                              ***

                              ***

     >> AVRI DORIA: Hi Jordan. This is Avri. The substantive
issue for this week is the initial response to questions asked
in December, made of this on the list this week. We figured we
better make a pass through that set of questions and see what
the answers are and decide what to do with them. Yes. So that
there are a set of documents as listed. Then we'll talk about
the process discussion analysis, development of solutions to the
issues, start talking about the approach we'll take. A reminder
that we will be talking about these issues in the Plenary.
Briefly then a document update but I don't believe there is much
of an update on either of the two documents. Let me see, what
do we have after that. Then basically we'll just talk about the
status of the work and look at the next steps on the various
documents and any other business.
   I -- it is too bad that there are so few people here. But
since one of the main discussions on one of the issues is here I
think it is good that we do the meeting anyhow. Is there any
other business that anyone would like to add or any change to
the agenda? At this point it is a fairly standard agenda. I do
remind people to keep themselves muted if not speaking and try

to say your name at the beginning which I forgot to do. This is Avri speaking. So anybody want to change the agenda? Seeing, hearing nothing, okay.

Then SOI is just to remind everyone that SOIs need to be updated. Looking at the list of people attending I am fairly sure we don't have an issue there. Is there anybody attending on the phone that is not on Adobe Connect? I don't hear any voices. I'll assume that there is no one. Okay. Then the first item is the staff engagement. I am wondering whether there is any update on what is happening in terms of bringing more staff participants in to the group. Patrick, do you have any update on that?

>> PATRICK DODSON: Sorry. I was taking myself off mute. This is Patrick. Based on the issue tracker it is being shared with Theresa and Theresa's intention is to bring it in to the exec team in their weekly staff meeting to help focus that group's discussion on the potentially good candidates to approach within the staff to see if they are interested in volunteering. So hope to have some names here sooner rather than later but that's the latest.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you very much. Okay. Any questions on that, Jordan or anyone else? Okay. Now we'll move on. We have the questions paper and George basically brought up the question of us needing to basically work on the answer for those. So though that hadn't been the plan for today, we had had a different planned agenda, we have decided that we should probably do that. And Jordan wrote an initial draft of a set of what we are calling light answers because many of the answers talk about future answers. But that -- and then I made an edit pass through of that document. We made it public I guess yesterday or the day before, I guess it depends on where you are and what time zone you are in. I am wondering if we can bring up that document. I regret that I did not send a PDF of it out which -- before the meeting which has been my practice but I forgot to do that. But thank you for having one.

So Jordan, would you like to walk us through this, this document and give us your thoughts? And perhaps after each question if there is anyone that's got a comment. And then after we have talked through it, we could talk about what we do next with it. Of course, it being available for anyone to read it as a public document. But would that be okay with you, Jordan?

>> JORDAN CARTER: Yep, Avri, I could do that.

>> AVRI DORIA: Fantastic.

>> JORDAN CARTER: It is Jordan here. Hi everyone. I am conscious of a small call and the fact that everyone on this call is particularly diligent. And so I'm not going to read it

out. But I think that -- well, I was trying to distill, where it seems the group's discussions have been going, the consequences, spending the time on this is that the proposed one pager and on that -- oh, what do you call it? The one pager on the relationships to the community and Delegations and stuff wasn't done because there is only so much time one can put in to this stuff. There is no harm in answering the staff's questions. I thought we were having a good dialogue but obviously some didn't feel the same way.

   So I hope that's reasonably self-explanatory and I tried to keep the answers reasonably brief and further answers will come through the ongoing work. Does anyone have any thoughts or issues about the draft answer in question 1? Or about the whole pack if you don't want to talk specifically about any of the questions.

        >> AVRI DORIA: This is Avri. George has his hand up.
        >> GEORGE SADOWSKY: This is George. And I am speaking really as an individual at this point because I want to -- I want to help get this thing going. I think we had a fairly intense e-mail discussion about this. And I think that what you are doing is going in the direction where you want to collect more evidence, you want to understand the situation better before you give specific replies to any of these questions. And the staff questions, they are asking for specific replies and what you are saying is look, yeah, we are -- we're really generating I don't want to say hypothesis because I think that's a word that's too tentative for some people who will be reading this transcript. Issue areas where you are collecting information and you are not ready to talk about it yet but you intend to within the structure of the issue table that you are generating. And these answers fit within that context and that's the way you are going to go. And that's an acceptable way of going. So I really don't have detailed comments on these answers. I think this is a direction and you are going to take it and --
        >> George?
        >> GEORGE SADOWSKY: I think it is a good idea that you are answering the questions because you really want to get a dialogue going with staff because ultimately you are going to need to talk with them and say look, here is what we found. And they are going to say well, let's explore this and you are going to say yes, let's explore it. And let's see what we can find what's constructive going forward. At least that's the way I see it.
        >> JORDAN CARTER: It is Jordan. We have got a dialogue going with staff whether we answer these questions in writing or not. Do you think that we should change these answers or --

(Talking at the same time) (echoing).

>> JORDAN CARTER: Do you think we should change these answers or do you think we should hold off and rely on the discussion that is happening? Patrick being here to say that answer is definitely coming but too early to answer specifically because we are still in the investigation phase.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: I don't know. Again speaking as a member of the group and not of the board, my own preference would be to sharpen the answers and try to answer them as directly as possible. But you have a strategy which would -- which takes in to account that you are going to take this set of issues before the whole CCWG and for that matter well beyond that if you wanted to, before pronouncing any with respect to the issues. And so that's the strategy you are going to follow it is one of the number of strategies. You seem to be doing it. Let's take it to the end. And I think that means writing answers of the type that you have been -- you have written here. Thanks.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thanks, George. Jordan, I have one question on this that I had when I did the first read through but never got back to talking to you about and that's on the second paragraph where we have the no/few/some listed as the alternative. We will pick which of these three was the correct, was the assumption I was making but wanted to check that.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Yes, I think that's right. I didn't have to hand any examples myself. So I didn't know whether other people did or not. So I just square bracketed that. I didn't really draft these answers with a firm in mind about when they would be sent. That paragraph as a holder when we did the issues identification work. I think that there are kind of two broad options. One is to sharpen up the answers based on where we are at today and say almost set of holding answers, saying overall we are still working on this and focus on systems and processes and we will come back to you on the detail once we have done that analysis. Or to just not do anything with them until we have done the analysis and rely on the informal conveyance through Patrick and the other staff on this call to say the group is thinking about the answers to the questions, the approach they are taking isn't going to generate those answers in detail yet and we are all fine with that. I don't have a preference between those two options. I always think the back and forth of letters and writing and stuff that you can do, especially when you are talking about and trying to have a dialogue the better. I don't know, Patrick, if you have got a view on that.

>> AVRI DORIA: Patrick has his hand up.

>> PATRICK DODSON: This is Patrick. I think it -- I think

it will be better for us to hold off on sending back a half
answer or generic answer document because, you know, I would
anticipate that the response back from many on the side, on the
staff side is going to be -- to revisit for more specificity. I
think the process of rounding out the issues table with the
bigger Plenary group to identify if there are other instances
that we can bring up as evidence or situation cases that that
will actually help clarify I think the answers here. What
I'm -- what I like about this is just by going through the
exercise of how to answer these questions kind of gives this
group I think an understanding of where they are on that
specificity to generic range of content which then just helps us
identify how to shape the answers and/or think about the right
way to engage staff beyond me in the dialogue as well. So I
would be in favor of letting those that need to know that
answers are not being ignored, but they are -- if anything we
are trying to go through the due diligence of getting clear
answers that actually support a dialogue moving forward as
opposed to continuing an unambiguous back and forth. Thank you.
        >> AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Alan.
        >> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I question to what extent
are we really going to get specific answers and specific
instances. We talk about using words like reprisals. I don't
think that's the right word to use in this kind of case. No, I
can give a specific instance of how a senior staff person has,
you know, I think not acted appropriately. But the relationship
between volunteers and staff is difficult enough as it is. I
mean otherwise we wouldn't be having this discussion at all.
And to give an example which might put him or her in a bad, you
know, bad way, it is going to poison the atmosphere even more
and make it more difficult for the next time we have an
interaction. And I am very reluctant to do that. I had a
discussion with the former Ombudsman at a point, about why
didn't you complain formally to me. It is not worth it. The
potential benefits are not worth the potential harm that would
be caused to the relationships both the individual -- with the
individual concerned and with the rest of the staff. You know,
because I'm -- because I have gone and done that. Maybe I'm
overreacting but I think that's a general feeling. So I
question to what extent -- we don't have a lot of turnover in
ICANN these days. It is hard to talk about the person who has
left now and now we can talk about them. So I question to what
extent are we really going to be able to address these issues
with specific hard facts and hard examples.
        >> AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Alan. Jordan, I see you have
got your hand up and Patrick, is that a remnant hand?
        >> JORDAN CARTER: Thanks. I think I agree with Alan. The

tension in all of this is that there is a difference between
hypothesis and generic issues informed by specific instances.
And we all face the challenge of trying to do this work in a way
that minimizes disruption and doesn't sort of worsen
relationships between and staff as a group and the community as
a group and specific individuals on either side. So that's why
the approach has been -- that Avri and I have been sort of
pushing is one where there are things that might look like
hypothesis but there never are. There is nothing in the issues
table that someone just dreamed up. Nothing can get in there or
be listed there unless there is a specific example underlying
and we might be able to speak about these examples offline or
people may have knowledge of individual cases but we -- I think
I agree with Alan, airing them through formal processes isn't
what this is about. And the way I see that you can operate that
on the basis of trust and without leading to questions about are
people telling the truth or making it up, by listing the points
and getting a wider audience and doing some work in terms of
prioritizing which ones to work on on a systemic level where one
or two interventions might be capable of addressing many of the
suggested issues and then leaving this for future review
processes to deal with. So I -- we definitely, I think, I hope
I speak for all of us, we don't want to turn this Working Group
in to a place where people start complaining about oh, blah
happened with blah years ago. And we don't want to sort of
delve in to things that happened 10 or 15 years ago which aren't
relevant to the current ICANN. But I -- if the organization is
signalling through these questions that what it wants is details
of cases to look in to them, that's definitely never going to
happen. And I hope that nobody is expecting and it is good to
say that's not going to happen because it is not our job. And
that's why the answers that I have drafted are all couched
around the idea of systemic responses informed by civic cases
that we might not be able to discuss. So I think that's a very
long-winded way of agreeing with Alan.
        >> AVRI DORIA: In terms of hand I have put mine up and
then I noticed that George and Patrick had their hands up. I am
not sure which one went first.
        >> Mine is a new one by the way.
        >> AVRI DORIA: Oh, yours is a new one at the top of the
list.
        >> Yep.
        >> AVRI DORIA: That means that you go first.
        >> Thank you. It is Alan. Thank you. It is Alan speaking
for the transcript or the captioning or whatever. I'll
back -- I'll back out a little bit from what I said. There are
some examples that are easy because they are so common. And if

you ask volunteers in ICANN what kind of problems you have with
ICANN staff, travel is going to be the top of almost everyone's
list because almost everyone has an example. And that
particular case the person who is -- who is the front line
person I know is running as fast as he can. He may need a
course in time management and a few other things. So it is not
so much a target at the particular person but at the overall
process. We have had problems with -- with travel for years
now. And they range from significant travel problems to little
things like I send an e-mail and no one responds to it in the
last three days which happens to apply to me at the very moment.
And performance problems are not a new thing in business. Yet
we have never even had a real candid discussion openly. I have
had it personally with a number of people. Nothing gets
resolved. No one has decided to say let's have a service level
agreement and let's track whether we are responding properly or
not. And it is just shoved under the rug because it doesn't
seem to be anyone's priority. That one we can talk about, but I
hate to target something which is -- which ultimately ends up
pointing at one person or two people, even if you are not
blaming them it still makes the situation really difficult.
Thank you.
    >> AVRI DORIA: Thank you. This is Avri speaking. One of
the things that I wanted to add to what Jordan said is that one
of the things that I hope we can identify for all the issues and
all the issue types is what an appropriate process would be for
dealing with those. If you look at the issues that come up and
those that get a certain amount of, you know, generality in
terms of various people saying yeah, we have had something like
that, in some cases it may be travel. In some cases it may be,
for example, based on the letter we got from the registry
stakeholder group or the indication we have gotten from the
business constituency, et cetera. And so, you know, we look at
those and say what's the process for dealing with them for this
kind of issue. And if so, what is it. And if not is one
needed. And if those are the kinds of things that I am hoping
to come out. So that indeed we are not dealing with specific
issues and putting them through the process but we are looking
at the class of issues and the types of issues and making sure
whether they are issues from volunteer to staff or staff to
community. You know, that's -- we will work out any issues.
But that there needs to be either we can say no, this is not
really a problem. This is not really an issue. We don't need a
process to deal with it or we so say yes, it appears there is a
certain amount of reality to this issue and there isn't a
process. So we recommend process X, Y or Z and that's kind of
where I hope it gets handled and gets handled in a very

nonfinger pointing way and trying to basically remove the specificity. And it is good that someone gives an issue in a specific manner but we discuss the issues by abstracting what is the problem of the issue and not what are the specific details. So that was mine. George, was it George or Patrick first? Do you know who got your hand up first?

        >> Patrick. Patrick.
        >> AVRI DORIA: Patrick, please.
        >> PATRICK DODSON: Great. Thank you. And I am -- everyone is making my points that I was going to bring up if I keep on waiting longer. But I'll just quickly second the comments that have been made here, that the stories I think are less about evidence in let's solve that problem as much as they are illustrative of the challenges in evidence that there is a valid systemic problem or a pattern that this group should address.

   And then I agree with Avri, I second the reminder of the focus of this group is not to resolve the systems that are the sources of those challenges but to identify those mechanisms for appropriately addressing concerns or experiences that are not meeting community expectations. Thanks.
        >> AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you. George.
        >> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Yes. Thanks. George here. I tend to understand where you are coming from. But my shift is this, that up to a point, if you stay in a fairly broad systemic level assuming the problems are systemic, you are going to catch them. You are going to be able to identify them and your strategy will work as you have described it. But to the extent that they are not systemic, maybe they are quirky, maybe they are individuals, maybe they are attitudes that are shared, who knows, that the less specific you get the less likely you are to be able to say things that are -- that are meaningful in terms of being able to do something about them. And one thing I would say is that you might want to point out some of the things that you have been saying and saying that look, we don't want to point fingers. We don't say it this way, we are not going to point fingers, even though it may be useful to point fingers to show examples of what we think may be systemic. We don't have a space in which we can do it in ways that don't worsen relationships and that don't create a us versus them or we versus you attitude. And let's go to the safe space so that we can set up a system for identifying and dealing with these problems as they come up in the future and not letting them stay invested. There is nothing worse than a problem that doesn't get solved and everyone knows it is there and continues to irritate. And it is sort of an elephant in the room. And it is known that it is in the room but you don't know how to deal with it. So it just aggravates

everyone on and on and on. It is like Chinese water torture.
You can't get rid of these. If you think the issues are
systemic, then what ways of showing they are systemic, the best
way I know is evidence. I understand why you don't want to go
there. So that's why I go back to saying maybe the lack of a
safe space is what you need to talk about and how to create that
space so that these things don't become problems. Am I making
sense to you? It is going in a somewhat different direction
than you are going. Thank you.

      >> AVRI DORIA: George, I am actually not sure that you are
going in a different direction if I can speak and I don't know
whether Patrick, your hand was a new instance. But I think in
some cases we are collecting specific issues as I say those that
are actually being written up and were already submitted. So in
those cases and part of the discussion in the Plenary meeting is
to basically look for wider feedback on the degree to which
people may have experienced things that are similar. Perhaps
without needing to get in to those details but enough to give a
systemic picture. I think that the issue that you bring up,
those things that are not systemic but are particular but become
elephants in the room may be actually describing yet another
role in the table of another kind of issue that needs to be
solved by there being some ongoing safe space or what have you
for further discussions after this group. So I think what
you -- what you identified is perhaps another kind of issue than
the ones we have listed is those issues that aren't systemic but
come up do not get resolved and get birthed to elephants. And
so, you know, I'm just sort of thinking this through as I was
listening to you. That that may just be another kind of issue.
Your hand is still up, George. Did you want to comment further
or did we want to quickly move through some of the others?
There has been some discussion in the chat room. I don't know
whether we need to bring that in. Alan made a point that you
can cover some of the issues but others that you can't mention
without it becoming personal. And perhaps that is the
particular, the specific issue and may fall in to the kind of
category that I think George was opening up, the safe space,
there is a safe space discussion. Okay.

      >> JORDAN CARTER: Can I make a point, Avri? Yes, it is
Jordan here. I think George from your intervention, I got a
clearer sense about your point of evidence on systemic issues, I
think the issues we are finding on the issues table are probably
perceived gaps in the HR deployment manager and accountability
system for staff. That may be able to be either filled in the
case of building feedback loops or provide a safe space to
resolve individual issues that come up. And what I hadn't
thought about is if one of the issues alleged was, for example,

the HR system broadly doesn't hold staff to account for poor
performance. Now if you wanted to make a generalization like
that, my personal view is that they would be beyond the scope of
this group because this group can't and shouldn't try and
accumulate the evidence, but that would be required to validate
or otherwise the hypothesis. The best it could do is to say we
wonder if there is a performance issue and we would like you to
look at the assistance. We shouldn't try to do the work of the
organization. Maybe that's where we have been slightly talking
across purposes, occurs to me.
          >> GEORGE SADOWSKY: That's quite possible.
          >> AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you, George. The captioner is
getting the names in, recognizing our voices. Okay. Do we want
to go through the other questions? I know I had some content to
add to question 2 in answering the question in parenthesis, but
I don't know if we are ready to move on to the other questions.
          >> JORDAN CARTER: I think this is a general discussion,
Avri, and you should say what you have got on that.
          >> AVRI DORIA: I have added it in the document as a
comment but not as a write-up. And this was the reticence
that's been reported about various members of the organization.
And basically I'm one of the main people who is bringing this
one up. In that sense the work in HRT2 and since then I have
talked to more than a handful of staff members who have had
things to say. And for some reason having made myself sort of
very visible on the whistleblower necessity and such, people
have come and talked to me. Now that was always done
confidentially and such. And even when I have gone and
approached people about joining this group who I have heard, you
know, commenting and moaning, I corrected my speech, but
commenting and moaning about various issues and I said hey, come
on down and let's talk this through, whether it was issues about
community member behavior or it was situational about how some
of this stuff worked within the organization and such, all I can
do is say yes, these things get reported to me. I hear them in
discussions. But that's all I can do is pass that on. And the
only thing I offer kind of a further clue on that is the fact
that we are then beating the bushes on people to participate.
And everyone I have approached have said I kind of like to but I
kind of like my job. And -- so that's why we are going through
the larger process to get some staff members to volunteer in a
different matter as opposed to just coming forward and
participating.
     So that's the point on the answer to that one. You know, I
take responsibility if no one else has been talked to
confidentially by staff members of just saying that's where that
one comes from. George, I see your hand up.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: George here. Speaking as an individual and not as a board member, let me tell you what my answer based on what your position is. I would have said something like this, we do believe that there are concerns of the type that you mention, that there is a fear of talking about specific instances because of unwillingness to upset relationships...and so on. We are talking with a broader group of people about this so that we can present you with a better idea of how prevalent or nonprevalent this is, however you want to phrase that. And we do believe that this is an issue to which you should give some attention. We believe that the establishment of safe spaces for discussing issues like this will help ICANN in the future, full stop. Direct and illustrate your concerns in a very tangible manner. Thank you.

>> JORDAN CARTER: I don't know if we have lost Avri from Chairing but I will step in while she is still on mute saying George, thanks, that was helpful. In every organization I have ever been a part of people are a bit reluctant to speak out against hierarchy or power structures and there is an informal layer of communication that goes on. But my answer would have been almost if I was sort of being silly, of course, there are people who have that view because we are human beings working together in a group. That wouldn't be a helpful contribution to this discussion.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Yes. This is Avri again. Yes, I was speaking muted. And so thank you for reminding me that I was muted. And what I had basically said beyond what you said is I think we will take what George said and cut and paste it in to the document and such. Yeah, the only people that are notorious for always speaking their mind in organizations become essentially unemployable. I can testify to that.

  You get a bad reputation. Okay. Any other questions? Question 2 -- yes, George, is your hand up again? Please.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: It is an old hand.

>> AVRI DORIA: Sorry.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: I would argue. I understand your point, troublemakers get shut down. And perhaps one could add, I don't know quite how, but one of the characteristics of really new organizations, benefit from feedback they find a way of doing this without expelling troublemakers. They turn the troublemaker energy, whether positive or negative, in to a positive force for appropriate change. Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Good comment. Yes, Alan.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Through all that, I have worked with a number of organizations over the years. ICANN values loyalty more than your typical organization. Partly perhaps because it is still small enough. Partly because it is a very hierarchical

organization, you know, and their relationship between everyone and their boss is something they are not going to do anything to endanger. And I don't know how you get around it. I mean we are not living in the world of Rod Beckstrom where people were fired right, left and center for saying one thing, but there is an ax hanging over everyone or at least many, many people because of the need to not do something which will reflect badly on the people who work for you or the people you work for.

You know, and I -- I have a pretty good relationship with some people in ICANN and they will speak candidly to me but they would never say that to their boss or out loud. So...

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you. I have got Patrick and then George.

>> PATRICK DODSON: This is Patrick. I agree with Alan. The other observation I would make though, the other attributes that you can characterize within ICANN is, you know, for many of the folks they remember and worked under Beckstrom and even further back than that. And another attribute and not just on the staff side but on the community side is that there is a lot of longevity and a lot of memory and those memories I think linger for folks, even if they are instances that we acknowledge are five or even ten years old, people will still remember them. And some people on both sides of the camp remember them plain as day. And unfortunately learn those lessons the strongest. So that's also another factor in the dynamic as we are trying to think through the way to engage. And I think even characteristically on an individual level people are given credit and reputation for having big contribution opinions. And I know there are other folks that have felt that their contribution needs to be muffled as it relates to dealing with the community and where that gray area is between the work that the community does and the experience and intelligence that the organization has. So there is a lot of different dynamics in this that create a lot of landmines, real or perceived, for individuals, depending on who they are and where they come from and how much they are on the troublemaker spectrum. Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Patrick, I liked your characterization really a lot. And I think this is the level at which a lot of the discussion of this group could and perhaps should take place is the dynamics of the situation and I don't know if this goes beyond your mandate or not, but how do you improve them. Because ultimately there is a problem to be solved and that is staff community dynamics aren't what they could be. We are not in love. We live together. We are roommates. We are not enamored of each other. We want to get things done. Improvement of that relationship helps us get things done.

Alan, if your characterization of loyalty, the dominance of loyalty is affecting how staff treat the community then that's something which is pretty serious and systemic and worth making explicit. Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay. Jordan.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Yes, I mean this is a discussion about culture. And in my experience organizational managers are pretty defensive of their right to view culture in organizations. And it is pretty clear already that Joran has a pretty different take and so on on the chain of CEOs. I have encountered interesting pushback when raising it in that frame. I think the ICANN system needs a culture reset based on a restatement of values under which people come together and work together to enable it to work together better. I think the underlying is a cultural one. That's not a staff accountability issue and not even enhancing ICANN accountability issue. I don't know where that lives. By my slight responsibility with that lives with the ICANN board and then they in the end are responsible for setting the cultural leadership of the system because they are the people from the community electors to the governing role. I feel like some of that stuff is really important. I don't know where it is being addressed. I don't feel like the CCWG is the place that should be doing it but maybe if it calls it out that can then spur wherever the right place is to deal with it. I'm nervous about us stepping on toes and being accused of stepping outside the mandate and that being used as a tool to ignore us.

>> PATRICK DODSON: Great comments, Jordan. Two thoughts, one is I think that the appropriate place for this group to venture in to that discussion is using the language around the culture of accountability and/or the behaviors that we are seeing that are potentially the points of issue. Because behavior -- it is a nice code word for, you know, culture in action.

   That's one thought. The other is that I think it is not just potentially the culture change or a culture reset but also just clarifying what the culture is or what the desired culture is, but also taking a look at what are the different cultures across the community as well because they -- the cultures impact other cultures. And if anything we are an ecosystem of many different cultures through the different efficiency groups in the broader ecosystem and more clarity around that as well I think
just -- this is a general comment, would serve the community as well and figuring out the right ways to work with each other. It is a different type of diversity. If you want to we can try and point in to that group. That was a joke. Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you. A comment I wanted to make is

that while revising the culture is certainly not within our
scope, I agree, Jordan, but I think that if after discussion of
the issues and having conversations like this one with more
people and going further in to some of the issues, because this
I think has been a very solid conversation, is that we could
come out with, you know, looking at our culture may be something
that could be a follow-on activity somewhere else and certainly
not part of the accountability, but if we think that that's part
of the accountability misunderstandings or the accountability
that leads us in to some of the accountability problems because
indeed the organization is as multi-stakeholder as ICANN is
trying to be, and is multi-stakeholder actually making decisions
and doing work, which is a very rare instance within the
multi-stakeholder world and with such an expensive staff, is a
specific kind of organization that, you know, I know this gets
accused of being called exceptionalism but is different from the
other organizations we know and have similarities certainly.
But because of that nature and because of our mission and
values, et cetera, that that does make us have to look at
culture and that may be something that, you know, we certainly
can't get in to but we can certainly recommend as one of the
possible solution areas for the future.
   George, I see your hand. I want to point out that we have ten
minutes left. Before going on I can say very much there is
almost nothing to say about the other documents that are there.
It is just a checkpoint that lives on our agenda. So I'm fine
with spending the next ten minutes on this if no one has an
objection. And George, the floor is yours.
     >> Thanks. I think that's good judgment. This has been a
very solid conversation. It may be out of mandate and probably
is doing what the group is doing, e-mailing it. Seems less
knowable in some way to providing a path to progress than the
conversation. And I don't know whether you agree with that or
not. But flagging this issue I think is the first step in
getting it out for discussion. I want to ask Patrick a
question. Patrick, if the senior staff were in this call right
now up to this point, what do you think their reaction would be?
     >> PATRICK DODSON: What would their reaction be? I think
it would be as varied as the individuals on this call. I think
that they would be in agreement around the themes that we are
discussing here but also in agreement that it is meandering
around the scope and focus of this group's work. But there's
quite a bit of conversation going on within the staff around
organizational effectiveness and culture and clarifying those
fun navigational tools like vision mission strategy, values as
we are talking about annual planning, as we are talking about
employee fatigue and all of those different pieces. So I don't

think that anything on this call would be a surprise. I'm
certainly bringing up observations that I have made or have been
part of discussions where these observations have been made in
the past as well. The other thing about communities that have a
lot of longevity within the community members is all of these
things oftentimes are discussed in that interesting way that it
is open, yet not really discussed for the purposes of addressing
or challenging things. And that's for a whole host of reasons
as well.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I want agreement check from
Jordan -- I was just checking to see if it was a remnant hand.
Okay. With eight minutes left here we haven't talked at all
about questions 3 and 4. Yes, Jordan.

>> JORDAN CARTER: I was going to say something about the
next agenda item, the next bullet point about process. So I'll
wait until you are ready.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay. And that's -- if nobody had anything
to add to 3 or 4 that's where I wanted to go, but I just wanted
to make sure I had given people a chance to comment on those.
And then to lead in to the next one saying the impression I have
this remains a living document and will keep working on it, but
we are not delivering it as an answer yet. Of course, it is an
open document on drive that anyone can go in and comment, can
add text, including staff members. One does not need to be a
nonstaff member to go in, comment and read and, of course,
that's up to you, Patrick, and the senior staff in terms of
whether, you know, or who can and I know that you have already
participated in the other docs on occasion, on the issues doc.
I am glad to see there is a precedent for it. Yes, Jordan, the
rest of the process.

>> JORDAN CARTER: I didn't know how the timing would go
today. And if we had lots of time we could brainstorm some of
that process but we don't. I thought we might do it by means of
me jotting down sort of almost like a sort of enumerated process
similar to what George did during his e-mails in the work. A
list of steps that we can take to do that work and fire it
around the group for input and feedback for us to firm up on the
next call.

>> AVRI DORIA: Sounds like a good suggestion. Anyone else
wish to comment on those two points made in terms of the way
forward? One, this document remains open for continuing
discussion and answer. And two, that Jordan will initiate a
discussion on a bulleted set of process items on the list,
excuse me, that we can work towards.

   Okay. Seeing nobody wanted to comment on that, basically
there has been no change made in our other documents since our
last meeting. There has been no change made in our plans. So

we did move off the -- one of the discussions by a week. But I
don't think that changes our schedule yet. We do have the
upcoming Plenary discussion which I believe is before our next
meeting but I would have to check the comment. I mean I would
have to check the schedule for sure but I believe that's the
case.
   And does anybody else have anything else to add?
      >> Yeah.
      >> AVRI DORIA: Yes, George.
      >> GEORGE SADOWSKY: (Inaudible).
      >> AVRI DORIA: What?
      >> What happened to the group? There is only five people
on the call.
      >> AVRI DORIA: That's an issue we have been having with
many groups. In the beginning Alan was talking about people
being tired. But I have been on two meetings that got canceled
because we didn't get enough people. And by some of the rules
that people are using that there have to be at least five
members of the group that are neither group leadership nor staff
for a meeting to be held. Now that's just a rough practice. It
is not an absolute command and it is one that I chose to miss
today because it seemed appropriate to have a conversation. But
you are right, it is a problem and it is a problem throughout
CCWG at the moment. Probably something that we should discuss
at the CCWG level. But I'm also having it in the new GGLT
Working Group. Unless we have done a good job of drumming up an
exciting discussion for the meeting we sometimes have light
attendance. So it is not just this group that's having that
particular problem. Yes, Jordan.
      >> JORDAN CARTER: I think it is an ICANN wide problem that
possibly relates to exhaustion following the transition. And I
don't know if given the long lead up to that of many years and
encouraging a certain sort of person who had time and interested
to do things and given its passing, I think that volunteer
participation might actually be a systemic issue that the board
should be very worried about given the effect it has overall on
the system's abilities to do its job. But in terms of this
group in particular I think we have had a number of calls that
have been closer together to get more work done, but because
they are so close together it is very hard to get any work done.
   So one of the thoughts that I had was A, we still are varying
the times through the schedule that's allowed, but I think if we
ask people would they rather have a less frequent schedule but a
longer call with something more of substance to discuss at them,
and that might be more likely to attract participation, I don't
know. It is just my theory, that if you ask people to do lots
of bite-sized chunks it's harder for them to make the time

available. But if something to get their teeth in and offer an opinion and perspective about, they are more likely to bother to come and do it.

>> AVRI DORIA: We can talk about that. Because before we were doing the less frequent and trying to only have the meetings when we had something substantive to talk to. But then our schedule was slipping at every meeting. And part of it is that we need to be done with this. I think part of the exhaustion is also that, you know, we all know that it is time to be done with this particular chapter of the accountability work. And -- so we should really talk about what works better. But George, is that a new hand?

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: The last one, as a board member I can tell you that we are concerned about volunteer burnout. And any suggestions you can make to prioritizing delaying whatever it is that keeps people sane and able to function well would be -- would be suggestions that would be welcome by the board. Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Yep. Okay. So anybody else have another comment before I adjourn the meeting?

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hello.

>> AVRI DORIA: Go ahead, Cheryl.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry about that. My computer literally ran out of battery. And I didn't feel like plugging it in for the last couple of minutes of the call. I am glad that we are all concerned about volunteer burnout. We need to do something. That's a piece of work. But the -- the learnings from the accountability efforts should not necessarily be seen as typical. They are affecting other groups, absolutely, as I pointed that out. But this is an unusual sort of circumstances with some particularly heavy demand with high frequency and very regular meetings because of taking subteam and breakdown in to small facets approaches. Now that's not bad, that's not good. I am not criticizing. Let's be careful what we try and remodel and why we are remodeling and circumstances that prevail at the moment. Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thanks. And in closing I think that's part of the reason why we are taking the issue to the Plenary for a more people discussion. I thank you all for a very good meeting and a fine discussion. I love that we have a transcript for it already. And the meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Bye.

>> Thanks all. Bye.

(Call concluded at 1 a.m. CST)

***

This is being provided in rough-draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in

order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a
totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

<center>***</center>