

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer  
October 7, 2015  
1:00 pm CT**

Leon Sanchez: Thank you (unintelligible) I think that I have a little background noise and apologize for that. So maybe someone could help me chair the meeting. I would only highlight a couple of thoughts. I think - I think that maybe Keith, would you mind helping me chair the call or maybe Greg? Anyone of you chair the call? Greg, could you jump in and save the call?

Greg Shatan: Sure. This is Greg. I'm on Adobe and obviously on the phone as well. I do not have the benefit of the agenda in front of me, so a little bit handicapped as chair here. So do we have an agenda? It appears we do not have an agenda. And I've not prepared one so if we are here to review public comments we should begin with the public comments that are...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: ...public comment analysis that is in front of this particular working party. So hopefully some who are on this call have prepared analysis of public comments. Is there anyone who has done that?

Kavouss Arasteh: Excuse me, which working party is that? It is not announced.

Greg Shatan: This is working...

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, go ahead...

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: ...good evening, good morning here.

Greg Shatan: Hello, Kavouss. It's Greg Shatan and this is the Working Party 3 meeting Number 7 on the 7th of October. We should start the recording if we have not already done so.

Kavouss Arasteh: Okay, I will - no, okay I will connect myself here.

Greg Shatan: Thank you.

Kavouss Arasteh: It was not announced. Thank you. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: So now we are on Working Party 3 call. So apologies for being somewhat at sea but I am trying to figure out exactly what is in front of the meeting right now. Any of the other participants would like to clue me in that would be great. I think the stakeholder SO AC accountability and diversity I think were two of the particular subjects that were in front of this group. But so I see here from Bernie that we have under diversity 23 comments were received and the staff tally show that there were 19 that supported fostering diversity in some fashion, 10 that raised issues.

Then on staff accountability topic we only had nine comments received - nine that were supportive but four also raised issues apparently. And lastly, SO AC accountability with 15 comments received, 12 supportive and three with issues.

If we have not started in this group with assigning members to analyze these public comments and prepare analyses along the so called Zuck model then that is an issue. So I will ask if anyone has - in this group has yet been assigned or has taken on the task of reviewing the public comments and preparing an analysis for this group.

Well, it appears that we're at a little bit earlier stage than WP 1, 2 or 4, although 4 only had one topic so a little easier for 4 to get started. So I think what we need to start with is getting volunteers for the three separate topics. Carlos, I see your hand is up. Carlos, we can't hear you yet. I hear typing but no talking.

So I suggest that what we do is call for volunteers on the three separate topics and that we can then have each of those volunteers or hopefully teams of volunteers prepare an analysis of the comments and I can circulate to this group, as soon as I'm not talking, a representative example of the Zuck or now - I call it the Zuck DelBianco model basically begins with a - just pulling out from the second draft report what it is that comments were made on, an overall tally of the public comments that covered this topic and then most importantly summarizing the areas of consensus with reference to each of the comments, or at least to particular points in the comments that need referenced.

Secondly, areas of clarification and refinement. Third, areas of divergence. And, last, but certainly not least, matters to be taken back to the CCWG for

further consideration. So I'll circulate that model but I think the thing that is - now it's the - it's the Zuck Steve Kavouss model. So in any case we have to give it an acronym clearly since this is ICANN. So I see we are beginning to see some volunteers. So let's first see if we can get a volunteer for diversity.

And I see Carlos volunteering for diversity. If we could put that into the notes. And I think that at no point did I say the group (unintelligible) somebody fell asleep on the keyboard. Any other volunteers for - well let's first take one volunteer for each and then see whether we have more than one volunteer for any.

Staff accountability. Do we have a volunteer for staff accountability? Leon, I see your hand is up.

Leon Sanchez: Yeah, that is volunteer for staff accountability.

Greg Shatan: Okay, we have Leon and Jeff Neuman volunteering for staff accountability. We'll send the model around as indicated so we can all work from the same basic template. Last but not least - definitely not least especially given recent conversations - SO AC accountability. Do we have a volunteer to plow through the comments and analyze them for us? Leon, I see your hand is up.

Leon Sanchez: Yeah, not only am I volunteering for this but also I think this is very important topic since as you said latest discussion point towards one of the recent, at least in my view, that has told us why they would be not - let's not say rejecting but just not buying the membership model. So I think that if we can - if we can address SO and AC accountability in a way that removes the board's concerns with regard to who will the community be accountable to then we might chance to actually continue to build upon the membership model. So, yeah, let's definitely do that.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Leon. Thank you for volunteering. What I would suggest is that, Leon, you take the lead on SO AC accountability and that Jeff take the lead on staff accountability with you as kind of second reader or second eyes. I'll see if anybody volunteers to be second on diversity or SO AC accountability. Noting that staff accountability has the fewest number of comments, probably not the one out of the three should have two people on it. But I'm not going to volun-tell people what to do since most of us are up to our eyeballs and would probably volun-cry.

But I do - we at least have one person on each one which has the advantage of not requiring coordination. So I think what we'll need to do is as quickly as possible get the comments analyzed and having been on a few calls and prepared one analysis myself I would say that it breaks down into two large tasks. One is to objectively report and synthesize the comments and to put them into the three buckets of consensus, refinement or clarification and divergence.

Whether or not you agree with the comments and to not shade your analysis of the comments toward a position you would support. It's really in the last section in terms of discussing what we want to take back to the CCWG that subjective analysis needs to take place because we need to discuss whether the response to any of these comments is to take it up to how we would use it, whether we would tend to refute it or otherwise, you know, all comments must be considered but not all comments must be adopted. So it's in that last section that it's subjective.

So to restate the list for staff accountability, yes, we have Jeff Neuman as the primary and Leon Sanchez as the secondary. For diversity we have Carlos Raul Gutiérrez as the primary, secondary and tertiary. And for SO AC

accountability we have Leon Sanchez. I see Jan Scholte's hand is up. Jan, go ahead, please.

Jan Scholte: Yeah, just to say, Greg, on the chat that I was willing to work with Leon on the SO AC accountability if that's helpful.

Greg Shatan: Oh I think that's definitely helpful. Many hands make light work so let's add Jan Scholte to SO AC accountability. Do we have a second for diversity? With 23 comments it is the largest load. Looks like Kavouss needs a dial-out. Any volunteers for diversity? I appreciate your confidence in Carlos. In any case Christopher Wilkinson, is that a - is that checkmark a volunteering or an agreement with an earlier statement? I see Christopher Wilkinson is typing in the chat also has asked for a dial-out.

Oh, Christopher Wilkinson has volunteered for SO AC accountability so we can add him to the list for that along with Leon and Jan. And Carlos still has the complete confidence of the group in his ability to go it alone.

Okay well without any public comments to analyze or rather without any analysis of the public comments to discuss, the question is what to do with the rest of this meeting. I note that Bernie states in the chat that the next meeting of this group, WP3, is in 21 hours. I am tempted to release you all so that you can have another hour and a half to work on the analysis.

And get them back at least a little bit before hopefully - ideally it would be several hours before the next WP3 meeting but understanding with only 21 hours to play with and assuming that most people have at least one sleep session scheduled for that time there's not a lot of time.

I suppose we could have a broader discussion of the issues in front of this working party other than just public analysis comments especially given the burning questions around SO AC accountability. Carlos, please go ahead. Carlos, we can't hear you yet. Looks like we're having audio connectivity problems for Carlos. I'll turn to Jan Scholte.

Jan Scholte: Yeah thanks, Greg. I'm just wondering - I'm sorry, I missed the first 5 minutes so you may have discussed this before. But what's the - what (unintelligible) plan of action of this group between now and Dublin and beyond? I mean, do we - are there particular aims to achieve one thing and another by certain times?

Greg Shatan: We did not discuss that since the first few minutes were spent trying to figure out who would chair this call and I've ended up with a battlefield promotion, if one can call it that, to chair for this particular call. It's a good question. I think - I think all of these working parties are working on two tracks in my mind.

One is the important but somewhat nuts and bolts track of taking the public comments, analyzing them, synthesizing them and determining how those public comments should be brought back to the working group and what we would recommend the working group do with those public comments recognizing of course the full working group may or may not take any recommendation that come out of the working group analysis.

The second thing that I think each of these groups needs to do is on a more beyond the public comments, not ignore them, but in addition to the public comments decide what if anything needs to be done to the public - to the second draft report with regard to these subjects. And since these are all kind of emerging issues which were not handled at great length in the report since

they're more or less Work Stream 2 issues, the question would be whether any of these need to be elevated to Work Stream 1 issues and if so what would be our approach.

So in a sense these are all somewhat open fields for discussion. So I think those are the two tracks. The analysis of public comments track now has just started in the sense that we are - we have made assignments, which have been accepted to prepare an analysis, bring them back to the group, refine the analysis on the next call and then hopefully finalize that analysis and give it back to the CCWG for the next step with the public comment analysis. There's really nothing more to be done on this call with that.

Jan Scholte: But, Greg, is the notion that this group wouldn't go on to try to - yeah, rework text and send reworked text back to the overall CCWG?

Greg Shatan: Well in this particular case I'm not sure how much text there is to work. I think we need to look at - we need to look back at the - at our report and decide what - and see what has been said in these three areas and decide how to rework them as well based both on the public comments and on everything else that's swirling around.

What you see in front of you is, by the way, the Zuck model for preparing an analysis of the public comments. So I think it is definitely, you know, within the remit of this group to have the primary discussion of what the CCWG should do, if anything, or different from what it has said about any of these three topics: diversity, staff accountability and SO AC accountability.

Kavouss. Kavouss, we can't hear you yet.

Jan Scholte: Greg, if I could just finish with this?



Greg Shatan: Oh yes, Jan, please go ahead.

((Crosstalk))

Jan Scholte: Oh no, it's just a general (unintelligible) that I'm sorry I missed the meeting in Los Angeles. I wasn't able to do that. But I did go to ICANN hub in Los Angeles last week after the meeting. And I also was in Washington the week before that and met with Larry Strickling and others. And my - the sense that I was getting was that there was more time for the - for these things to be worked out, for the proposal, the CCWG proposal to be worked out. So some of the urgency that one was hearing from the certain quarters of staff and board about it has to be done yesterday, that that was probably exaggerated.

But at the same time I did pick up real concerns that if progress on a number of these kinds of issues weren't quite specific and weren't quite specific and concrete fairly quickly that there was concern that the process would start to run into the ground. So I'm just - when I hear us talking about doing a review and working through the review and talking about what we're going to do with the review and then I'm thinking, okay, by Dublin is - are we going to be any further and is there going to be anything more to say. If we don't have a lot more to say by the time people come together in Dublin I'm just concerned ICG and others will start to lose patience.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Jan. I would say, as I said, we need to work on two tracks. We do need to have a process to analyze and take into account the public comments. That's unavoidable. And indeed it would be an abrogation of our duty and of the multi stakeholder model not to take the comments into account. So the method by which this group is taking those into account is by creating these analysis documents so that we have a handle on what is being said. And then

to bring them back to the working group with, you know, appropriate learning and suggestions from the greater community to the public comments.

The second track, which needs to be a parallel track, not a serial track, is the development of - and revision of the sections of the document or even, you know, creation of new sections of the document relating to each of these subjects.

So it's not mutually exclusive but the fact that we do have a nuts and bolts need to work through the public comments is in no way an indication that we're not going to make progress on the underlying substantive issues, it's a necessary tool in making progress on the substantive issues.

Kavouss.

Jan Scholte: Yeah, I take your points entirely, Greg, but I think if - I just think there's too much concern with process it might be the end of the process.

Greg Shatan: Well, the process is a process of substance which is that we have 94 groups that put a lot of time into making comments, which they believe we take into account very seriously. And if we don't have a process to take them into account they just won't get taken into account. If you have a way of getting them to taking into account without following a process I'm all ears. But I don't think there is one.

So it would have been nice to get on this call to discuss substance if the process had been done before this call. But we are where we are. And as such we need to let the public comments talk to us and this is the method - I'll stop using the word "process" - the method by which we have the community talking to us is through these analyses of the public comments.

Keith, I see your hand is up.

Keith Drazek: Hi, Greg. Thank you. Can you hear me?

Greg Shatan: Yes, Keith.

Keith Drazek: Hi, this is Keith. Yeah, thanks. So I - what I thought would be helpful is if we could just run through a quick review of one of these templates, one of these public comment summary templates that's been done at the other work parties just so folks who are getting ready to begin their work can just have a frame of reference. So would you like me to run through one that we did in Work Party 1?

Greg Shatan: Keith, we have one up on the screen so...

Keith Drazek: I'm not sure if you all can hear me. Let's - yeah, that's the one I sent to Bernie. All right so this is the way that I and James Gannon in work party public comment summary and analysis for the fundamental bylaws section so Section 4.

You can see the heading, Public Comment Period Number 2, Section 4, Fundamental Bylaws, inserted the page number. And just by choice we included the excerpt from the executive summary of the PC report with the language related to that section just so everybody has a frame of reference to understand what it is the comments we're responding to in brief.

And then the template, and this is what Greg was referring to earlier as the, you know, what Jonathan Zuck started because he was the first one to come up with, you know, to develop a summary analysis so he got to name it - was

first, areas of consensus. And this is where there was a summary around the public comments that were submitted where there was clear consensus.

In this instance there was consensus almost throughout for the power but then questions about the implementation of the power. And so you could see there it says a total of 17 comments relating to the fundamental bylaws were received, etcetera, etcetera.

The next heading is areas needing refinement. So if a commenter submitted a comment saying there needs to be more detail, there needs to be more work or I have a concern about something, you know, maybe I generally support it but it needs to be tightened up, this is the section where you highlight it. Okay. And we did one bullet for each one of the comments that sort of fall into that category.

Scrolling down further, areas of divergence. So this is where you make it clear that somebody did not agree with the proposal. And here as an example the ICANN board noted that it disagreed with the process of changing fundamental bylaws to the sole member model. You know, that's just an example. So areas of divergence, areas where there is a disagreement with the proposal that was put out.

And then finally the last section is options for CCWG consideration. This is where we, as the comment analyzers, you know, are trying to capture the various options in front of us to potentially deal with the public comments. Now - and that's the last section of the template.

And I would just reiterate that what Greg said earlier is that this process is not intended to be one that leads to, you know, sort of trying to sway or trying to nudge the discussion in one direction or another. It's simply meant to be a

factual, you know, data-driven representation of the public comments that each one of the work parties will then take back to the bigger CCWG for further discussion.

So I hope that helps and hope that helps everybody understand what we're trying to do. And the idea for coming up with a template was to try to just ensure that we had some consistency in our work. Thanks. Happy to answer any questions.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Keith. I would just add that in some of the other later prepared analyses in the last section options for CCWG consideration, some of us have been adding a subjective section with the comments of the working party or thoughts of the working party with regard to how to react to the options. Which was we put in italics just to set it off from the objective bullet points that at least helps to kind of jump start the conversation and to capture the discussions, which were quite lively actually, about the thoughts, about the options.

So kind of losing them at the end of the working party call was not a - did not seem to be a good option. So I suggest that as a - I call that the DelBianco corollary to the Zuck template since Steve was the first one who did that.

Kavouss, are you back online? Kavouss I think is asking a question in the chat which is, "Who are the communities that the SOs and ACs should be accountable to?" I believe that's the question. And then that's kind of a root - that's part of the overall question of SO AC accountability. And since that is - if we want to spend any time on this call discussing substance, and I take Jan's admonition as a concern that we not lose an opportunity to discuss substance if we can.

The - of the three topics that we're discussing, not to slight the other two, but I think given the challenges in front of the CCWG at the moment, SO and AC accountability is the one that needs to come to the forefront. There were recommendations that were made, I don't know if it's possible to get them up on the screen on Page 71 of the second draft there were specifically recommendations for Work Stream 1 to include review of SO AC accountability mechanisms into the structural reviews performed on a regular basis.

I would say such as the GNSO review that took place but the GNSO review seemed to ignore structure at least until the last minute but that's - I digress. These reviews should also include consideration on the mechanisms each SO AC has in place to be accountable to their respective constituencies, stakeholder groups, regional At Large organizations, etcetera.

And I would add also accountable to the community at large as well. Says this recommendation can be implemented through an amendment of Section 4 Article 4 of the ICANN bylaws which currently describes these reviews as - to be undertaken pursuant to criteria as the board shall direct to determine whether an SO AC organization has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure and if so whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness.

Work Stream 2 suggestions were to include SO AC accountability in ATRT reviews, to have a proposed - to consider a proposed mutual accountability roundtable, to have a working plan on enhancing SO AC accountability, and to assess whether the independent review process would be applicable to SO AC activities. Those were all Work Stream 2 proposals.

So I think the question in front of us is whether we want to, you know, pasting this into the chat is going to look awful because all of the formatting disappears. But I'll do it anyway.

I see Bernie says it's coming. So the question in front of us right now is given what's going on whether we - and how we want to revisit these recommendations whether any Work Stream 2 recommendations should be moved into Work Stream 1, whether any recommendations in Work Stream 1 should be changed, whether there are additional recommendations to be made right now, you know, at this point we would be discussing them without the benefit of the public comments except to the extent that any members here have already read the public comments on SO AC accountability.

Keith, is that a new hand or an old hand?

Keith Drazek: Sorry.

Greg Shatan: Kavouss, have you got audio yet? I see Kavouss typed into the chat - well first that each GAC representative is accountable to their government. And then a few other comments here that designates that GAC member. The GAC in total - how could the GAC in total be responsible to a particular government? I don't think that's the concept. I think accountability for each SO and AC probably works in subtly different ways. For instance, since the GNSO is broken down into stakeholder groups and constituencies it would work somewhat differently than the ccNSO which is not quite so differentiated.

So I guess one thing that occurs to me is that for purposes of creating a greater degree of comfort to those reading this report, which is not only the board, but others, that we could at least expand our discussion of SO AC accountability and perhaps touch more on how the SOs and ACs are currently accountable.

And I think they are in many ways at least de facto being the leader of or president of a constituency. I certainly feel every day that I need to be accountable both to my members and to the larger intellectual property community but also accountable to the multi stakeholder group that we work in since this is not a system that thrives solely on selfishness.

So that's - but we don't really have anything so much in our report that states that, no recommendations that go there. So I think we may want to at least expand on current accountability and move on from there in terms of how we might want to expand our recommendations as well. Jeff, I see your hand is up.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, can you guys hear me?

Greg Shatan: Yes, loud and clear.

Jeff Neuman: Cool. Yeah, I was just kind of writing a response to Kavouss's statement that, you know, the GAC can't be - accountability can't be implemented or examined. I don't think - we're not saying, as you said, that you have to be accountable to the other governments. I think what we're saying are things like the GAC should develop its positions in accordance with its own rules and processes that it establishes. And you can be held accountable. So in other words, something shouldn't be called a GAC position unless it's been achieved or accomplished through whatever the rules and procedure are.

There should be ways to make sure that that happens. So GAC declares a consensus then someone should be able to measure that and go back and say yeah, there were no governments that were objecting to it, you know, if that's the standard. So I think that's what we mean by accountability.



Same thing with the GNSO, the GNSO, you know, are the positions that are established by the GNSO in accordance with their rules and processes, are their rules and processes sufficient to gather that kind of consensus? I think those are the types of things we could talk about. And it's not about - and it doesn't implicate national sovereignty or anything like that.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Jeff. I see further in the discussion in the chat as Keith notes each group has its own challenges. Every group has unique structures and challenges. It seems we're being told now, after these groups have existed for upwards of 15 years in some cases that we need to develop accountability further because there are concerns that these groups are not adequately accountable or representative or at least that there isn't kind of evidence based or rules-based accountability baked into structures.

I think to some extent that's untrue but as said not adequately accountable. So the question - as Keith notes, some groups have GAC and Registry Stakeholder Group and to an extent the Registrar Stakeholder Group have finite memberships. Others have memberships that are much more potential memberships or constituencies that go far beyond the number of people in the group and there may be ways that more are represented in that group than are members but that's an analysis in each case.

So one thought I have, not to make work necessarily, is whether our third draft report - or maybe our final report if we're so lucky - should discuss current accountability for each of the SOs and ACs. And analyze them. It seems in a sense unfortunate to have to, you know, do that much of kind of a historical or present tense analysis. But it's something to consider.

So at least we can point to something that when somebody says the SOs and ACs are not sufficiently accountable we can point to at least a reasonable

analysis or discussion of how they are in fact accountable. So that would be a suggestion.

So a question is whether we should take any time in this particular call to discuss these matters or to release us from the rest of the time of this call so that the volunteers can analyze the SO AC - the three bundles of public comments. And I would encourage the rest of us, even if we are not one of the three volunteers, to at least glance at the three bundles of public comments so that you may have some familiarity also with what will be done or what will be discussed when we discuss these things.

Jan, I agree that introducing it now would introduce undue delay to conduct a review of existing accountability arrangements. I think it's a good suggestion for Work Stream 2, either that or for a long night at the bar with anybody who says that SO ACs are completely unaccountable arbitrary capricious organizations.

So I think that all in all what makes the most sense is to release all of the members here back into the wild for the comments and then for the next call we would expect to have written statements or written analyses along the Zuck DelBianco model distributed prior to the meeting. And then we would review each of them and listen to what the community is telling us as synthesized in each of the three comment analysis documents.

So any questions, any other business? Hearing and seeing no questions, seeing Jan...

Jeff Neuman: Greg, sorry, one more, just this is Jeff.

Greg Shatan: Jeff, please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: So when can I expect the comments that are the specific comments to look through?

Greg Shatan: You should have received a public comment tool, which is a massive spreadsheet that contains them all. Bernie, could I task you with distributing - resending to the WP3 list the public comment tool? And...

Jeff Neuman: So is that - it has a group as to which ones are...

Greg Shatan: Yes, it's an Excel workbook. There is a sheet in the workbook for each section of public comments. So you need to find the tab at the bottom which has - which will get you to the sheet which has all the public comments. They've been organized into three - excerpts have been organized into three columns basically support, neutral and issues. And then there are a bunch of columns off to the side trying to basically categorize the comments a little bit more by various - into various buckets.

I will say that what I found the most useful frankly was just to take the three columns - or the four columns and the name of the commenter and the three columns containing excerpts, copy them and put them into a separate document. I found actually a Word document easier to work with than Excel. I'm not a huge fan of using Excel for text since it's meant to be for numbers. I know it has certain advantages but whatever.

And then I, you know, basically that was my bible was the excerpted downloaded set of comments. I will caution that while, you know, an amazing job was done in creating the public comment tool, you may find it useful to go back to the original full comments especially if the excerpt doesn't quite seem to be hanging together because not everybody wrote their excerpts or wrote

their comments in ways that they were easily and discretely excerpted into subjects.

So those I think you can see that in some cases some comments were more challenging to slice and dice. So don't ignore the possibility, although given the amount of time we have, maybe difficult, don't ignore the possibility of going back to the original comments to see if anything besides the excerpt is relevant to this particular subject. But at the very least, you know, get the workbook, take those three columns and basically just start scoring them into these different sections.

Jeff Neuman: Cool. Okay thanks.

Greg Shatan: And I see Brenda has put into the chat the link for the PC2, the second set of public comments tool. So - and the original comments are in a - are also available in Bernie has put a link in there for both so you can access the original comments in all of their individual glory.

Any other questions on process from the volunteers? I see Jan has said that he's booked too solid to assist in the next 24 hours. But I suggest that anybody who's going to be on the next call should spend some time looking at the comments as well. And also re-familiarize yourself with the sections of the draft report that the comments are relating to. Both of those things will help us to have a more prepared call, help us be more of a hot bench so to speak as opposed to a passive audience for the analysis to be read to.

So the reference the three baskets Christopher was dividing comments or portions of comments into areas of consensus, areas of refinement or refinement and clarification and lastly areas of divergence. In each case as compared to our second draft report. So the first bucket is basically consensus

with our report and also secondarily consensus among the commenters; areas of divergence and refinement would be the areas where the various commenters - or sorry, areas of clarification and refinement, areas where suggestions and improvements could be gleaned from the public comments.

And last, areas of divergence are those where the commenters essentially disagreed with and did not support our second draft report in that relevant section. Kavouss. Not Kavouss, okay.

I could probably fill another hour with blather and nothingness but I think I've already done that well enough in this hour. So I will hereby call this meeting adjourned and send you off with Kavouss, what was your question? Oh...

Kavouss Arasteh: My question was that somebody said that, I'm sorry I missed his name, that yes we are going to establish rules and ways and means how the AC and SO would be accountable at all. Then my question was that if I take the GAC, GAC establish rules to be accountable but I would like to know be accountable to whom? To be accountable to its own or accountable to government? Accountable to all other SOs and AC?

So this was my question. And I think it was not answered. Still I have difficulty - the same thing apply for the others but I think the simplest one that they are more familiar with that even if establish rules to be accountable put every element so on and so forth then we don't know to whom we should be accountable. There should be accountability two parties, one party is GAC and what is the other party? Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. I think there were some answers in the chat from Keith Drazek and on the phone from Jeff Neuman with regard to that. Just to briefly summarize, I think was that the, you know, each GAC member is accountable to their

individual government. The GAC as a whole is accountable I think to the larger multi stakeholder community, at least for following its own processes but not in any larger fashion.

But clearly what we need to - the suggestion was that we should do an analysis at some point but I think it's a Work Stream 2 item of how each group is accountable and to whom and what their methodologies are but I don't think on this call we can do that right now.

So I suggest that we adjourn this call. We'll reconvene in about 20 hours for a discussion of the comments that we've received from our community or the world, and figure out where to go from there. So I thank you all. And look forward to our next call. Bye all.

END