different area for those agreements on the recommendation for the different subgroup.

And I guess maybe the question that maybe not for now but in future are the NCSG and also the convergence within the CSG feel they will support at the end when times come all the recommendation from Workstream 2 or not.

So maybe it's something we should have in mind but maybe it's a little bit too early to talk about that so just is something we can talk but maybe not now. Okay. Seeing no question or comment yes I guess...

Jimson Olufuye: Okay thank you Rafik. It's quite impressive as Rafik said to see some form of convergence in the opinions of the two separate groups and I think this session has eliminated the – some point of view of others and provided clarity why decisions – why position were made.

And I'm sure as Rafik said down the line recall about the - more opportunity for maybe alignment. Excuse me. The – on this note - though we just have six more minutes on this note – oh okay. You want to comment? Yes Remi.

Remi Ferland: Sorry. I'm – seems to be coming back to this. Yes there are some places where references were made basically to BC and IPC. Does it mean that either there was a consensus and maybe they have a position strongly held that required it to be mentioned or there was no agreement within the community that required that specific mention? I'm just wondering. Thank you.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay yes. This is Jimson and thank you Remi. Basically on the review of the comments those are the constituencies that specifically commented on those recommendations.

So that was why they were highlighted and it was arrived at independently anyway so...

Remi Ferland: So there was no response from the NCSG or something?

Jimson Olufuye: Well it looks like maybe there was no comment on that. Yes it was saying where you saw BC/IPC and there was no mention of NCSG so it said there was no comment on it.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks Remi. Yes we tried to summarize the comments from the CSG and NCSG so we – not the rest of comments coming from the community. For this one yes NCSG didn't submit any comments.

Unfortunately we – the member we had in the subgroup – they are not involved anymore and so with so many comments it was really hard to draft something that is meaningful so – but it's unfortunate but it happens.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay. All right, so two more lights. Remi yes if you need the slides that has comments of all the SO/AC we have that so you - could send that to you – this

one that has all the comments from all the AC/S – the AC and the SO so if you need I will send that to you, but we just focus on the CSG and NCSG an in addition to board comment.

Well we have the other slides that captures comment of everyone – member of the community. Thank you. All right, I want this opportunity to appreciate the ICANN staff that did the high-level summary from where we were able to - easily made this compilation. Thank you very much.

I want to appreciate everyone for their intervention and their attentiveness and thanking Rafik. So if we have done a good job you can put your hands together. Thank you very much.