
OPERATOR: This meeting is now being recorded.

JORDAN CARTER: Hi everyone. My name is Jordan Carter [INAUDIBLE] Staff Accountability Group. [INAUDIBLE] Avri Doria. Welcome to this call, the 5th of January 2017 at—it's 05:00 UTC, 18:00 in New Zealand, where I am. Thank you for coming, those who are here. And we've got a pretty quick agenda today, with two substantive items. The agenda that we've got is just first an SOI check. Do we have a staff response to the questions that we sent through in October or in November? And then the first draft of the document A, to outputs which led the drafting item, which I've checked into. And then we'll have a schedule check, and if we have any other business. If there are any other agenda items, if you would like to fill in, could you let us know now, or if there are minor ones, we can fit them in. We're on a scheduled course, for any hands up on that. And while I am, there are a few people attending outreach class, Pam and a couple of staff. I'm hearing that. And Karen is on the line as well. And if you haven't updated your statement of interest recently, you'll need to do that. Does anyone have any SOI updates to let the call know about at this point? Again, there's a quiet hiss down the line. And so, I think we might start with the staff response to your subgroup questions. How should we go about doing this discussion? We obviously got a set of answers from the staff to the questions that we asked, and they're available on the ICANN Wiki, and they're linked to the responses in the words on the agenda for this meeting. Personally, my take on them was that they were quite helpful, and I liked the fact that I can ask back a

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

few questions towards the end of the document, and I think we should probably elaborate some answers to those. But I'll just label as a couple of instructory currents. [INAUDIBLE] Do you all have any thoughts about the responses that we've got from ICANN, or other thoughts about responses to the questions that follow? Klaus, your hand is up, so please go ahead.

KLAUS STOLL:

Thank you, morning. Yes, Jordan, you know I worked—sorry about that—I was working on the other document, on the staff accountability draft, which we discovered a little bit later, and in that draft, is to work all these different documents and resources into this document.

And I took this response on out of the drafting process. So basically, the answers to staff are part of a working draft document 1.2. And I think the answers to the staff questions, which I also found extremely helpful, will be basically as a result of our discussion of the working draft 1.2. But I also would like to note that I'm very, very happy that the [INAUDIBLE] because I think at some point it was really helpful to see where we are now, actually see. Thank you very much.

JORDAN CARTER:

Great. So, thank you, Klaus, for that response. And yeah, I did notice a few comments that had come through from the staff documents, that drafting had prepared. So, that was really helpful. Are there any other thoughts? Avri, do you have any thoughts about the staff reply?

AVRI DORIA:

Yeah. I was actually—this is Avri speaking. I actually, since I have responsibility for starting to put together something for document B, hopefully there are some co-drafters, and there's a lot of the raw material in there that that document needs.

I started thinking about the five questions. Was it five? Actually, I might not have remembered the number correctly. I had something else that had five questions in it. They sent me a very good question, I think we've touched on, I don't even have draft answers for them in my mind yet.

But I do think it's something that we should have to not list, add it as an appendix to either document A or B, or however we handle it. I think we could add an answer to those questions as part of our output and not just leave them dangling.

But I'm in no way ready to start talking about what I think the answers are yet. Some of them are indeed things that could be recommendations as we get a little further on this work. So, that's what I wanted to mention. I was very appreciative of the answer, and it was very content. So, that was very much a good thing, and I appreciated it.

JORDAN CARTER:

Cool, thanks, Avri. Cheryl or Pam, did you have any views on what was presented back by the staff in response to our questions? You don't have to have anything, but if you do, just share it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I don't have anything in particular. It's Cheryl.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you, darling. I agree with Avri that I think we should probably provide some responses to these, and in the sort of ongoing dialogue for us that we're engaged in here, it seems to make some sense to me to do so. [INAUDIBLE] and they seem pretty reasonable as questions. Avri, your hand is up, yeah?

AVRI DORIA: Yeah, one thing that occurred to me when I was reading is it did refer a couple times to documents that are available to the staff at any time, in terms of describing some of the codes and such. I'm looking for the exact reference at the moment, in terms of those.

And I was just—I know I said that those things were on the ICANN.org website, and that's different than the ICANN website. I get confused by the reference to ICANN.org sometimes, and ICANN at other times, and I'm not quite sure what I'm looking at.

I was wondering the documents they refer to [INAUDIBLE] are available to the community to read or whether they're staff only, and it wasn't something that I was clear on, and I haven't gone around hunting for those documents yet to see.

Because all the employment policies remain available electronically to the employees on a 24/7 basis. I'm assuming that those aren't available to the community, probably because I'm semi-pessimistic about it, but was wondering whether that was indeed the correct assumption and indeed whether that was a considered decision with those, that they

should be private to the employees and not visible to the community. So, I guess I have that pending question that's not quite answered in my first reading of this thing.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Avri. That's a good question. And is Karen—Karen, are you on the line and able maybe to respond to that, sort of all those questions from Avri? Are those docs available either on the site or able to be made available to us? I see that Karen is just on listen mode, so maybe Karen, if you are able to type a response to that question.

In the meantime, we'll take Pam's comment, because Pam, your hand is up. So please, go ahead. And just to be clear, in case you were wondering and/or talking, we can't hear you at the moment. Karen is going to note the question in respect if those docs are available and find out the answer.

So, that's good. Thank you, Karen. And apparently, we have some audio issues. We don't know whether they are audio issues with the system or whether they are related to people's browsers or anything else. And so, yeah, I also have followed contributions to the work that we did in document A.

Can we take it as a consensus that we will later reply to these questions from ICANN in return and to incorporate the work—the responses that we've got into the work in document A and B? And maybe with that, move onto the next agenda item? Would people be happy with that? Cheryl's got a tick on in respect to that.

AVRI DORIA: This is Avri. Yeah, I'm happy with that, but I do think we do need to come back at some point while we're picking out the answers and putting them in A and B. We should just make a note that we do want to come back to these at some point and make sure there's nothing we missed while we were sort of pulling the things out. But yeah, I think for now that's a good idea.

JORDAN CARTER: I think we should consciously answer them, and in doing so, they may lead to further questions in turn, in respect to the dialogue that we might have as well. So, something we—

[CROSSTALK]

JORDAN CARTER: Go ahead, Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah, Jordan. No, I definitely agree on the questions they asked us, and then on the answers they gave us. As opposed to walking through them all in depth now, we're going to use them as the raw material for A and B. But I just want to make sure that we come back to the answers they gave us at some point, just to make sure that we've digested it all. That's what I meant. Sorry.

JORDAN CARTER: Right. Okay. That makes sense. It sounds like we're [INAUDIBLE] to whether Pam can join on audio or not. And Pam, Yvette is trying to get you a number in chat to make a dial-out if required. And you're the one person whose audio seems to be a little bit of an issue at the moment. So, we'll come back to you if we can't hear you now, which it seems like we can't. So, the third item on the agenda today is the working draft of document A. Hello.

PAM LITTLE: Hi, can you hear me now? It's Pam. Sorry about that.

JORDAN CARTER: Yes, we can hear you. Hi, Pam.

PAM LITTLE: Hi. Sorry about that. Am I interrupting you? There's so much information.

JORDAN CARTER: No, I was just about to launch the next agenda item, but here you are, so let's take your comments on this, on these questions.

PAM LITTLE: Okay. Great, thank you. I guess I will just start trying to jump into the way we're talking about the ICANN response to our questions. And I was saying, or trying to say, my impression was on the surface, ICANN seems

to be—everything seems to be great. ICANN has everything and it's kind of clear delegation of authority to the CEO, to staff, etcetera.

But what I was trying to say is I think the devil is in the details. It's kind of my form of substance, as any conversation in this kind of topic. We can see there's all these documents in place. But who is actually looking into the detail and saying, for example, "This delegation of authority really is in force or a conflict of interest, or it's really forced?"

For example, there was this employee hotline, I believe, and there was a survey or a firm look into the practice. And apparently, there's only three users over the last five or six years, using the hotline. So, I don't know whether that was good or bad. Maybe there was no one had any issue.

But I think my concern is on this is I trust her to summarize. I seem to have a lot of process and documents in place, but the thing is, who is really looking into the detail and the practice of those process and [INAUDIBLE] to make sure it's actually—someone is actually enforcing it?

And then, what is the consequences for, for example, not following the practice or the guidelines or the principle documents that are in place? That's something not clear to me. For example, there's this document recently published, soon after Hyderabad I believe, it's a power delegation of authority from the board to the CEO.

That was only a recent document. So, my question is then what happens if, for example, the CEO actually acted on something exceeding that

power of authority? Then what happens? So, I guess that's my question. And another thing, about KPIs.

They've got all these KPIs for employees, right? But as community, we really don't know what those KPIs were at the beginning of each year and how they were mapped and how staff were reiterated. So, there's just a lot of detail questions, and KPIs, you can set a lot of KPIs that are not meaningful. So, I'm just not sure—hello? Hello?

AVRI DORIA: Still hearing you.

PAM LITTLE: Okay. Whether things are good as ICANN would like us to believe. That's all I wanted to say. And maybe when we talk about the document A, I will still have some comment about some of the recommendations now drafted. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, so—

JORDAN CARTER: It's Jordan here again.

AVRI DORIA: I think Jordan—okay, you're back. Okay, great.

JORDAN CARTER: I managed to disconnect myself by accident. I apologize. I missed the last part of your comment, Pam. Would a summary of what you were saying be that it's kind of like how do we know that the framework is compared to the master A and B being enforced? Is that a very short summary?

PAM LITTLE: Yes.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay. I think to answer your question, Pam—

[CROSSTALK]

JORDAN CARTER: It sounded like Avri and Pam were speaking at the same time for a moment.

AVRI DORIA: I wasn't speaking.

PAM LITTLE: I don't think we were speaking—

AVRI DORIA: I was speaking out of turn, so I stopped and I raised my hand. This is Avri speaking. I think the other part that was—that—in the short synopsis is

also that—and this is part of the reason that I was asking about some of the other documents that are referred to, is the devil in the details part in terms of what exactly are some of the details within these codes in addition to the compliance and the enforcement issue? So, it's basically that is this a high-level view that yes, all the documents exist, but what's in them and what are those policies? Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER: And Avri, just to build a little bit on that, is it fair to say that your document B is going to be looking then to more detail on what leads to know the answers to that question as well as Pam's question?

AVRI DORIA: Yeah. That does seem to be the case.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay.

AVRI DORIA: And that's kind of why—

JORDAN CARTER: So—

AVRI DORIA: —Pam brought it up, I think.

JORDAN CARTER:

Yeah. So, I think Karen is listening on this call, and we all have a bit of a sphere here on what we're going to need. I think Karen, if you are taking a summary out of this, it would be that the group is grateful for the responses, which were helpful, and there are some further points needed in terms of what the group would like to know in terms of some more detail about the documents and processes that are still up, how they're enforced and stuff.

I think it would be good for you if you could to go back to the wider organization and to find out what the best way to have that conversation is, whether it's some more stuff in writing or whether is discussion on a call like this. And something like that probably makes sense. And Pam, I think your hand's up again?

PAM LITTLE:

Yes, if I may Jordan, I just want to ask for that about compliance and enforcement of those policies or procedures, or measures in place. I feel like everything seems to be channeled to the general councilor's office. So, people on this call can be aware, there was this recent effort of appointing a compliance officer, and that person was to report to the general councilor's office, again.

I personally feel this promotes concentration of power because I just feel there should be kind of decentralizing and that will mitigate some of the risks associated with concentration of power. And we all know the conflict of the fiduciary duty of being ICANN's legal officer.

The sole obligation of that position is to protect ICANN's interest, ICANN the organization, the corporation only. So, I'm just not sure. I saw there was some debate or discussion in Hyderabad about this, whether this compliance officer should be under the general council's office, but that seems to have been dropped.

So, my point was ICANN seemed to channel everything, the compliance, the problems, the whistle-blower procedure, was all going to channel through the general council's office, and I personally feel there should be an ethics office or something like that, to kind of minimize the risk of too much concentration. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Pam. Can I make a suggestion to you, which is to work that thought up a little bit more and to pop an email on the group list about it? Because it's a comment that I've heard before, and as a CEO myself, in a membership organization, I'm acutely conscious of the risks of centralization and the complexity of doing anything different.

So, if you were to chat some thoughts on what might work differently, and put it on the list, to put people in sight, using it out, and talking about it, I think that would be really helpful.

PAM LITTLE:

I can do that, Jordan. In fact, I would actually advocate for a compliance office [INAUDIBLE] the general council's office. A lot of big corporations now have realized the benefit of having a corporate compliance office.

[INAUDIBLE] the ICANN contractual compliance that was passed [INAUDIBLE] contracts.

I'm talking about something to make sure ICANN is complying with applicable laws and whatever policy and procedure governing ICANN, that function internal ICANN corporate compliance function, not the general contract compliance function. And it's a trend. More and more businesses are opting to have a separate compliance function independent of the general councilor's legal function.

JORDAN CARTER:

And I think that goes to part of the core of what you and Mike are trying to do here or not, and the understanding what perspective on the linkages between compliance and ethics and so on compared to maybe yours. So, I think just writing it down so we can talk about the text in the group, and just make sure on the same page, before we take the discussion further, would be quite helpful.

PAM LITTLE:

Will do it. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks. Do you have any other questions, or should we zip on a little bit to the document A? I think we'll do that. I think we're about to that. And then Pam got her audio. So, if we could pop the so-called document A on the screen, staff, and that would be helpful.

And I first talked to you about where this came from. The structure of the document came from a brainstorm that Avri and I had at the IGF, and really actually just [INAUDIBLE] was constructed to us as our plan of work in the Work Stream 1 report from the group.

And then Klaus took the initiative in terms of doing a lot of background research and writing a first draft. I sent him a whole bunch of additional material that was about—mainly the stuff about trying to explain what a co-norm would be, like what we would hope a good relationship looks like among the various parties.

And then Avri's added a bunch of questions. According to the work timetable that we've got, we've got a chance to discuss this paper on this call, and then I think we need to sort of finalize it, ready for plenary discussion on our next call. So, I've opened discussion about how we go about doing that.

To me, the most obvious way to do this is to get some high-level feedback or comments now. Basically, it would be good to know if we're on the right track, or the wrong track, whether the document is making sense to you or not, and then to get—are there any specific points we would like to raise?

I think we've got time to do that as well. But the most helpful way to raise them is by chat, or by comments in the Google Doc version of this document. And I think it's a nice start. It's built on a relatively straightforward governance management, which I think some of the comments already indicate.

It may not find favor with everyone, and I think we've got a bit of work to do to get this into a consensus document. But I invite any sort of broad comments at this point. Are there any? Pam, go ahead.

PAM LITTLE:

Thanks, Jordan. I feel the document A is simply a bit longer than what was expected, and it appears to me that this document, the time is set out for the more high-level aspirational observational goals rather than the detailed plan or recommendation in document B. Is that—is my understanding correct, this one is more high level, document A, and B will be the detailed one?

JORDAN CARTER:

Pam, from my memory they dealt with different topics. Document A was meant to look at the relationships between the staff, the boards and the community. And document B was meant to look at the specific HR processes. So, that's my understanding of the differences between the two of them.

PAM LITTLE:

Okay. So, if that's the case, sorry to jump back in, then what is the relationship between staff, the board, the community, is what it is. I'm not sure what we really can say. I mean there are some recommendations there, and I guess one of the main things I picked out—picked up from that was these kinds of perceived conflicts of interest.

So, I think there was some comment about not understanding what the recommendations say, but if I understand that recommendation, basically saying there might be some perceived or potential, or actual, conflict of interest, so therefore, there should be some sort of structural or operational separation within ICANN, the organization.

And that's something a lot of community members were talking about, for example, the compliance function should not be under GBB [INAUDIBLE] from today onward. Because the new senior vice president, [INAUDIBLE], will be reporting to the CEO. So, things like that would the—for me to kind of make it more detail in comfort, otherwise our recommendation as currently drafted in this document A seems to be pretty vague to me.

JORDAN CARTER:

Okay. I think that's useful feedback. I personally haven't looked closely at the recommendations, as in the narrative description of the relationship, and I think that one of the challenges that we face is that they are radically different expectations throughout the community about what the roles of the board and staff are.

And some of those radically different expectations are already coming through in some of the comments in the Google Doc. So, even if the document seems—we shouldn't have a document that seems vague in the end. We need to tighten it up if that's how it's feeling to you.

And it is a bit longer. We had estimated about 8 pages, and it's about 14, plus the reference material. But just documenting what those

expectations are is something that hasn't been done before. If it had been done before, we'd find another document that did that.

So, I think that's helpful feedback, and we just need to take it on board as we evolve this through to the next draft. And Klaus does a lot of it, and his hand's up. So, Pam, with your agreement, I'll pass the floor over to Klaus to speak more about it.

PAM LITTLE: Sure.

JORDAN CARTER: Klaus, go ahead.

KLAUS STOLL: Yeah, thank you. Pam, I think you are absolutely right with your observations, but let me try to explain some of the parts. The draft document as it is at the moment has a lot of reference to existing documents. So, at the end, the document which we will give out will only be—or should only be basically the comment part and the recommendation part, and everything else, the references to existing documents basically go into a huge annex.

So, it's still inside the target of approximately 8 pages. What I would say is we have a chance—and you're right, we need to be more specific. But on the other hand, I think, as Jordan just mentioned, there are fundamental differences of understanding of staff accountability and what the situation is, or who's doing what.

So, I think where we have a chance is to be more philosophical in the comment part and to be very precise and clinical with our recommendations. What I find personally reading and working on this document, and looking at both documents, for me there is a basic, basic, basic gap between what is stated and what is said is staff's role, staff's work is, and what is actually happening on the ground in the day-to-day work, and that is not anything criticizing staff.

It just reflects reality, because one of the aspects that struck me when I was working on that is what is actually staff given from the community to work with? We also, if we are looking at the work of the staff and the quality of the work of the staff, we also have to look at the quality of the work of the community and what it gives staff to actually execute.

But this is already going into the [INAUDIBLE]. And yes, finally, what I was hoping that [INAUDIBLE] work on that document, these comments and go more and more and more into the details and get as many varied opinions in there. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thank you. Thanks, Klaus. Okay, another [INAUDIBLE], and Klaus's iteration. I think we can probably tighten the document up for sure, but kind of aside from the details Pam noted as staff conflict of interest, anyone on the call, was there anything you noted in the structure, particularly you're uncomfortable about or think was going in the wrong direction?

That would be really useful to know, because it does, in this small court, there are any alarm bells going off, it would be really helpful to share

them now so that by the time we come to the next draft, and then send it to the plenary, we've had some prewarning about. Cheryl or Avri, are there any things that you've seen in this that you go "No, this is a problem." I know, Avri, that you've made some comments in the document itself.

AVRI DORIA: This is Avri speaking. Oh, Pam's got her hand up. I didn't put my hand up, though. I'll put my hand up and—

JORDAN CARTER: You go ahead, Avri.

PAM LITTLE: Go ahead, yeah.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. So yeah, I think in some of the comments, I was indicating some concern, but perhaps it was more a semantic concern, because I got mixed. Although in some of the ways, for example, the whole example, the isolation of the board is described, if that's indeed the case of what is the case, and if they shouldn't be involved in things.

So, there were various points where I was concerned by some of the— I'm not quite sure that I was always clear between what was descriptive, what was normative and what was descriptive in this document, and that was perhaps my reading.

That the community having no role in governance was something that concerned me when I read it, but that some of the policy implementation discussed in there, I don't think took enough account of some of the work that's been done on policy and implementation.

So, there were those kinds of things. I thought that at times it wasn't in the structure of the document, but more in the sort of giving less of a role sometimes than I thought it had. And also, I guess the isolation of the three bubbles from each other, perhaps descriptively that is correct, but are we saying that we accept that in a normative sense? And that would concern me.

So, those were the kinds of issues I had, and those relate kind of to the comments I've put in there that I see Klaus has started to answer some of, but I haven't had time to read them. So, that's the kind of concern that I had. Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER:

Okay. And thanks, Avri. I think that makes a lot of sense. And yeah, the document is a draft, there's a few comments going around. So, I think we've all got a bit of an action point to read the documents, to read the comments and questions, and to respond to them, and to just all—I think the point I'd like to make is that this is a document [INAUDIBLE].

It's not—I don't know if Klaus agrees with this, but certainly from my point of view, it's a draft that is the property of the group, and can be shaped and changed a lot [INAUDIBLE]. And in terms of the larger community, yeah, I think we need to describe how that works in a way

that works with our governance framework, includes the community in the way that's most effective.

I don't know how we get the language right. If you're raising the kind of concerns that you have, I think we've got the language wrong. So, there's more work to be done. And Pam, your hand is up, so why don't we flip back to you?

PAM LITTLE:

Thank you. I was going to say this is maybe a very difficult topic so far from my participation, to hold staff accountable in this ICANN environment. Because it's not easy being ICANN staff. I have been there, and I have experienced it, competing interests from different constituency or stakeholder groups.

So, staff, you're damned if you do it and you're damned if you don't do it, right? So, I think we've got to acknowledge that competing interests within the ICANN community, or perspectives, right? And staff is sometimes jammed in the middle, and how they kind of balance different interests, different pressures from different stakeholder groups is not easy.

But I want to say this: I think there should be—as a community, we should have the expectation. I think there was some language that Klaus had drafted about they have to have the work and personal life to be balanced to be healthy and productive.

But I can say from experience that ICANN staff is—seems to be reasonably remunerated, and in terms of there's a balance between

work and life is probably a personal choice or a difference between staff. But from community perspective, I think we can expect that the hiring and promotion of staff should be open—should be in an open and competitive environment, and that’s very important to me, rather—because I think we should expect—

JORDAN CARTER:

Pam, could I just interrupt there? To me, that topic is totally—I totally agree with you, but I don’t think it’s part of this. I don’t think it’s part of this document. I think that the sort of hiring process and language that it’s open and so on is more a part of the document B that Avri is drafting.

PAM LITTLE:

Okay, that’s fine. That’s fine. But I just want to make sure we capture and appreciate that they are in a difficult position, the staff, how we as a community to hold them accountable sometimes this parameter has been set, that [INAUDIBLE] doesn’t really have a say. It’s really the management to manage staff. So, it’s not an easy juggling act in terms of how to really come up with a document that makes sense.

JORDAN CARTER:

Yeah, I think [INAUDIBLE] we’re trying to be known as to how that relationship could work. And in terms of a specific way to implement policy and process, I think that would be in there, that B document.

PAM LITTLE: Okay.

JORDAN CARTER: That's my take on it, anyway. So, we need to get that expectation set out right in this one. And what else in terms of comments here? Cheryl, what did you think?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I have some comment in the chat. So yeah. Just if you look at that.

JORDAN CARTER: Okie-dokie.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And I have to drop the line because I'm expecting a call. Sorry.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay. And I don't have any other comments to make about this doc, and I think we've noted the fact there's some questions and comments in the chat, and we need to maybe shorten the document a little bit. There are questions and comments that's been added.

There's comments in the Google Doc. And I'm certainly happy to [INAUDIBLE] to trying some editing on this. I'm sure that Klaus will be as well. And in terms of dialogue, in terms of the comments and questions that have been raised, as comments in the Google Doc.

And I think we all need to highly commit to doing that and to ask on the list by the middle of next week. And then maybe next week, we can do a bit of an editing job on it so that we've got it ready for our next call. Because at the next call, we'd like to get the first draft of document B, the process doc that Avri has taken the lead in preparing, and we're actually doing a second reading of this, ready for the CCWG as a whole.

So, we can't sit on this for weeks and weeks at a time. We do need to get our thoughts in order. And I'm happy to lead some editing and fining down of this, if that's helpful to people. And are there any other steps in terms of what needs to be done here that people would like to suggest or raise? Avri, your hand is up.

AVRI DORIA:

Hi, this is Avri. One of the things I just wanted to point out to people is that in the Google Doc, people—and I know Klaus knows this, and many know it, just to make sure that everyone knows, you people don't have to just comment. Being in comment mode means you can edit the document as much as you want, but will be in what's called suggest mode.

And so, it will be marked as changes that everyone can see, and until Jordan, as the rapporteur on this, or perhaps Klaus as the primary author on this, or me as a backup helper, accept them, they'll be visible as suggested changes.

So, I would really suggest that people not just comment as pretty much I was trying to understand, but also in places where you think the wording needs to be changed. And as I say, those are the things that, in

testing those changes, we can have conversation both online, in the comments of the document, or however else.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thank you, Avri. That's a really good point. And yeah, it's not shown on the writing, that mode is available to everyone who wants it, either anonymously or logged into Google. And so, if the actions could be if there are any comments or drafting changes by the close of, say next Wednesday, the 22nd, 0900 UTC, then we ask the list to do that. And Klaus, are you happy to spend a little bit of time after to [INAUDIBLE] that? Maybe Avri, just the second draft for review by the call in two weeks. Does that make sense? Klaus, your hand is up.

KLAUS STOLL:

Hello. Jordan, thank you. First of all, yes Avri, I think you are absolutely right. And I just want to emphasize that the draft, what you're seeing, is a draft of a draft. It's nothing written in stone. So, it was just mainly to start off. Just as a tip, if you are disturbed by the links of the document, basically we—what we have did is just basically [INAUDIBLE] source documents.

So, if you want to go to the meat, go to the comments and go to the recommendations. Jordan, the problem is that I'd really, really love to help with the editing, but I'm actually, next week [INAUDIBLE] New York at very hard to say that.

But in terms of meetings, from Monday up to Friday, I will try to do my best, but I wouldn't like to commit to be the lead editor. So, Jordan, if

you have a little bit of time from Wednesday, if you sort of [INAUDIBLE] have a look in and try to support, but I can't commit to it for the reason I just gave.

JORDAN CARTER:

Okay. Thanks, Klaus. That's [INAUDIBLE]. So, I'm happy to transcribe it. And then if you were to have a go either on the weekend or on Monday, I think that's still the best time before our next call. And so, if anyone else has any other actions to follow up, or any comments or thoughts, you know what to do.

Fire them on the email list or feel free to add them into the doc as tracked changes or as comments. And with that, we will just close this off as an agenda item. We will then try to perform a schedule check. In terms of that schedule check, we've talked about this document A progress and we've talked about the responses to questions we've got from the staff and the need to make sure we answer those.

And Avri, you're working document B, which is another key part of our work here. Would you like to offer some thoughts about where that one's up to?

AVRI DORIA:

Yeah.

JORDAN CARTER:

Go ahead.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah, that one is yet to be really started. Yeah, this is Avri speaking. Yeah, that document has yet to be put together. Basically, all I've done so far is create a [INAUDIBLE] document. So, when is—I'll send the URL out to the list again. I will be working on it next week.

So, I'm hoping to get it, and I'm hoping there are people who will help me with it, getting through the answers that we've got, seeing what other documents that are obtainable or indicating where we don't know the answer yet. And so on.

So, I'll be working on that next week. I can't get it in until Monday, because I have something else I've got to deliver Monday. But hopefully, if anybody else has time, I think some people have indicated they might like to help, if they have time.

So, I'm hoping next week you've got time to jump into that argument, reach out, into that document, reach out to me. We can talk about it and so on. But my goal is to have at least something by the end of next week or the beginning—at least—yeah, end of next week.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay. So, do you think—

AVRI DORIA: And sent out.

[CROSSTALK]

AVRI DORIA:

So basically, it's not impossible. I really—I'll have a better idea by—you know, what can I say? I'm going to try to refute it, but I certainly am not here saying "Oh, there's no chance." Otherwise, I would say so. So, I just didn't have a chance to work on it yet, but will in the next week.

So, one of the things in leaving it on the schedule, that way see how far we get with closing up document A at the next meeting, see how far we get into document B. But there will definitely be something there to discuss. And then at that point, we can do a double-check and see at the other meetings whether we have enough time.

Because we need to send documents to the plenary in mid-February for our deadline. So, we can gauge whether we need an extra—or a longer meeting sometime down the road to check on things, depending on how it goes. One of the things, though, that I wanted to check is that in general, we want to stick to the schedule that we came up with last time, which indeed does have our draft ready to be this—

I have to—well, you and I, Jordan, have to sort of update our dashboard entry with the form that they've encouraged on the group to try and get it all to look alike, and that needs to be done by this Friday.

So, that's why I wanted to bring up the schedule, and just make sure that despite the discomfort of needing to get things done in the next couple of weeks, whether anybody's felt any alarms or anything, or whether I should just proceed with this schedule that we put together at our last meeting. Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER: And firstly, I don't see an issue with the schedule. Does anybody else on the call see any? It's tight, but we should aim to do it. Basically. There are no other hands up on that one. So, I think we will look forward to seeing that, Avri. And Avri made a call for volunteers who would like to help on that. Avri's posted the current schedule into there—into the chat.

AVRI DORIA: I did, but it lost its formatting. It lost its formatting, so it's hard to see. But yeah.

JORDAN CARTER: That's okay. But there's key dates in there, and 19 January we'll try to finalize document A and look to the first draft of document B. And then document—the 2nd of February we'll retest document B. And Avri posted the link in the chat to that work plan. I'll just ask if there's any other business for people to raise? There doesn't have to be. Klaus, your hand is up. Go ahead.

KLAUS STOLL: Yes, sorry, Jordan, but I'm trying to, as well in the last minutes, in terms of the work of document A. I'm just looking at the people who are on the call, and actually thinking about the significance of document A and B. Is there any chance that we get already other people to comment on this, and to get a point of view?

Because I feel very uncomfortable that we are just a few people working on a very, very important topic, and it would be better to have broader engagement on this one. I know you tried everything to get people into the group, but it just makes me feel a little bit uncomfortable, and maybe good enough [INAUDIBLE] but for myself, that's all. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER:

Well, Klaus, I agree with you, and I think that the way that we work around that is that we're a very small group of people, and we're preparing a draft that will be discussed in plenary working group, [INAUDIBLE]. And that's where we'll probably get feedback and we'll probably have to make changes.

And in terms of the input that we'll get, I don't think we'll be able to work through a larger group of people at this point, prior to that. And Avri might have a different view, and her hand is up. So, while I worry about it as well, I think that's the process that we've been set to.

AVRI DORIA:

Yeah. I agree. I mean this is a problem. Yeah, this is Avri speaking. This is a problem that every one of these groups has had. One thing I've noticed is when you send it up to the plenary is sometimes when people start idling about details, because they finally read it.

I just looked. We have 24 active, so-called active participants. I see that we really only have six or seven on the call. It's fascinating. But we have 24 active participants, 18 observers. So, I think one thing that you and I, Jordan, can/should do over the next week is just say "Hey folks, there's

a document here, A. It needs some eyes. 24 of you have signed up as active participants. So, do something.”

And then do the same thing for B. I don’t worry about getting more people to write. I certainly put out a call for volunteers, but I suspect that if I get any help from anyone, it will be from the handful of people that have attended the meetings.

But so, we’re okay. I’m not worried because we will get comments before long, whether we get a lot of comments, I don’t know. I’m hopeful. But I’m not terribly worried. Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Avri. And Cheryl, your hand is up. Your hand is up, but we are not hearing you, just so you know.

AVRI DORIA:

No, I can’t hear Cheryl either.

[CROSSTALK]

AVRI DORIA:

Now I hear you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yay. Okay, let me start that again. Talking to my muted microphone. I’m trying to do it through the AC, and I usually leave that microphone muted at all times. Okay, Cheryl, for the record. I agree with everything

you've said about trying to get more people involved, and the plenary involved when it tends to resuscitate.

In fact, in some cases, we hear as much from the people who have commented in the sub teams in the plenary phase as we do in the sub team work. That's just some double dipping in my view. One thing that may be worthwhile, and it is only a maybe, but I'm just putting it out there.

I know, particularly when we're horrendously busy, certainly the way I manage my email list, I'm much more likely to pay attention to the link that is sent specifically to me as my address, a personal like to the Google Doc, than I am to a message that goes to the list. It's just easier to ignore a piece of list for another day, another day and another day. So, maybe try that. I don't know whether it will work, but we can try.

JORDAN CARTER:

So, Cheryl, just so I can clearly understand what you're suggesting, is it to say that we get the email addresses of the participants and observers who have volunteered and just send them a direct email rather than using the email list? Is that what you're suggesting?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yes, that's correct. A personal link as opposed to an anyone with this link can edit. You know what I mean? It just might work. I don't know.

AVRI DORIA: This is Avri. I don't [INAUDIBLE] Google Drive enabled with their own address?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: As far as I—

AVRI DORIA: Because I'm not in favor of that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I don't believe you have to have a Google address or a Google Drive to do that. I do, so that doesn't include me. But as far as I know, you should be able to send a link specifically to the actual individual email addresses, not just to the list address.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. I don't think it will make a difference, but okay. Just so you weren't suggesting that everybody be made an individually named editor. Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER: Yeah, that's the thing about that. I can think of a way to do it that doesn't involve making everyone a sort of master editor of the doc. Is there any other business for this call? It's been quite a constructive discussion, and I'm happy to leave it there until our next discussion.

AVRI DORIA: Nothing from me. Thanks to everybody.

JORDAN CARTER: Yeah, let's leave it with thanks. Thank you all for your participation on this call, this very early point in 2017. And our next call's in about two weeks. Please add your comments to the docs, and I look forward to speaking with you the next time. Thank you all for coming. Have a good evening, or morning, or day.

AVRI DORIA: Or night.

KLAUS STOLL: Bye, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]