CCWG ACCT WS2 Meeting #14 F2F at ICANN58 Copenhagen (10 March 2017)

Attendees:

Members: Alan Greenberg, Andreea Brambilla, Athina Fragkouli, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Fiona Asonga, Finn Petersen, Izumi Okutani, Jordan Carter, Jorge Villa, Julie Hammer, Kavouss Arasteh, Leon Sanchez, Mathieu Weill, Robin Gross, Sebastien Bachollet, Steve DelBianco, Thomas Rickert, Tijani Ben Jemaa,

Participants: Aarti Bhavana, Avri Doria, Daniel Nanghaka, David McAuley, Denise Michel, Edward Morris, Erich Schweighofer, Gordon Chillcott, Greg Shatan, Herb Waye**,** Jan Scholte, John Curran, Julia Charvolen, Keith Drazek,Lori Schulman, Malcolm Hutty, Matthew Shears, Michael Abejuela, Michael Karanicolas, Niels ten Oever, Olga Cavalli, Paul Wilson, Philip Corwin, Pua Hunter, Rika Tsunoda, Selim Manzak, Shin Takamura, Vidushi Marda, Wale Bakare, Wanawit Ahkuputra, Yusuke Kaneko

Guests: Goran Marby, George Sadowsky, Steve Crocker

Staff: Bernard Turcotte, Berry Cobb, Brenda Brewer, Emily Crane Pimentel, Karen Mulberry, Laena Rahim, Xavier Calvez, Yvette Guigneaux

Observers:

Apologies: Julf Helsingius, Christopher Wilkinson, Sam Lanfranco, Paul McGrady, Renata Aquino

** If your name is missing from attendance or apology, please send note to [*acct-staff@icann.org*](mailto:acct-staff@icann.org) ****

Transcript

- [PDF](#)

Recording

- [Adobe Connect replay](#)
- mp3 replay: [AM SESSION](#) | [PM SESSION](#)

Agenda

08:30 – 09:00 Coffee

09:00 – 09:10 Welcome, SOIs, Standards of Behaviour, review and approve agenda

09:10 – 09:15 Review Action Items from last meeting

09:15 – 09:30 General updates and reminders

09:30 – 10:15 Staff Accountability – guidance requested

10:15 - 10:30 Coffee break

10:30 - 11:00 New mechanisms

11:00 – 12:00 SOAC accountability Recommendations (first reading)

12:00 - 13:00 Lunch

13:00 - 14:00 ICANN CEO

14:00 – 14:30 Glossary

14:30 – 15:00 Diversity questionnaire (first reading)

15:00 – 15:30 Diversity interpretation request

15:30 – 15:45 Coffee break

15:45 – 16:15 WS2 timeline extension

16:15 – 16:45 IOT update

16:45 – 17:30 sub-group updates

17:30 -18:00 Wrap-up and Conclusions

Adjournment

Notes

CCWG-Acct WS2 face to face 10 March 2017 - Notes

Presentation Staff Acct (presentation of slides)

Kavouss Arateh – I raised the issues wrt this sub-group. We are breaking the hierarchy that exisits. There is no black and white but we need to have limits. Do not understand the role of the community going into such details. We are going to far.

Steve DelBianco – support adjustment proposed. This group should look at systemic issues and not issues with individuals.

Alan Greenberg – Opacity/secrecy vs staff information. I donate a lot of time to ICANN and are completely dependent on staff – yet I spend a lot of time writing letters that are complaints that are not complaints because we need to continue to work with staff.

Jordan Carter – yes need channels to get complaints AND praise. Re KA is not about managing staff but rather about transparency of process.

Olga Cavalli – agree with most of what JC and AD have said – what are the next steps?

Greg Shatan – community needs staff. The work of this group after WS1 may be one of the most important accountability work.

Sebastien Bachollet – 3 sided coin – accountability of SOACs also. Too many situations where staff work raises issues with the community which we need to fix.

Mathew Shears – Doc A was useful and interesting – Doc B is where the change of tack belongs. Agree with GS and need staff involvement.

Avri Doria – affects doc A and drives B. Like what GS said.

Athina Fragkouli – want to echo comments made. Good idea for the community to give feedback on staff but limit it to the top of the pyramid. Need to formalize feedback process but lower down this is a confidential process.

Denise Michel – re public comments – decades old issue – that we get meaningful responses to public comment – we get pro-forma responses vs meaningful responses to the meaningful comments that have been made by the community.

Phil Corwin – most important topic of WS2 – if staff is not properly working then things cannot work properly. Policy dev support by staff is outstanding. New complaints office – we need to have input into the rules – needs to be a last resort but needs to be one which serves the community if needed.

Alan Greenberg – follow-on to comment by DM – need to differentiate between staff comments and community.

matthew shears: I think the "change" of approach is appropriate and that it will help better inform and shape doc b; but, I think your bullets 2 and 3 should be explicitly addressed in doc a

Greg Shatan: Where does the community fit in the "hierarchy of the organization"? ICANN is a unique "system". The idea that the "trinity" requires community to deal with staff issues only through the Board is a non-starter. This is a triangle, not a V.

matthew shears: + 1 Greg

Daniel K. Nanghaka: But staff has to support community

Thomas – We are clearer on what we do not want – do not micro-manage staff, no report on individual staff issues listing – we need to look at systemic issues and how they could be resolved but we are not tasked on how to implement. We need more input from staff and should talk to Goran Marby on this. It is all about customer satisfaction and how we do this so that formal complaints are not necessary.

Avri Doria – we are not consumers.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO) 2: I really question the value of feedback form and pro forma questions on the quality of interactions

Coffee Break

New Mechanisms

(Presentation of document by Sebastien Bachollet)

Kavouss Arasteh – how many groups do we need.

Mathieu Weill – not recommending a new group.

Sebastien Bachollet – need all the groups to give REQUIREMENTS regarding complaints so we can consider this in the Ombudsman review an if not for ombudsman look where it could go.

Fiona Asonga – need to give the other working groups need to be given time to complete their discussions.

Niels ten Oever – re linkage between groups – am not certain if there is a need for processification for this as is being discussed.

Sebastien Bachollet – not adding processes – but those issues will come and best to keep this in mind.

Mathieu Weill – valuable to have early connections between the groups. Important to have the requirements before designing a solution.

David McAuley (RySG): Appreciate Mathieu's comment that we will address consistency at the end - seems to be a good approach to the issue Sebastien raised

SOAC Accountability

(presentation of document by Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Steve DelBianco)

Niels ten Oever: While looking at this I realized that the outcome of WS2 will be quite some work for SOs and ACs. In the worst case scenario, this work will not be picked up. How do we evaluate the implementation of WS2 outcomes? Could that be part of ATRT ?

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: Yes, Niels, in general. But for SO/AC acct specifically, evaluation of implementation should be part of Structural Reviews

Tijani Ben Jemaa – are registrants covered.

Steve DelBianco – as per the gNSO rules

Malcom Hutty – re appeals mechanism for membership – is about the decision and not the eligibility criteria themselves

Steve DelBianco – correct.

Kavouss Arasteh – where does this go if it does not change the Bylaws? What is the follow-up?

Steve DelBianco – should be considered by the SOACs is in the document.

Kavouss Arasteh – we need to have a follow up process.

Jan Scholte – need to be clear on which units this is addressed to. Participation overlaps with Diversity and there should be a reference to this. The form of the annual report could use some details. Internal reviews of policies and procedures – it would be useful to have units interact on this without it being a mutual accountability round table. On implementation – any ideas, how will this will get done. Overall great report.

Steve Del Bianco – We encourage the SOACs to distribute to sub-groups – we refer to the Bylaws. Re outreach is up to the SOACs individually – not focused on diversity – diversity is considered in elections. Re annual reports individually will decide. Re insure implementation – these are only recommendations.

Fiona Asonga – on diversity and participation we may need to have a discussion on this.

Michael Karanicolas – re closed meetings – there should be a clear list of acceptable reasons

Steve DelBianco – does not match our mandate but would welcome you input for a recommendation.

John Curran – good document – need to clarify that this is within the context of ICANN re IETF cannot be covered by this.

Steve DelBianco – we can add something to clarify.

David McAuley – keep RECOMMEND and do not use URGE.

Finn Petersen – good document – on transparency point 5 re minutes – some overlap with point 4 participation – could it be simplified?

Steve DelBianco – we will try to clarify and make it consistent.

Thomas Rickert – have you looked at the notion of membership fees?

Thomas Rickert – Any objections to accept track 1 recommendations – none – accepted for first reading. Track 2 Any objections?

Kavouss Arateh – given there is no support for MART – could say there should be a meeting of SOAC leadership annually to consider these recommendations.

Alan Greenberg – I supported MART and thought it would be useful but we may not be ready for this.

Greg Shatan – unfortunate mutual accountability concept vs MART were conflated – mutual accountability is important but not MART. Need to look at how to do this.

Steve DelBianco – If you have suggestions please make them.

Malcolm Hutty – Mutual Acct is more the purview of ATRT type activities and support recommendations as they are.

Avri Doria – MART – wee need an event where the border issues between groups can work it out.

Jorge Cancio – similar to JS and AD have said – value in having such a permanent process.

Thomas Rickert – accept recommendation but put on the plenary agenda to discuss the issue.

Steve DelBianco – page 31 says there should be a meeting at the AGM as recommended by WC, is this acceptable.

Thomas Rickert – first reading of track 2 is successfully completed and will take that part of the issue to the plenary.

Sebastien Bachollet – should recommend group recommend track2 goes back to group would seem to be best.

Thomas Rickert – given what is recommended which is beyond MART we should go to the plenary.

Avri Doria – unfortunate to not use IRP. Using the complaints officer is a bad idea.

Kavouss Arasteh – suggest wording leaving it to the SOAC chairs to decide if they need a mechanism such as MART.

Thomas Rickert – fine for first reading – more discussions on track2 required.

CEO talk

Mathieu Weill – Staff Acct rapporteurs will try a test with a few issues

Keith Drazek (RySG): I welcome Goran's statement that his management of the ICANN staff is not "bottom-up" because it shows he is ultimately responsible and accountable. He also made it clear that his management of the ICANN staff is 100% in support of the bottom-up multistakeholder policy development work.

Robin Gross [GNSO NCSG]: We can't forget that trust must be earned, not dictated, or it isn't really trust.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): @Mark - yes indeed and that is why we can't continue to have policy stand-offs that immobilize the Board on policy matters like IGO/RC. Either the Community must decide it will be happy with whatever the Board decides or else we need to learn to resolve differences before they reach the Board level.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: +1 Anne

Chris Wilson: +1 Michael :)

Robin Gross [GNSO NCSG]: +1 Phil

Michael Karanicolas: +1 Phil. Questions around independence are really central to concerns about the CO, I think.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): What would be wrong about having Complaints officer report directly to Goran though?

Robin Gross [GNSO NCSG]: I agree, Anne. I'm troubled by the conflict of interest of having this officer report to legal dept, given their legal fiduciary duty to protect the org

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): @ Lori - =1 and this is the point robin is making

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): +1 I mean ;-) And this is not about an individual, it is about structure that builds trust.

Kavouss Arasteh 5: Individual staff accountability with respect to the community should be done through the CEO and the Board

Glossary

Presentation of document by AD and SB

Kavouss Arasteh – ICANN org cannot be just the staff.

Malcolm Hutty – need to match the Bylaws.

Tijani BenJemaa – we have to make it as simple as possible. Board is Board, ICANN org should be all.

Greg Shatan – do not agree with JS - broader community has to be defined. We have to find a name from the trinity and staff should be staff.

Erika Mann – agree very much – difficulty with wider community. Agree with the rest. Do not support ICANN org including staff.

Thomas Rickert – ICANN staff will be Staff and the community will be ICANN

Diversity

(Presentation of document by Fiona Asonga)

Steve DelBianco [GNSO-CSG]: It's one thing to answer #4 regarding membership, but more difficult to answer regarding active participation.

Greg Shatan: I took "skills" to mean "diverse skills" -- not diverse levels of skill.

Rafik: yes Greg it is diversity of skills, never intended to put skills vs diversity

avri doria: but if skills are not an element of diversity then they are counterposed.

avri doria: and you end up with stmt like skills before diversity, when really they cannot be separated from each other. skills in a diverse environment are different that skills in a mono environment.

Jorge Cancio – what I do not see here is diversity at the higher level at ICANN such as the Board, nom comm etc.

Andrea Branbilla gov of can – may be important that our list of criteria is not exhaustive

Julie Hammer – wants to speak in favour of leaving skills in.

Olga Cavalli (GAC Argentina): +1 to Julie's comments

Jan Scholte – great questions. Questions 4 to 6 could be reformulated. Using PROPORTIONALITY in 4 is a can of worms. On 5 diversity AWARENESS, On 6 formal practices.

Avri Doria – agree with JH on skills. skills should not be in opposition to diversity.

Rafik: yes Greg it is diversity of skills, never intended to put skills vs diversity

Greg Shatan – could resolve this by saying DIVERSITY OF SKILLLS. Physical – we need to be clearer.

Leon Sanchez – suggest sub-group review the questionnaire based on comments. Would suggest include the questionnaire with the recommendations for the first public comment.

Diversity Interpretation Request

Kavouss Arasteh – we need to be very careful – who will we provide this service for, only for Diversity? Human Rights, Jurisdiction?

Dalila – Diversity is the representative.

Leon Sanchez – why diversity – they have asked for it and it is meant as an experiment to see if it increases participation.

Kavouss Arasteh – need to extend to Jurisdiction group and probably Human Rights.

Erika Mann – a little concerned about this – very much in line with KA – labelling it as an experiment would be wise but we have no idea if this is a useful tool.

Timeline

Erika Mann – Auction Proceed funds – suggest we look into.

Kaovuss Arasteh – if we extend some groups will keep going over the same topics over and over.

Mathieu Weill – WS2 is a project which needs a clear end.

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland): regarding the extension it would be good to have clear deadlines for concluding our work

matthew shears: agree - while September 30 would be nice end of calendar year I assume

(brazil) Benedicto – any deadline would be artificial – it's a challenge to elaborate something more concrete for April. We need flexibility.

Tijani Ben Jemaa – no wants to make this longer – am a little bit sad we are thinking of imposing a hard deadline – we need to finish the work.

Greg Shatan – have avoid overstating the scope of WS2 – we have 9 problems is all – if it takes too long we may have may of misunderstood the scope.

Jordan Carter – supports moving as fast as we can – we need to finish. Need to get this done by first meeting next year.

One report vs multiple

Niels ten oever – consistency is important and finishing the work is critical – we should send it batches – go with a split approach with two deadlines.

Robin Gross – discussed in non-commercial stk – individual topics are closed individually with a final harmonization.

David McAuley – still support a single approach – harmonization and consistency is critical. – but single vs multiple can wait for ICANN 59.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr – now support a split approach, tie up sub-groups as they are ready but still need everything in one book.

Thomas Rickert – we have two processes – one public per sub-group as they are ready and then a final consultation on any inconsistency – we could do the same wih the chartering orgs. We could propose this and let them the chartering orgs decide.

Jordan Carter – agree with TR

Kavouss Arasteh – for some SOAC it may be difficult to consider everything in one meeting.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): The final Work Product from our CCWG should for the future archive be able to be seen as a single Final product, *BUT* happy to deal with WT Outcomes (including PC for them) as they go , and to deal with some batching (think Volumes 1 & 2 etc., of a 'Single product outcome) with batching...

Robin Gross [GNSO NCSG]: I think everyone agrees to have a final package, but the question is what to do before that final package and what remains open for horse trading before that final package. So getting the discrete issues tied off while waiting makes the most sense.   And THEN the final package.

Jordan Carter: Agree, Robin

matthew shears: + 1

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): Yup

Jordan Carter: and public comments on topics leading up to us finalizing them

Jordan Carter: then SO/AC approvals at a subsequent ICANN meeting

Jordan Carter: and then final comments on any inconsistencies, fix it up, final sign off and then Board adoption

Jordan Carter: avoiding "horse-trading" within the package, and between the CCWG process and any other party

Mathieu Weill – we will try to highlight this approach in our communication to the SOACs and collect any issues from them in the communication on extension.

IOT Update

(presentation of slides by David McAuley)

Niels ten Oever: Are members of the standing IRP panel compensated for their time and experise?

Niels ten Oever: Is there also the possibility to submit Amicus Briefs that would be considered?

Samantha Eisner: @Niels, we anticipate that there will have to be some retainer to make sure that the panel members remain available, and then they will be paid, pursuant to teh ICDR rules, by the hour for their service on IRP panels

Niels ten Oever – question re parties – possible for amicus birefs?

David McAuley – part of the comments that are being considered – but no decision yet.

Sub-group updates

(Human Rights - presentation of slides by Niels ten Oever)

Kavouss Arasteh – not comfortable with re-starting the work. We are going back on Ruggie principal – language was agreed on. If GAC advice must follow HR principles then Gnso and ccNso pdp SHOULD ALSO.

Niels ten Oever – Good news KA we have addressed this in the next version of the document.

Steve DelBianco – need for new policies to respect human rights?

Niels ten Oever – There is no COMMITMENT in rec 12 so this should not be an issue.

(Ombudsman - presentation of slides by Sebastien Bachollet)

(CEP - Presentation by Ed Morris)

(Good Faith – Presentation of slides by Lori Schulman)

Mathieu Weill – This could be on the SOAC Accountability recommendations and maybe they could be joined.

Steve DelBianco – Some of our recommendations will change over time while these look like they will survive the test of time.

Kavouss Arasteh – this is different than SOAC Acct.

Steve DelBianco – does the group have something updating the Bylaws?

Lori Schulman – we have not considered any of this for Bylaws changes – this could be part of procedures manual to accompany the Bylaws.

Alan Greenberg – no need to change Bylaws for this.

Kavouss Arasteh – sensitive important issue – we should not modify the Bylaws – but we should refer to it or a framework of implementation.

(Jurisdiction – presentation of slides by Greg Shatan)

Steve DelBianco – EC is complex and new – at some point do think you will go through these vs California law.

Greg Shatan – I anticipate we will look at this as a concept but not granularly.

Niels ten Oever – Do you foresee an end to this marathon? Should we actually take this out of WS2 to be able to properly deal with.

Greg Shatan – I think we have time to complete

Kavouss Arasteh – where are we with this?

Greg Shatan: we are in the middle of the middle

Conclusions

Recap by TR - SOAC Acc. first reading successful - major take away: SO/ACs are accountable to their communities and need to be transparent to everyone - Staff Accountability guidance by the plenary to the sub team - good discussion with Göran, Steve and George on the roles of the CEO, Staff and the Community and how to make that collaboration more accountable. Pilot for collaboration agreed for the Staff ACCT sub team - goal is to see whether systemic improvements can be achieved in the course of the work. CCWG discussed how to best finalize its work reports by the sub teams will be put to public comment and approved by the CCWG as they get ready, there will be a final public comment period only to ask for comments on inconsistencies between the various individual reports. CCWG will reach out to the chartering organizations to recommend the same staggered approach to them. groups made progress, yet it is certain the group will not finish its work by June this year and extend its work beyond the end of the fiscal year 2017. A discussion on carrying forward resources to the next fiscal year has been initiated, but it is expected that the CCWG will stay within the budget initially proposed.

Adjourned.

Decisions:

- Staff Accountability – (TR) We are clearer on what we do not want – do not micro-manage staff, no report on individual staff issues listing – we need to look at systemic issues and how they could be resolved but we are not tasked on how to implement. We need more input from staff and should talk to Goran Marby on this. It is all about customer satisfaction and how we do this so that formal complaints are not necessary.
- SOAC Accountability – Track1 and 3 have completed first reading. Track 2 has to go back to the plenary.
- Glossary – For the CCWG-Accountability ICANN staff will be Staff and the community will be ICANN
- Diversity Questionnaire - suggest sub-group review the questionnaire based on comments. Would also suggest including the questionnaire with the recommendations for the first public comment.

- Diversity Interpretation Request – Approved for the Diversity sub-group as an experiment until the end of June 2017.
- Timeline – Co-Chairs should request an extension for FY18 (July 2017 to June 2018) to allow the CCWG-Accountability to complete its work using the original budget for the transition.
- Timeline – CCWG-Accountability will approve final versions of sub-group work as they become available. A final report, once all sub-groups have completed their work, will only address any conflicts between the various finalized sub-group recommendations and will be put out for public consultation. This approach will also be suggested to the Chartering Organizations.

Action Items:

- Staff – Arrange for interpretation of Diversity sub-group calls as required.

Documents

- CCWG-Accountability-WS2-Plenary-20170310-Slides-V1.5BT
- CCWG ProsAndConsOfSegmentingApprovalsV1.11BT

AC Chat

Yvette Guigneaux: (3/10/2017 08:53) Welcome all to the ICANN58 - Copenhagen CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 F2F Meeting March 2017 Hall A2!

matthew shears: (09:02) morning

Daniel K. Nanghaka: (09:04) Good morning

Brenda Brewer: (09:07) Good Morning Daniel!

Daniel K. Nanghaka: (09:08) Its great to have the link super perfect

Daniel K. Nanghaka: (09:09) I am missing in Action physically but will be attending the full meeting remotely

Jordan Carter: (09:09) Good morning everyone!

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (09:10) Thanks Daniel !

Daniel K. Nanghaka: (09:11) Thanks Mathieu

Thomas Rickert, CCWG Co-chair: (09:12) Great you will stay with us for such a long meeting, Daniel!

Daniel K. Nanghaka: (09:14) Yes

Yvette Guigneaux: (09:16) working on slides now

Keith Drazek (RySG): (09:41) Just one quick note for clarification: The letter referenced related to Staff Accountability was a joint letter to ICANN from the Contracted Parties...both Registries and Registrars. Just want to ensure the record is accurate. Thanks!

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (09:43) Good point Keith.

Alan Greenberg: (09:44) We need to remove the volunteer perception that staff is here to "control" us but to support us.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO) 2: (09:45) Need a system that is conducive to a Staff:Community relations and oporations, that is under collegial, cintinuous improvement...

Jordan Carter: (09:46) thanks Keith

Jordan Carter: (09:46) Alan, yeah: that's about strong norms being supported, and specific behaviour being consistent with it

Lori Schulman: (09:47) Agree with Alan and Cheryl. Staff should be encouraged to cooperate and support. However, I do not think that their goals should be tied to community progress. That sets up a big conflict because the staff should control their personal performance and not the community's performance.

Kavouss Arasteh: (09:47) What is your impression on why when staff were asked to come they did not come?

Kavouss Arasteh: (09:49) Why they refained, as you said; to coe to you and share their issues with you?

Jordan Carter: (09:50) Kavouss -- just wondering who you are asking these questions? Is it to Avri?

Kavouss Arasteh: (09:50) We must work with them ,support them, encourage them and NOT to criticise them so strongly

Kavouss Arasteh: (09:51) The rapporteurs

Jordan Carter: (09:51) Oh yes, I just think we have realised that the work needs an ongoing active dialogue between the group and staff, and at the moment the staff involvement is mainly about support for the group's work. So it's not criticising so much as asking for a different way of working, as I see it

Kavouss Arasteh: (09:53) Yes , fully agree with that. Then the language and zone of gthe rdport need to be streamlined

Steve DelBianco [GNSO-CSG]: (09:54) Good point, Matthew.

Kavouss Arasteh: (09:55) We need to encourage them directly and through the current hierarchy to get inovloved in discussion with you but you need to demonstrate that the objectives are to improve and not to criticise them

Jordan Carter: (09:56) yep - if they see the effort as just being about criticism it will get nowhere, and won't deserve to either.

Kavouss Arasteh: (09:57) If we want to make the things tranparent and improve we need to have mutual collaboration

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO) 2: (09:58) indeed we do Kavouss

Kavouss Arasteh: (09:59) Ceryl, Tks then pls change the tone of report

Jordan Carter: (10:00) the report draft Doc A will be left as it is if we proceed there - will make a comment about that after these interventions

Kavouss Arasteh: (10:01) Once again, we neeed to focuss our actions on discussing within the ghierarchy scheme i.e. more with Board and CEO

Greg Shatan: (10:01) Accountability should not only imply criticism or complaint. But even criticism should be seen as and offered as constructive criticism. There also needs to be a way to communicate positive views. Anyone who has conducted a performance review knows how important it is to spend time on strengths and things that are going well. But it is inevitable that more focus will be on "gaps".

Steve DelBianco [GNSO-CSG]: (10:01) Denise is right about this, and I think this should be the 5th bullet on the slide you're showing now.

Kavouss Arasteh: (10:03) I personally appreciaate very much the diligent works being done and just wish to make come sort of way to remedy any eventual problem

matthew shears: (10:05) I think the "change" of approach is appropriate and that it will help better inform and shape doc b; but, I think your bullets 2 and 3 should be explicitely addressed in doc a

Greg Shatan: (10:05) Where does the community fit in the "hierarchy of the organization"? ICANN is a unique "system". The idea that the "trinity" requires community to deal with staff issues only through the Board is a non-starter. This is a triangle, not a V.

matthew shears: (10:05) + 1 Greg

Daniel K. Nanghaka: (10:06) But staff has to support community

Daniel K. Nanghaka: (10:06) The role that community plays is tremondous and cannot be neglected or ignored

Greg Shatan: (10:07) I don't feel blamed by Avri, just constructively criticized.

Greg Shatan: (10:07) And will strive to participate more regularly.

Kavouss Arasteh: (10:08) Healthy discussion ,good will and establishment or foster the trust

Jordan Carter: (10:08) there may be an unancipated advantage of being a little later - that more of you will be a bit less busy with the earlier part of WS2 and be able to add your thoughts and input

Greg Shatan: (10:08) Maybe there should be a "Praise Officer" as well as a "Complaints Officer"....

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (10:08) I certainly support that ! Feedback officer would have been my suggestion

Greg Shatan: (10:10) Just as long as it's not .feedback officer.

Robin Gross [GNSO NCSG]: (10:10) Well done, Jordan and Avri!

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO) 2: (10:14) I really question the value of feedback form and pro forma questions on the qwuality of interactions

David McAuley (RySG): (10:53) Appreciate Mathieu's comment that we will address consistency at the end - seems to be a good approach to the issue Sebatiien raised

Lori Schulman: (10:53) Hello Farzi

Kavouss Arasteh 4: (10:57) Brenda, my raising hand process does not work. Did somebody block tht pls

matthew shears: (10:57) This SOAC accountability doc is an excellent piece of work

Kavouss Arasteh 4: (10:57) I logged three times but did not work

Kavouss Arasteh 4: (11:00) Bernie, the hand rasing on my connected is blocked

Bernard Turcotte Staff Support: (11:01) ok will look into it

Brenda Brewer: (11:01) Raise hand option should be available now.

Kavouss Arasteh 5: (11:02) it works now after logout

Niels ten Oever: (11:06) While looking at this I realized that the outcome of WS2 will be quite some work for SOs and ACs. In the worst case scenario this work will not be picked up. How do we evaluate the implementation of WS2 outcomes? Could that be part of ATRT ?

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (11:07) Yes, Niels, in general. But for SO/AC acct specifically, evaluation of implementation should be part of Structural Reviews

Wale Bakare: (11:10) Hi everyone

avri doria: (11:11) please show the slide for the track being discussed

Yvette Guigneaux: (11:16) will do Avri - we had some technical difficulties back here that created delays - our apologies

Mark Carvell UK GAC rep: (11:17) @ Cheryl and Steve - Excellent work by the team with very clearly written rationales and guidance.

avri doria: (11:17) thanks

Kavouss Arasteh 5: (11:25) There is mechanism to ensure the implementation at all

Mark Carvell UK GAC rep: (11:28) It is incumbent on every SO and AC to schedule consideration of the outcomes on accoutnability best practice etc and report to the community on its review of the recommendations. The GAC members engaged in this work will make this clear expectation for the GAC.

Kavouss Arasteh 5: (11:28) Sorry, I mreant there is NO modality or mechanism to ensure their implementation

Robin Gross [GNSO NCSG]: (11:28) Good suggestion to standardize when mtgs are closed.

Mark Carvell UK GAC rep: (11:30) The GAC is fully committed to open all its physical meetings and this is embedded in recent practice. Intersessional virtual meetings is another question however. The GAC needs to discuss that.

Michael Karanicolas: (11:33) Regarding a standardised list for closing meetings (which, to clarify, should help to promote implementation, not to mandate it) - it's possible these could be directly tied to the DIDP exceptions, which are meant to embody the main public interest reasons which may justify restrictions on transparency. Perhaps that could be a good starting point.

Kavouss Arasteh 5: (11:34) Mark, I do not agree with the language used "Committed " as GAC meetings are open, That is all

Jan Scholte: (11:34) If there is no prescribed follow-up on implementation, how do we prevent this becoming an aspirational document which only gathers dust? For example, could we suggest that when future ATRTs review SO/AC accountability they make reference to these recommendations?

Jordan Carter: (11:35) I like that suggestion, Jan

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: (11:35) me too, Jan.

Kavouss Arasteh 5: (11:35) Steve, pls be carefull as there is a trade off between membership fee and costs

matthew shears: (11:39) Agree with the findings of the work group on MAR but it would be useful to have some process for sharing of best practices - with the best intentions informal sharing often does not occur

Steve DelBianco [GNSO-CSG]: (11:39) The Bylaws require independent reviews of each AC/SO (other than GAC) every 5 years.   Those reviews could include comparison of each AC/SO with the "Best Practices"

Mark Carvell UK GAC rep: (11:40) @ Jan - very good suggestion on linking follow up and stock-take to ATRT.

Greg Shatan: (11:41) One could also recommend that groups with fees have a process for applying for reduced or waived fees based on financial concerns or criteria, rather than merely recommending that fees be as low as possible across the board.

Niels ten Oever: (11:42) @Jan +1

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (11:42) @Greg : that practice would be covered if we say "as low as possible" right ?

Jordan Carter: (11:43) I think the gap is people honestly appraising the effectiveness or otherwise of the various parts of the system. It's part of the conversation that people seem to be most sensitive about. It's a bit of an "unaddressable issue" at the moment, seems to me. But a lot of the work done in WS1 and in this process is helping. We'll get there :-)

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland): (11:43) Jan has a point... one of the plus of this setting is its ongoing character and its openness

Jordan Carter: (11:44) That should hopefully describe the culture we aspire to across the ICANN system, I think, Jorge

avri doria: (11:45) there are border issues about how one SOAC relates to another that could well be part of mutual accountability.

Jordan Carter: (11:45) and Alan's comment there a nice illustration about how we aren't there yet

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland): (11:45) @Jordan: the question is whether we need this "permanent-contact group" for maintaining the flame alive...

Jordan Carter: (11:45) (well not nice, but you know what I mean)

Kavouss Arasteh 5: (11:46) Greg +1

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: (11:46) well said, Greg.

Jordan Carter: (11:46) Jorge: yeah. Well, not asking the leadership to have to defend/critique itself / each other all the time. This group has provided a space alongside but separate to the SOAC leadership. Which has probably allowed it to be a bit more open and creative.

Kavouss Arasteh 5: (11:47) I fully support the Mutual Accountability which is entire diufferent from Mutal round table accountability

Kavouss Arasteh 5: (11:49) Different instead of mistypied word

Greg Shatan: (11:50) @Mathieu, "as low as possible" is subject to multiple interpretations, but I don't think it expressly recommends or alludes to reduced fees and fee waiver processes, sliding scales, etc.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO-CSG]: (11:51) Good suggestions on the membership fees. Thanks all

Jordan Carter: (11:51) we need "permission to discuss"

matthew shears: (11:52) + 1 Avri

Kavouss Arasteh 5: (11:54) May be we call it " Mutual Accountabilit Process Between SOs/ACs"$

matthew shears: (11:54) perhaps finding a slot in ICANN meetings for such discussions on an onoing basis - such discussions should be F2F I suspect

Kavouss Arasteh 5: (11:56) Stecve ,That process could trigger the need for a wider scope on mutual Accountability

Kavouss Arasteh 5: (11:57) Thomas, it is important to allow further discussion on this important meeting

Steve DelBianco [GNSO-CSG]: (11:58) @Matthew -- please see page 32, Willie Curry's description. Is that what you would favor?

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: (11:59) I think the mythical complaints officer has been named today.

avri doria: (11:59) oh joy

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland): (12:00) is it Solon?

Keith Drazek (RySG): (12:00) I don't have a problem with something like a mutual accountability engagement, but I don't think it needs to be a standing session at very AGM. It could be triggered on an as-needed basis if there's sufficient interest among SOs and ACs. Otherwise we might have a wasted and unecessary meeting once per year. A mechanism to trigger an ad hoc session really ought to be sufficient.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: (12:00) I thought you might be excited by it Avri ð

avri doria: (12:01) no i am am not.

avri doria: (12:02) the role is still mythical even if the man did pick someone to fill it.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: (12:02) https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.icann.org_news_announcement-2D2017-2D03-2D10-2Den&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=kbiQDH54980u4nTPfwdloDLY6-6F24x0ArAvhdeDvvc&m=zOsm0hYHYkgeM4HWMxM9HTMNg9Cctr_sqGJ4Zy0hE6I&s=GX8PKR3Nh8oMcgOQk6yMbBfkGiDBk6CqvNm74z2qOqI&e=

Malcolm Hutty: (12:02) We don't want to make it a principle that officers of SOACs are as accountable to each other as their are to their own constituencies.

avri doria: (12:02) the role has along way to go to gain any credibilty. that is has to earn and a job description is just aspirational.

matthew shears: (12:03) @ Steve - I think Keith's proposal above is correct - on an as needed basis - I think Willie's proposed structure is to burdensome

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: (12:03) a good topic for discussion with the CEO, Avri.

Sebastien (ALAC): (12:03) Krista Papac Named as ICANN Complaints Officer

Steve DelBianco [GNSO-CSG]: (12:04) This is the mutual accountability roundtable recc from Willie Currie: imagine a Mutual Accountability Roundtable that meets once a year at the ICANN meeting that constitutes the annual general meeting. The form would be a roundtable of the Board, CEO and all supporting organisations and advisory committees, represented by their chairpersons. The roundtable would designate a chairperson for the roundtable from year to year at the end of each AGM who would be responsible for the next Mutual Accountability Roundtable. There could be a round of each structure giving an account of what worked and didn't work in the year under review, following by a discussion on how to improve matters of performance. The purpose would be to create a space for mutual accountability as well as a learning space for improvement.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: (12:05) Agree with Mathieu.

Niels ten Oever: (12:05) Can we put the temperature up a bit in here?

ANAND MOHANDAS: (12:05) I just tweeted congrats to Krista Papac

matthew shears: (12:06) + 1 Niels - its chilly

Rafik: (12:06) @Niels it is intentional :p

Jordan Carter: (12:58) what will cold help us to achieve?

Brenda Brewer: (13:03) Welcome all to the afternoon session of the CCWG Acccountability Face to Face at ICANN58!

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): (13:04) My hotel room is warn but thanks for the tip - better stay here.   - just for this afternoon. ;-)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): (13:10) If you have packed some scarves or shawls then they will come in handy Anne

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): (13:11) @Cheryl - yes I did - coming from Tucson I even brought a fake fur coat. which I'll remember to wear to the meetings.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): (13:12) :-)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): (13:15) Yup we need to find a mutualy beneficial solution here @Avri

Jordan Carter: (13:18) I think the key point in Goran's conversation is that we need to find a format that works

Jordan Carter: (13:18) but we need to do that, in our Staff Acct work, in identifying issues of which this is an example, and looking at systemic solutions to them

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (13:18) An identified issue for staff acct right ?

Kavouss Arasteh 5: (13:18) Avri, What do zou mean bz retaliation When ask a question and the staff showed, as zou said , the fear of retaliation, then it sound strage to hear that. What tzpe of question was that on which the staff refrained to replz being affraid of retaliation _ Pls kidlz explain

avri doria: (13:19) btw, i am not one who is afraid of retaliation as might be obvious.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): (13:20) @Avri - good for y0u - that you are not fearful.

avri doria: (13:20) that is probably why so many tell me their compplaints and fears. and leave it to me to say something.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): (13:20) Yes.

Kavouss Arasteh 5: (13:21) Whz the staff gave the impression that if he or she repled to zou he or she would be subject to retaliation _

avri doria: (13:24) every time i hear 'my staff' i cringe

Kavouss Arasteh 5: (13:26) If we ask the staff a critical ansd sensitive question that he or she need to coodinate with his or her supervisor, do we intreprete it as fear to replz_

Robin Gross [GNSO NCSG]: (13:27) I guess this is an example when simply voicing a concern is regarded as "impolite" and discouraged.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): (13:30) Well said @Greg

Keith Drazek (RySG): (13:32) Clarifying roles, process and procedures is the key.

Jordan Carter: (13:34) A period of time being very careful about the signals that are sent, intentionally or otherwise, worth considering too.

ANAND MOHANDAS: (13:35) nice meeting u all

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): (13:36) @Keith - I thought it made sense for the CPH to ask to revisit the Policy & Implementation Working Group outcomes in terms of processes and procedures.

Mark Carvell UK GAC rep: (13:39) The relevance for the GAC is that when we defend ICANN in the UN and ITU it needs to be with utmost confidence that the bottom up model of governance works: otherwise we will lose ground in favour of multilateral governance. Talk of CEO/staff top down at odds with bottom up policy and of fear and friction over mistakes and oss of trust is quite worrying.

Lori Schulman: (13:40) Agree with Mark. Top down and bottom up should meet in the middle for a working entity

ANAND MOHANDAS: (13:41) Make the language simple

Keith Drazek (RySG): (13:42) I welcome Goran's statement that his management of the ICANN staff is not "bottom-up" because it shows he is ultimately responsible and accountable. He also made it clear that his managment of the ICANN staff is 100% in support of the bottom-up multistakeholder policy development work.

Robin Gross [GNSO NCSG]: (13:42) We can't forget that trust must be earned, not dictated, or it isn't really trust.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): (13:43) @Mark - yes indeed and that is why we can't continue to have policy stand-offs that immobilize the Board on policy matters like IGO/RC. Either the Community must decide it will be happy with whatever the Board decides or else we need to learn to resolve differences before they reach the Board level.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: (13:43) +1 Anne

Chris Wilson: (13:45) +1 Michael :)

Robin Gross [GNSO NCSG]: (13:49) +1 Phil

Michael Karanicolas: (13:50) +1 Phil. Questions around independence are really central to concerns about the CO, I think.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): (13:54) What would be wrong about having Complaints officer report directly to Goran though?

Robin Gross [GNSO NCSG]: (13:55) I agree, Anne. I'm troubled by the conflict of interest of having this officer report to legal dept, given their legal fiduciary duty to protect the org

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): (13:58) @ Lori - =1 and this is the point robin is making

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): (13:59) +1 I mean ;-) And this is not about an individual, it is about structure that builds trust.

Kavouss Arasteh 5: (13:59) Individual staff accountabilitz with respect to the communitz should be done through the CEO and the Board

Malcolm Hutty: (14:02) KAvouss, I agree strongly. I am worried this staff accountability track seeks inappropriate community intervention in the chain of command. That wouldn't even improve overall accountability; it would limit the CEO's and the Board's control over, and thus accountability for, the staff's actions

Jordan Carter: (14:02) well, that's not what we want to achieve.

Jordan Carter: (14:02) to be clear, for the record, etc.

Malcolm Hutty: (14:04) I know. But I still worry about it. And the comments earlier this morning about reaching our for staff input, and staff not being willing to step forward, suggest they might worry about this too.

Jordan Carter: (14:04) I don't think the group has a mandate to do that

Keith Drazek (RySG): (14:04) Our focus should be on establishing a process or mechanism for addressing future systemic staff accountability concerns.

Jordan Carter: (14:04) and would strongly resist it going in that direction, as one of the rapporteurs of the group

Kavouss Arasteh 5: (14:05) Rather than speaking of so/called problem ,on abstract, we need to clearlz raise those actual and real problems

Kavouss Arasteh 5: (14:06) Once we identizf the real problem then we need to describe how to raise it

Greg Shatan: (14:11) Next slide please.

Jordan Carter: (14:11) why have the slides not moved?

matthew shears: (14:12) the slides have frozen in place like the the rest of us

Malcolm Hutty: (14:15) very droll

FIONA ASONGA: (14:17) +1 Tijani

Malcolm Hutty: (14:17) Well put Tijani

Daniel K. Nanghaka: (14:17) I agree with you Tijani

Greg Shatan: (14:21) @Erika, I think we need a definition of the wider community because we (the Community) represent the interests of the wider community, even though only a small piece of that community is actually participating in ICANN

Jan Scholte: (14:21) @Greg. I take the point that ICANN has wider constituencies than SOAC, but the suggested definition is too vague. What are the distinguishing features that will allow us to delimit 'populations', 'interests', 'responsibility'??Arguably the whole of humanity fits in in some way? with one or the other SOAC?

Greg Shatan: (14:22) I think we have too many existing uses of "Secretariat" in ICANN to adopt a new meaning for it.

Lori Schulman: (14:22) Agree with Avri on this one.

Lori Schulman: (14:23) Many have spoken with Goran about use of "organization" as have Stevel DelBianco and others...it is what it is...

Kavouss Arasteh 5: (14:23) Staff ! CEO be called Secretariat or HGeneral Secretariat and forget to define anz thing else than alreadz done

Michael Abejuela (ASO): (14:23) For clarity, I would suggest finding another word to describe distinct references rather than Wider Community and Empowered Community. Finding a distinct term for each would go a long way in keeping things not as confusing

Greg Shatan: (14:24) Wasn't it another C(C)WG that accomplished the transition? :-)

Jordan Carter: (14:24) I thoguht it was an ICG

Greg Shatan: (14:24) So did the ICG.

Kavouss Arasteh 5: (14:25) I am sorrz to saz that STAFF PLUS CEO is not organiyation I oppose to that

Kavouss Arasteh 5: (14:25) Sorrz to saz

Greg Shatan: (14:25) We are only defining terms for our documents, not proposing any "real world" changes.

Kavouss Arasteh 5: (14:26) ?w kewboqrd is noz corrected

ANAND MOHANDAS: (14:26) type it in a notepad and copy paste it

Greg Shatan: (14:27) +1 Thomas -- let's start with "general usage" and go from there.

Greg Shatan: (14:28) Although I liked my suggestion for all of ICANN: "ICANN The Universe" (acronym, ITU)

Julie Hammer (SSAC): (14:29) I had not realised that we were making a conclusion about using "Staff" vs "Organisation" so quickly. I would have voted for "Organisation".

Jan Scholte: (14:29) @Greg. That's the point - is there anyone on the planet who is not in one way or another part of ICANN's 'wider community'?

Jan Scholte: (14:29) @Greg. That' the point - is there anyone on the planet who is not in one way or another part of ICANN's 'wider community'?

Greg Shatan: (14:33) @Jan, I'm sure ALAC and NCSG would agree with you (but perhaps not with each other). For the other sectors, it is not the case. In any event, I don't think that erases the need for a term to refer to the broader group(s) that we stand in for.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO-CSG]: (14:33) What does "proportional" mean in Q4 ?

Steve DelBianco [GNSO-CSG]: (14:35) It's one thing to answer #4 regarding membership, but more difficult to answer regarding active participation.

Greg Shatan: (14:37) I took "skills" to mean "diverse skills" -- not diverse levels of skill.

Rafik: (14:38) yes Greg it is diversity of skills, never intended to put skills vs diversity

avri doria: (14:41) but if skills are not an element of diversity then they are counterposed.

avri doria: (14:42) and you end up with stmt like skills before diversity, when really they cannot be sperated from each other. skills in a diverse environemtn are different that skills in a mono environement.

Olga Cavalli (GAC Argentina): (14:49) +1 to JUlie´s comments

Alan Greenberg: (14:53) That is the problem with trying to capture an important concept with a single word which can be misinterpreted.

Rachel Pollack: (14:53) Could it be: "types of skills"

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland): (14:54) normally there is some degree of bizarre obsession as Greg says :P

Greg Shatan: (14:58) Was linguistic diversity on the list?

Rafik: (14:59) yes, language

Greg Shatan: (14:59) Us monolingual anglophones should try to help, since we have no other language skills to offer, n'est ce pas?

Greg Shatan: (15:01) Should they also have captioning?

Rafik: (15:02) we had the captioning experiment for one call thanks to ALAc pilot project

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): (15:06) and of course captioning can also be provided in many languages

avri doria: (15:08) becasue the other groups have not asked for it?

avri doria: (15:09) the other groups did not feel the need to make the request for their own reasons.

Rafik: (15:10) co-rapporteurs received a request for interpretation and put it under discussion in the subgroup.

Rafik: (15:10) a diversity subgroup has to live up the goal of improving diversity.....

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland): (15:20) regarding the extension it would be good to have clear deadlines for concluding our work

matthew shears: (15:21) agree - while Septmber 30 would be nice end of calendar year I assume

stacy: (15:31) Audio seems to be gone.

Greg Shatan: (15:31) It's the end of the work as we know it, and I feel fine.

Seun: (15:32) not getting audio either

Mark Carvell UK GAC rep: (15:32) Having a clear timeline ensures momentum and planned commitment. Reasons for extension need clear rationale and the options for moving longer term work to ATRT reviews for example should be fully considered.

Brenda Brewer: (15:36) Apologies for audio and Adobe issue. This is now corrected.

Brenda Brewer: (15:36) Meeting will resume in 10 minutes

ANAND MOHANDAS: (15:45) ok

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland): (15:56) I feel one package is more helpful

Kavouss Arasteh: (16:01) I thnik there is sme ground for incremental or stepwise approach

Sebastien (ALAC): (16:06) As I was not in the room, I can't raise my hand.

Chris Wilson: (16:06) +1 to Thomas's suggestion.

Michael Karanicolas: (16:06) +1 Thomas, that sounds like a good approach

Sebastien (ALAC): (16:06) What about overarching issues?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): (16:06) The final Work Product from our CCWG should for the future archive be able to be seen as a single Final product, *BUT* happy to deal with WT Outcomes (including PC for them) as they go , and to deal with some batching (think Volumes 1 & 2 etc., of a 'Single product outcome) with batching...

Robin Gross [GNSO NCSG]: (16:07) I think everyone agrees to have a final package, but the question is what to do before that final package and what remains open for horse trading before that final package. So getting the discrete issues tied off while waiting makes the most sense.   And THEN the final package.

Jordan Carter: (16:07) Agree, Robin

matthew shears: (16:07) + 1

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): (16:07) Yup

Jordan Carter: (16:07) and public comments on topics leading up to us finalising them

Jordan Carter: (16:08) then SO/AC approvals at a subsequent ICANN meeting

Jordan Carter: (16:08) and then final comments on any inconsistencies, fix it up, final sign off and then Board adoption

Jordan Carter: (16:08) avoiding "horse-trading" within the package, and between the CCWG process and any other party

Greg Shatan: (16:09) @Robin, it matches your hat.

ANAND MOHANDAS: (16:18) ok

Niels ten Oever: (16:21) Are members of the standing IRP panel compensated for their time and experise?

Niels ten Oever: (16:22) Is there also the possibility to submit Amicus Briefs that would be considered?

Samantha Eisner: (16:22) @Niels, we anticipate that there will have to be some retainer to make sure that the panel members remain available, and then they will be paid, pursuant to teh ICDR rules, by the hour for their service on IRP panels

Niels ten Oever: (16:26) @Sam Thanks! Sounds very reasonable

Michael Karanicolas: (16:31) Niels is all about the Latin today

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (16:33) We are planning to request live Latin translation for the next plenary. struggling to fit it into the budget

Greg Shatan: (16:41) For the record, I've just looked at Annex 6. I see no mention of the Ruggie Principles in that document.

Niels ten Oever: (16:43) The slides with the picture for those interested: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__github.com_nllz_IRTF-2DHRPC_raw_master_Presentation-2520CCWG-2520plenary-2520F2F-2520March-25202017-2520ICANN58. pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4l5cM&r=kbiQDH54980u4nTPfwdloDLY6-6F24x0ArAvhdeDvvc&m=zOsm0hYHYkgeM4HWMxM9HTMNg9Cctr_sqGJ4Zy0hE6I&s=pfh_eiFLYlkLDCIomtLS7sRyTMT5UW_eEsjMkhlFHlU&e=

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (16:44) They have been shared on the list as well

Niels ten Oever: (16:44) @greg - Did I imply the Ruggie Principles were mentioned in Annex 6 ? That was by no means my intention.

Seun Ojedeji: (16:49) CEP being?

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (16:49) Cooperative Engagement Process

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (16:50) Step prior to IRP

Seun Ojedeji: (16:50) Thanks :)

Grace Abuhamad (NTIA): (16:51) Hi everyone :)

Grace Abuhamad (NTIA): (16:51) Excited to see progress :)

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland): (16:51) hi Grace!

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (16:51) Hey Grace !!!!

Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong: (16:53) hello who is speaking now ? bonsoir qui est cette dame qui est en train d'intervenir ?

Grace Abuhamad (NTIA): (16:53) Lori Schulman

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (16:54) Lori Schulman, rapporteur of the Good Faith Guidelines subgroup

Greg Shatan: (16:54) @Niels, no you did not imply that. It was implied in the Q&A afterwards.

Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong: (16:54) thanks

avri doria: (17:16) ultra marathon?

Mark Carvell UK GAC rep: (17:17) ad infinitum...

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (17:17) For a number of ultra marathons the finish line is actually at the same point as the start. Just saying

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (17:18) What matters is the journey

Leon Sanchez (CCWG Co-Chair, ALAC): (17:19) Infinite loop!

Seun Ojedeji: (17:20) hahahaha

Seun Ojedeji: (17:20) lol

matthew shears: (17:20) we're pivoting frantically

Seun Ojedeji: (17:21) Looks like Greg has lost some weight hopefully its not due to jurisdiction ;-)

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): (17:28) Thank you Chairs and Co-Chairs!

Grace Abuhamad (NTIA): (17:28) Good luck this week!!

Seun Ojedeji: (17:28) Merci

Gordon Chillcott: (17:28) Thanks and bye for now

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): (17:28) Bye all