Jimm Phillips: (10/19/2015 09:57) What's the url for the captioning transcript?
Jimm Phillips: (09:58) thanks!
Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (10:21) Hello and welcome
Alice Jansen: (10:21) Welcome to the Enhancing ICANN Accountability Engagement Session I! Please note that this session is being recorded. II chat sessions are being archived and follow the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior: http://www.icann.org/en/nes/in-focus/accountability/expected-standards. You are the voice for remote participants and will be reading your comments and questions today. When submitting a comment/question that you want me to read out loud of the mic, please provide your name and affiliation if you have one then start your sentence with <COMMENT>/<QUESTION> and end it with ><COMMENT>/<QUESTION>. Text outside these quotes will be considered as part of chat and will not be read out loud on the mic.
Becky Burr: (10:23) hello all
Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (10:23) hi all - we'll try and keep an eye on the room too
Sébastien (ALAC): (10:25) Thanks Jordan
Sébastien (ALAC): (10:26) Good to do that in different languages
Sébastien (ALAC): (10:26) I know that it is not easy
Sidley: (10:27) Sidley in the participants list is Holly Gregory.
Dietmar Stefitz: (10:29) Is there a way to switch to original language in his platform?
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO: (10:29) thanks for that I'd Holly
Sébastien (ALAC): (10:29) No in Adobe just one canal (in english)
Alice Jansen: (10:29) Links to all languages are available on session page
https://meetings.icann.org/en/dublin54/schedule/mon-enhancing-accountability
Sébastien (ALAC): (10:30) but you can joint other tool with other languages
Holly J. Gregory (Sidley): (10:30) I have resigned in now.
Dietmar Stefitz: (10:30) Thanks
Seun Ojedeji: (10:32) You resigned @Holly?
Holly J. Gregory (Sidley): (10:33) No. Apologies -- I have signed in again
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO: (10:33) auto correct. Holly re assigned her name
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO: (10:36) we also welcome a hub joining us from Pakistan... WELCOME

Dave Kissoondoyal: (10:42) Will the decisions of the IRP be final or they can be overruled by any other instance

Becky Burr: (10:44) the decisions of the IRP may be appealed in specified circumstances to the entire 7 member panel

Becky Burr: (10:46) also, the IRP does not tell ICANN "how" it must resolve a bylaw violation. It will determine whether an action or inaction violated the bylaws, then ICANN must decide how to address the problem.

David McAuley (RySG): (10:46) Alice, can you post URL to the scribe caption?

Dave Kissoondoyal: (10:46)


David McAuley (RySG): (10:46) Thanks Dave

Alice Jansen: (10:46) Thanks, Dave!

Dave Kissoondoyal: (10:46) Welcome

David McAuley (RySG): (10:48) Good points, thanks Becky

Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO: (10:52) welcome to the hub from Brazil

Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO: (10:53) we now have hubs running in Kenya, Dubai, Pakistan and Brazil

Alice Jansen: (10:55) Reminder - When submitting a comment/question that you would like to read out loud of the mic, please start your sentence with <COMMENT>/<QUESTION> and end it with <COMMENT>/<QUESTION>

Bruce Tonkin: (10:56) Great slides. Is a copy of those slides available somewhere?

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (10:57) Great work by Hillary, Alice, XPLANE and staff!

Hillary Jett: (10:57) @Bruce the slides were circulated to the CCWG here:

http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2015-October/006966.html

Matthew Shears: (10:57) yes, good clear slides - should consider using more of these visuals in the next iteration of the proposal

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (10:58) Definitely will be, M.

robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (10:58) yes, great pictures

Alice Jansen: (10:59) You can also find the slides on the CCWG-Accountability wiki -

https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=56143659

Anne Aikman-Scalese - IPC: (11:00) This is an excellent presentation - very clear and easy to understand. Thank you!

Alan Greenberg: (11:00) I think that Steve said 2 ACs plus @ SOs. I thought is was any 4 ACs or SOs.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (11:01) Right, Alan

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (11:01) as per the slide as it shows now

Anne Aikman-Scalese - IPC: (11:01) @Alann - I think any two can raise
at early stage after pre-call - later taking action requires 4 I think
>if there are 7 participating.
> Alan Greenberg: (11:03) @Anne. yes. I *thought* I heard Steve say
>that to exercise a power requiring 4, this it required 2 ACs plus 2
>SOs. and I thought it was any 4 ACs or SOs.. I can live with either, I
>was just asking which it was.
> Alice Jansen: (11:05) You are more than welcome to ask questions and
>provide input. When submitting a comment/question that you would like
>to read out loud of the mic, please start your sentence with
<<COMMENT>/<QUESTION> and end it with <COMMENT>/<QUESTION>
> Anne Aikman-Scalese - IPC: (11:06) @Alan - I think I thought any 4 of
>the 7, not two from each. Steve?
> Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (11:06) @Alan -- the proposal is that
>ANY
>4 of the 7 ACs and SOs would signal support for exercising a Community
>Power such as blocking a budget, approving a fundamental bylaw,
>recalling the entire board
> Holly J. Gregory (Sidley): (11:06) Great slides -- well done Hillary,
> Alice, XPLANE and staff (+1 @Mathieu)
> Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (11:07) The support threshold would any
>3 ACs/SOs for exercising community powers to block a regular bylaw,
>remove an individual director, or launch a community-based IRP
> robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (11:08) people have to climb over desks to
>get to the microphone though
> Anne Aikman-Scalese - IPC: (11:09) Thanks Steve. Okay - so at
>present we have two classes of community powers - one that requires 3
>of the 7 and one that requires 4 of the 7.
> Jay Sudowski (I2C): (11:11) Just came here to say the same thing
>about the microphone situation, it is not very well setup for people
>being able to get to the microphones
> Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (11:11) And our proposed consensus rule
>would require those levels of support and no more than 1 objection from
>ACs/SOs
> Anne Aikman-Scalese - IPC: (11:11) Could the sound people activate
>some roving mikes?
> Arthur Zonnenberg: (11:12) <QUESTION> What influence will these
>community powers give to contracted parties when renegotiating their
>own contract? <QUESTION>
> robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (11:12) good idea, Anne
> Alice Jansen: (11:14) Thank you for your question, Arthur. My
>colleague
>- Hillary - will read it in the room.
> Hillary Jett: (11:16) @Anne, Robin, unfortunately we do not have
>roving microphones. Apologies for any inconvenience.
> James Gannon: (11:18) Its near impossible to get people our of seats
>and up to the mics
> Milton Mueller: (11:19) QUESTION: There were many public comments
>questioning the role of ACs in the membership or designator structure.
Why has the group on stage not commented on this? It is unclear whether ACs and SOs should have the same status.

Jay Sudowski (I2C): (11:20) With regards to the caretaker budget, has any consideration been given to the potential impacts to human capital at ICANN? Would employees of ICANN continue to get paid during this kind of dispute?

Jonathan Zuck (IPC): (11:22) @Jay, this is a great question and has been raised. Xavier is considering carefully what would go into a caretaker budget. As discussed we would not send anyone home but we might hold off on making the 5 new hires for project X, for example.

The point would be to minimize any "human" suffering as a result of a veto.

Jonathan Zuck (IPC): (11:23) Bertrand's points have been canvassed and considered carefully by the CCWG but the bulk of feedback supports the proposed approach.

Dave Kissouindoyal: (11:24) Very good question from Bertrand. The process stepped out on the slide is designed to make sure the community perspectives are expressed and listened to.

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (11:24) but we could not, based on the feedback we have had, move the proposal to be in line with the opinion he has expressed.

JJS: (11:24) @Bertrand +1.

Brett Schaefer: (11:26) Jonathan -- I just arrived in the room, so I apologize if you covered this, but is the amount of the caretaker budget still under discussion? The Board wanted the previous budget plus 10 percent, which strikes me as lessening the pressure on the Board to heed community concerns that led to the veto in the first place.

Jonathan Zuck (IPC): (11:29) Hi Brett. It's a new concept. The "caretaker" budget is the minimum budget for the organization to run so it's actually a lower number than this or any year's budget.

Dave Kissouindoyal: (11:29) waiting for the term to end and not re-electing the board member as mentioned by Chris Despain. Frankly defeats the element of accountability as the board member could just be elected and waiting the end of his full term to totally unacceptable.

Brett Schaefer: (11:30) Jonathan, thanks. A better approach.

Jonathan Zuck (IPC): (11:31) yes, inspiration from Cherine

Alice Jansen: (11:36) Co-Chairs have just announced that the queue is now closed. Please note that the CCWG-Accountability will receive a transcript of this chat. You are more than welcome to keep posting comments.

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (11:37) Ken Stubbs: the answer to your question is in Para 407 of the second draft proposal: "No new call to consider the removal of that same director can be made during the term they are serving on the Board following a vote to remove them failing or no decision being made."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO: (11:40) reminder if you have questions and can not make the microphone list please type your question here in Chat.
so that will be a good time for those who just sat down to get back to
the microphone
Chris Disspain: (11:42) Mathieu..superbly well handlded re the queue
Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (11:46) this session will run to
11.50am
Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (11:49) Working session begins
at 2pm at Liffey B
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO: (11:49) allwelcome to that session. and we
will have more engagement sessions later in the week...
Wolfgang: (11:50) Axel 1+
Alice Jansen: (11:50) You can listen to the CCWG-Accountability's
working session taking place today at 13:00-17:30 UTC - see
https://meetings.icann.org/en/dublin54/schedule/mon-ccwg-accountability
for details
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO: (11:54) thank you all.
Andrew Sullivan: (11:55) I did want to get a more general comment on
the record, speaking for myself
Andrew Sullivan: (11:55) The progress I'm observing on accountability
measures is tremendous. This community deserves sufficient power to
ensure that ICANN actions reflect community will. That's how any kind of
multi-stakeholder organization ought to work: the power rests in the
community. Yet new power arrangements must not themselves create new
accountability issues. And of course, we owe the transition to the rest
of the Internet. Other operational communities have invested in
that transition. If we can't all make it happen together, we'll lose
the people's confidence. We'd have to face bad options in disunity.
Soplease, keep working to place practical, legitimate, and
appropriate power in community hands so the transition can go ahead in
a reasonable time frame. Thanks for the hard work.
Alice Jansen: (11:56) Thank you all for attending this session -
archives will be made available at
https://meetings.icann.org/en/dublin54/schedule/mon-enhancing-accountability
ili
ty