
LEON SANCHEZ: Welcome, everyone, to this CCWG on [inaudible] at ICANN's Accountability Work Stream 2 Meeting #4 on August the 30, 2016. I see some new names on the attendance, and as usual the roll call will be based on those attending the Adobe Connect room. And if there's anyone at this point that is only on audio, this would be the time for you to kindly speak up so we can add you to the roll call.

BECKY BURR: Hi, this is Becky Burr. I'm only on audio at the moment.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Becky. Noted. Anyone else that is not on the Adobe Connect room but is on the phone bridge?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, it is the same for Sebastien Bachollet. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Sebastien. Any one else?

Alright, I hear no one else on the line. So for those who are joining us as newcomers to the CCWG, there is the custom as per our charter to file a Statement of Interest. So we would definitely encourage you to file your Statement of Interest in the corresponding wiki page, and if you haven't done so you could of course approach anyone on staff and staff I know that will be happy to help you file your Statement of Interest. So kindly,

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.

if you haven't done so as I said, please be so kind to file your Statement of Interest.

So our call today will be reviewing of course different topics that have been sent into the agenda, and I note that Kavouss sent us some suggestions to be added, some points to be added to the agenda on this call and we will be taking care of those agenda items at the Any Other Business point of our agenda for the call today. And actually we have already been taking care of some of the suggestions provided by Kavouss, as we will be providing of course some updates on the subgroups and on the staff papers. So Kavouss, thank you for your suggestions and we will of course address the rest of your suggestions in the Any Other Business section.

So at this point I would like to turn to my co-Chair, Thomas, for the next agenda item.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. This is Thomas Rickert speaking, the GNSO appointed co-Chair, and we would now like to discuss ATRT a little bit. As you may recall, we have sent a letter to the Board a couple of weeks back and we have discussed this topic at the last ICANN meeting as well, i.e. the relationship between Work Stream 2 and ATRT 3.

Just for your information, we have been informed that the response from the Board to our group is in the making so we should be receiving something relatively soon. Nonetheless, we thought it would be a great idea to give this group an overview, a little bit more detailed overview,

of where ATRT 3 stands so that you all know what's happening there and to see where it fits or potentially overlaps with what we're doing. And Larisa Gurnick has kindly agreed to speak to this group.

Just for your information, your Leadership Team, including the rapporteurs for the subteams has been busy as before the previous call so we've met as a Leadership Team and prepared for this call and we all thought that it was a good idea to ask Larisa to speak to the CCWG plenary.

So without any further ado I'd like to hand over to Larisa. She will give a short presentation to this group, and afterwards we will give Avri Doria, our ATRT expert, the opportunity to add to that should she see the need for that. So thanks very much, Larisa, for volunteering to be with us today, and over to you.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. I am happy to provide a brief update on the status of ATRT 2 implementation, a very timely discussion as you have already been doing some thinking about ATRT 3. So what I plan to cover today is the status of ATRT 2 implementation work, touch on some areas that we've identified as potential overlap of ATRT 2 recommendations with the work of the CCWG Work Stream 2 is working on, and also touch briefly on some process improvements and lessons learned through the process of implementing ATRT 2 recommendations.

So as a means of a quick refresher, ATRT 2 issued their final report in 12 recommendations which contained over 50 components in December of

2013. In June of the following year, the Board approved all 12 recommendations as presented, and that kicked off the implementation of work which was done as a pilot with some project management discipline focus in mind. And we've been providing quarterly updates. Progress reports have been published since October 2014 and are available on the community wiki. So as we report out information today as of June 30, 2016, nearly all the milestones have been completed.

Drilling down into a bit more information here, you can see the 12 recommendations and the status of the ones that have been completed – you can see most of them, 10 out of 12 – have been completed as of June of this year. There's two recommendations in particular that are still ongoing and the expectation is that they will be wrapped up before the end of this year.

Looking at the 12 recommendations in terms of the various milestones that they comprised, here is a different view. And again, you can see that there's just several milestones left to be accomplished in Recommendations 9 and Recommendation 10. And this takes into consideration the overlap, and specifically two milestones have been marked completed because of the overlap with the CCWG Work Stream 1 work actually, and five milestones have been removed from this work plan due to ongoing work by Work Stream 2. For example, the work in the area of the Ombudsman in one of them but we'll dig down into that level of detail a little bit further.

And by the way, I should say at this point that at the end of this presentation you will see links to the place on the community wiki where executive summaries that provide much more detail for each one

of these recommendations and their various components. You will be able to find that information and the executive summaries also contain links to other work that will provide a much more full picture of what exactly was included in the implementation work than we have the time to address here.

So for Recommendation 9.1, the focus is on the proposed Bylaws to change that was recommended by ATRT 2 to impose a requirement on the ICANN Board to acknowledge advice arising from any of ICANN's Advisory Committees. So while there was proposed Bylaw text that was developed, it had been incorporated into the draft of the new ICANN Bylaws which have been approved by the Board in May of 2016. So that is an example of one of the items where there ended up being overlap between the implementation of ATRT 2 recommendations and the work of Work Stream 1.

Recommendation 9.2 was focused on the review of ICANN's existing accountability mechanisms through a community comprised group, and in specific, it was intended to look at the Independent Review Process and the Reconsideration Process. And that work, of course, is being addressed by your groups and the recommendations of ATRT 2 have been marked to reflect that that work continues as part of the Accountability Work Stream 2 effort.

Recommendation 9.3 asked for a review of the Office of the Ombudsman and to look into whether duties and scope of the Ombudsman should be expanded or changed in line with some suggestions of ATRT 2. The milestones or the project plans associated with this component of the recommendation have been removed from

the work plan to avoid duplication with the work that the Work Stream 2 effort and the Ombudsman is planning to undertake.

And finally, another example here is the review of the Anonymous Hotline. In accordance with ATRT 2 recommendation, an expert had been engaged and conducted and completed a review of the Anonymous Hotline and procedures. And this work was completed in January and the report and the recommendations of the independent organization that conducted the review is publicly available and posted as well as is linked here, and I believe that in prior meetings you've received some update on this from staff.

And of course it's our understanding that Work Stream 2 group on Transparency may be looking into the Anonymous Hotline policy and might be considering the independent report that was issued as well as doing some of its own analysis and investigation.

So that was just a quick overview of some of the immediately identified areas with potential overlap and we wanted to at least start the dialog by bringing those up to your attention. And I also wanted to speak to a couple of process improvements that have been noted by the community as well as by staff throughout the process of implementing ATRT 2 recommendations. One observation which was incorporated in the public comment from about a year ago on the process improvements having to do with reviews was to have representatives from the Review Teams continue to be involved even beyond the time that the final report is issued and be available to participate into the implementation planning to ensure that the intent and the expectations

of the Review Teams are clearly integrated and incorporated into the work of the implementation plan.

Another area that we've been looking at is the means of ensuring that recommendations are measurable and clear – smart if you will – specific, measurable, actionable relevant, and time based, to help the Board as well as the Implementation Teams focus on measurable and clear outcomes to make the implementation plans and efforts more focused and effective.

I'm so sorry about this. I hope you can still hear me. I may have gotten disconnected. Are you able to hear me?

THOMAS RICKERT: Yes, Larisa. No worries.

LARISA GURNICK: Excellent. Thank you so much. Alright.

In the process of thinking through the best roadmap for recommendation to move through Board approval and into implementation, we've given some thought to some questions that might be useful to help frame how to formulate a recommendation that could end up being specific and measurable where the outcomes could be clearly expressed. So what you see here is just some ideas about types of questions that might be useful on a go forward basis to consider as recommendations are being formulated.

And finally, of course, I wanted to touch on next steps. I really appreciated the opportunity to give this brief update on the progress and would certainly offer to provide a more in-depth briefing on any details of the ATRT 2 implementation with other relevant groups that might find that beneficial. As well as something that came up at Avri's suggestion from the discussion earlier today with the Leadership and the rapporteurs is integration of ATRT 2 implementation work into the work of the Work Stream 2 subgroups that you're all planning out right now how best to make sure that those dots are connected and that the implementation work and updates are clearly articulated and carried through into the Work Stream 2 subgroups. Would welcome the opportunity to continue more discussions about lessons learned from the community's perspective as well and incorporate any process improvements into future plans, particularly as we prepare for ATRT 3.

And finally, there's progress being made on the part of staff to develop measurements and Key Performance Indicators for various aspects of our work, and in particular as it relates to the strategic goal of promoting ethics transparency and accountability which is directly related and connected to the work of the Accountability and Transparency Review Team.

So with this, I will leave you with some information and links where you can get much more in-depth details on the implementation of the 12 recommendations, and as I suggested, you will find at this point the most latest update is as of June 30th. And the second set of links provides information on the more detailed pages pertaining to the Accountability and Transparency Review, ATRT 2 as well as ATRT 1.

Thank you very much. I appreciate very much the opportunity to speak with you, and I will hand this over to Avri at this point.

THOMAS RICKERT:

So thanks. Avri, the floor is yours to add to that if you'd like to.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay, thank you. I have very little to add. And thank you, Larisa, for the report and for going through that. I just basically wanted to mention how important I thought that second bullet was about making sure that as we go through the Work Stream 2 which is supposed to really tie up the work that we've been doing and finalize it, that it basically is mapped where it needs to be against the ATRT 1 and 2 work.

So at the moment I have – perhaps quite insanely – but I have made myself a participant in each of the groups, and kind of what I'm focusing on is their connection to the ATRT work. And as they develop their specific statements, their specific programs of work, just double checking against the ATRT 1 and 2 outcomes to make sure that we're connected, that we know what's been done before, and that can be the basis from where the work takes off as opposed to not necessarily knowing. But I very much appreciate this analysis and bringing out, and we've already seen in a couple places where more than one of the particular subgroups may be looking at the same part of an ATRT outcome but perhaps slightly from a different perspective. So trying to help us or keep that somewhat coordinated will be something that I'm spending a bunch of time over the next couple weeks in just making sure that that's known and understood. Thanks.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Avri. So let me now turn to the group. Are there any questions from you to Larisa or to Avri? At the moment I don't see any hands, so I think that all questions... Izumi, your hand is raised. The floor is yours. Izumi, you have lowered your hand in the meantime. Would you still like to speak?

AVRI DORIA: She did type in a question.

THOMAS RICKERT: "Thanks, Avri. Thanks, Larisa. Very helpful update on the [series] of overlap with ATRT and Work Stream 2. What are they?"

So, Larisa, if you'd like to respond to that.

LARISA GURNICK: Sure. So I will just refer back to slides 8 and 9 where we've identified some of the overlaps, and certainly there's possibilities that there would be others. But primarily the overlaps are in the area of Recommendation 9, 9.1, 9.2 – 9.2 having to do with accountability mechanisms, specifically the Independent Review and Reconsideration Processes. 9.3 which is the area of review of the Ombudsman. And 9.5 which deals with the review of the Anonymous Hotline. I would say that those would be the more prominent examples of the overlap. I hope that that answers your question.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Larisa. I trust that Izumi would follow up in the chat if there were more questions, but she thanks you for your answer so I think we're fine. There don't seem to be any further interventions from this group, which allows us to move to the next agenda item. But let me first thank Larisa and also Avri for taking care of this issue and paying so much attention to this and keeping us updated. As you know, Avri is constantly watching for ATRT dependencies and this is much appreciated.

With that, I'd like to hand over to Leon to chair the next section on the agenda.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Thomas. And our next agenda item is the update on travel support and budget status. And for that I would like to turn to Bernie. Bernie, could you please take the floor.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Leon. Hello everyone. This is going to be short. We're applying [versus] the travel request that we received for ICANN 57. So that's the update from the budget side. On the more practical side, just a reminder that the visa process is a complex one for going to India for almost everyone. Almost everyone will require a conference visa. It's very important that you only apply for a conference visa if you're coming to ICANN 57. You need to complete the online form and print it, and then you send the following to the Indian Embassy Mission to

obtain a conference visa, valid passport, visa application form, passport photo, ICANN invitation letter, local host letter, flight confirmation, hotel confirmation, additional particular form for visa services, and in India there's the application fee payment.

So it's not a simple process, and in our next slide we have deadlines and timelines. Local host letter, the [clearance] letter takes two working weeks to receive from India via e-mail. Visa processing takes two working weeks to receive, may vary per location. And the ICANN meeting 57 is of course 3 to 9 November, 2016. So the minimum expected processing time is four weeks. To be safe, we would recommend that you begin now if you intend on attending the meeting. Everything you need to know about this process, you don't need to go back to this presentation, the ICANN 57 website has an excellent section on this, the URL is there.

Thank you, Leon. That's all I have for this.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Bernie. And at this point I would like to open the floor for questions if there's anyone that has any questions on the process that Bernie has kindly explained to us.

And I think I've seen on some list a couple of questions already on the process. For example, the visa application asks for to provide the name of a contact in India, and in the link that is on the slide the ICANN Travel Constituency Team has provided us with all the information that we will be needing to provide in the visa application. So if you have any doubts

or questions, of course feel free to come back at us, but first have a look at this wiki page in which all the information is available.

So I see Bernie's hand is up. Bernie?

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Leon. Just a note. There's a special visa e-mail address that has been set up that's referenced on the website that deals with questions if you have them. If you go through the details, there is also an example form about how it needs to be filled out. So really, it's quite a comprehensive website. Please, if you're thinking of going, start early. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Bernie. Kavouss, I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. Good time to everyone. Just I raise a question in the chat two times and I want to know what is the end of the meeting, whether is 8 or is 9? If it is 9 in the slide should not be 9 in the morning for the number. The slide should be once the meeting is finished. So this is important for hotel reservations and for the flight confirmation by the number. Because if you count the second of November of the meeting day, the people should be there on 1st of November and they should leave at the end of the meeting normally unless somebody has other obligations. So this is important whether it is seven days or whether it is eight days. So please as my flight has been booked for 9 of November from in the

morning. So that means is there anything in the morning that I miss or not? So this should be clear. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Kavouss. I believe that the meeting is from the 3rd to the 9th of November, so the last day would be the 9th of November. Although usually the return plane tickets are reserved for any flight on the last day usually. But that's of course something that you could always go back to Constituency Travel and ask for guidance on the subject.

Are there any other questions on this subject? Sebastien Bachollet?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, thank you, Leon. Just two points. And the first one it's that we need to be sure that the day for the CCWG on Accountability is taking care into the travel because it's not yet the case and I am struggling with travel staff on that and I hope that it will be done for everybody member of this CCWG.

And the second point, we really need a clarification from staff – from my understanding but maybe I was wrong – the 9 it's not really a meeting day even if it's including in the meeting it's just for just into [inaudible]. But it's supposed to be for sitting the new bodies as the new ALAC people, the new GNSO Council people, and then that's mainly for, I will say, Leadership Team not for the whole ICANN. If this have changed, I am sorry about that. But we need to have clarification from

staff on all that because the question of Kavouss it's a good question.
Thank you very much.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Sebastien. I am not sure if staff is in a position to make a clarification on this question at this point since I believe that we don't have a final schedule for the meeting at this moment. So I would ask to kindly wait for staff to have this final schedule available and of course come back to us when that information is up to date.

So are there any other questions on this subject? Okay, I see no other questions. So Stan, is that an old hand? Thank you.

So our next agenda item is an update on the status of the remaining staff papers. And for that I would like to hand over the floor to Karen Mulberry. Karen?

KAREN MULBERRY:

Yes. Thank you very much, Leon. I hope everyone can hear me.

I just wanted to let you know where we stand with the staff papers. I was able to complete two of them last week so [the review] in the CEP has been posted for that subgroup on the wiki page, and I believe that our jurisdiction was posted as well. So we've got Staff Accountability, Transparency, SO and AC Accountability and Diversity, are ones that are being worked right now, and I hope to have those posted to those groups by the end of this week.

So is there any questions?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Karen. Are there any questions on these updates? We've received a couple of e-mails on some topics in which the subgroups are waiting to advance their work to have these staff papers available. However, I think that we would kindly encourage all of the subgroups to not wait for the posting of these draft papers and continue to advance the work. I am conscious that these draft staff papers are an important part for the work of each subgroup, but we must remember that there is just a reference for or to [feed] the work of each subgroup. So please continue to advance your work even if these papers are not available yet. And I will be of course waiting for staff to post the remainder draft papers in the coming days.

Are there any questions or comments on this topic? Okay, so I see no hands up.

And now I would go to the next agenda item which is the update on the status of the Work Stream 2 subgroups, and for that I believe that we have two speakers in line which are Sebastien Bachollet and Steve DelBianco. And I would like to hand over the floor to Steve DelBianco for SO/AC Accountability, and I believe that there are some slides that he has prepared for this meeting and I would kindly ask staff to please put the slides that Steve prepared on our screen. So Steve, you have the floor.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Leon. I doubt that the slides, at least on my screen, appear to have some characters that have been substituted in the posting. The

pdf that I sent to staff perhaps you need to reload that because it looks like it didn't come over correctly.

I'm joined by our two co-rapporteurs for the SO/AC Accountability group. That's Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Farzaneh Badii. We are all on the call as well as many others from our SO/AC group. It's a very active group. We've had four calls already. And we have a pretty extensive working draft for SO/AC Accountability. I'm not going to go through that on this call, but our draft document is in the chat. I've just posted it into the chat. It's already approaching 10 pages.

So Leon, we took your advice and we're not waiting for the completion of that staff paper. I shudder to think what more we'll need to add once the staff finishes its work.

What we're going to present today is a very brief update that feeds into an inquiry. It's a question from our SO/AC Work Stream 2 group to the broader plenary because we, frankly, could use some advice about the threshold question on accountability of an SO and AC to the broader Internet community. The co-Chairs asked me to quickly give a little overview.

The first slide that you see on the screen is the Work Stream 2 Bylaws charged us in this Work Stream 2 project actually to review and then to develop improved processes for the accountability, transparency, participation, that are helpful to prevent capture. The participation item really stems from Stress Test 34 where an SO and AC failed to actually be a welcoming place for members of the target community to want to join and participate. And then "helpful to prevent capture" came up

many times but probably most prominently in Stress Test 33 noted by Larry Strickling which raised the concern of whether an SOAC were captured by subgroups of its membership community that were able to steer decisions in a certain way.

So the Bylaws themselves keyed it up that way. So let me transition to just show you two of our accountability final report items that specifically reference this, because the first line said, “To the extent set forth In the CCWG final report.” So if you go to the second slide it was Recommendation 12 that was the first one to come up. Recommendation 12 said, “To include SO and AC accountability in the ATRT process, to evaluate Mutual Accountability Roundtable, and if it were viable, to recommend implementation action and to come up with a detailed plan on enhancing SO and AC accountability, and finally to assess whether the IRP would also be applicable to the activities within an SO and an AC.” So that’s Recommendation 12 where we keyed up all of Work Stream 2.

Now let me show you another recommendation that also came from our final report. It’s Recommendation 10. Recommendation 10 said that as part of our Work Stream 1, we needed to change the Bylaws to suggest that the review of an SO and AC accountability mechanism should be part of the independent structural reviews. I think that all of you are familiar with the periodic independent reviews required by the Board to conduct every five years, and they’re reviews of the ACs and SOs other than the GAC. For the GAC the Bylaws indicate that the GAC does its own internal review as opposed to an independent review driven by the Board. The point here is that the new Bylaws were changed to reflect that. That’s not part of our Work Stream 2 project,

but Work Stream 2 is where we have to focus on whether we need to go further.

So I point you to the fact that the Bylaws now reflect the independent reviews have to assess and determine whether an SO and AC is accountable to its constituency, stakeholder groups, organizations, and other stakeholders. That's i3; i2 which was already in the Bylaws said that the independent review looks at whether the SO and AC is effective in its operations. So now we have to add accountability. Now because that includes the phrase "its constituency, stakeholder groups, organizations, and other stakeholders" we are assuming that that's referring to the internal accountability of an AC or an SO to its members.

Now the present question that we have looks outside of present members. The question that we're putting in front of you tonight is – Should we in the SO and AC group try to increase the accountability of each of the SOs and ACs, not just to its internal members, but to the global community beyond its membership? This has been a topic we've covered on each of our four calls without necessarily drawing consensus on where we need to go with this.

For example, the ccNSO was created in the Bylaws, and the Bylaws indicated that the ccNSO's members are ccTLD managers who have agreed to be members. So the internal membership of the AC and SO called ccNSO are the ccTLD managers. That's unequivocal, right? But pursuant to the previous slide and the charter for Work Stream 2, should we seek to make the ccNSO, for example, more accountable to Internet users and domain registrants outside the ccNSO?

And before you answer that question, my final slide is just to indicate the present accountability mechanisms for a group like the ccNSO to global community members outside. Bernie Turcotte on staff helped me to identify these, but there were really four areas where there's already some accountability beyond the members of an SO and AC. The first is that some SOs but not all have to include liaisons from their stakeholder groups. I know you're familiar with that from the ccNSO and GNSO, but not all of them have the same kind of liaison structure.

Some of the SOs and ACs in their internal charters have to put out, gather, and consider public comments outside of their own membership before they arrive at a policy, and that's particularly true of the SOs.

The third is that our Board of Directors has to approve any SO or AC policy or decision that affects ICANN operations, and they have to do so in the global public interest as part of the charter of the Board.

And then finally, the ATRT is supposed to assess whether ICANN's decisions are embraced, supported, and accepted by the public and the Internet community. So I certainly think that that is the broader community. But that only occurs periodically when there's an ATRT. The other three – the first three items on this slide – probably occur within the standard flow of policy decisions and recommendations that are reached by an AC and SO.

So with that, I'd like to ask my co-rapporteurs Cheryl and Farzaneh whether you have anything to add to this and then we'd love to open up a queue to the plenary to gather your input on this threshold question

of whether we need to improve the accountability of an SO and AC beyond its members.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm happy that you've whet their appetite. I'm satisfied that we can just move on to discussion. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Farzaneh? Great. Back to you, Thomas. You're chairing this part of the meeting. We are happy to take advice and input from anybody here in the plenary. There are many members of our SO/AC Work Stream 2 Project Team also on the call. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Steve. And I see that Kavouss has his hand raised. So Kavouss, could you please take the floor?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Thank you, Steve, and thanks to the co-Chairs. We had a very heated discussions in the group. We still have some problems of some of the things intra-accountability, inter-accountability, and many other things. Are we not going in too much detail of this thing? Could it be done in a self-regulation process during the implementation? So many things that almost impossible to do. So to what extent we have to go into the details? This mutual accountability is something really not very helpful. It's good for Work Stream 1 to mention but not helpful, not implementable because you cannot make this mutual accountability.

You need another IRP. You need another forum. You need another court and so on so forth. Are we going really to this sort of detailed discussion? Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Kavouss. I believe that this is the kind of discussion that subgroup is actually having, but I'll go to Farzaneh so she can follow up on this. Farzaneh?

FARZANEH BADI: Hi. Just to respond to Kavouss. I repeatedly said this. We have a mandate and by the CCWG for a report, we have to look for issues in our working group, and one of them is Mutual Accountability Roundtable. However, at the moment in our group there are other critical questions that we need to focus on. But to answer Kavouss, this is not a decision that the group makes. We are mandated to look at MAR and decide whether we want it or not. And also the other issues. But the important questions that Steve raised in the presentation are the ones that need to be addressed and clarified so that we can move forward. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Farzaneh. So anyone else have any questions or comments on this? And I see that Steve has his hand raised. Steve?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Yes, only to say, Leon, that if members of the plenary on this call think it over and really try to put their own hat on within their own AC and SO and ask themselves whether their deliberations and decisions are made with the consciousness of the global Internet community and not just the members of the AC and SO, and if there are ways that you affect that in your procedures of your AC and SO. Please share that with our group, with any of the co-rapporteurs, and we'll distribute it to the group if you wish because we're anxious to make sure that we learned enough about each of the seven ACs and SOs and not try to reinvent the wheel here as we move ahead on this project.

I know that Avri's hand is up. I didn't mean to draw conclusions just yet, but I did want to let everyone know that you could give us your input after the call if it doesn't strike you during the call.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Steve. Next in the queue I have Avri. Avri?

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. I just wanted to address it a little and I am a member of the subgroup. And when we're looking at this notion of accountability of each SOAC to global community beyond its membership, I think when we all realize that none of our stakeholder groups contain all of the possible stakeholders of our type, that there is that certain obligation. Sometimes it's expressed in outreach, sometimes it's expressed in ways of including the comments that go beyond reaching out to other organizations within our larger stakeholder grouping to make sure that we're constantly pulling in, that bottom up doesn't mean just us at the

bottom, but it means reaching deeper constantly into the larger communities that we are the same type as.

So I do think that there is a positive answer on that, but I think it's very focused on the stakeholder group type. Thanks.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Avri. Next on the queue I have [Mathieu Weill].

[MATHIEU WEILL]: Thank you, Leon. I'm speaking more as a sitting SO appointed member than as a co-Chair at this point. And I think I can assume there is a lot of certainty that the answer to the question on the slide right here from the ccNSO would be that it's trying to redefine the basic community and accountability targets for the ccNSO is not what the ccNSO is expecting from this group as a chartering organization. And so if you move back to slide number 5, I think there is an expectation from the ccNSO that it's been a balance with the various mechanisms that are mentioned here, and I don't think there was any clarity or intent when proving our Recommendation 12 that this would be the focus of our discussion.

So unless we will get a clear signal from all chartering organizations that yes, this is something we should work on, as a member once again, I would not be comfortable going back to my community and saying, "Well, finally we are actually working on this." I think that would be very unfortunate for the group as a whole and so I would be much more comfortable if the SO/AC Accountability will focus on the other

dimensions as Avri was saying, on the mechanisms of [inaudible] be more accountable to the target group. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, [Mathieu]. I see that I have Kavouss and Sebastien on the queue but I'm not sure whether Sebastien or Kavouss was first, so I would now go to Kavouss and after that to Sebastien. Sebastien has lowered his hand, so Kavouss, could you please take the floor?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, I think we should not go in too much theory and too much detail. All of this is good, but in theory it's very, very difficult to implement, very, very difficult to discuss. We should limit it to the area that is possible to do something. I have no problem that we establish a work process, but my problem is that until the time that we don't know how to implement that, it is not very productive to go to that deeply of detail. We should see whether it is implementable or not implementable. So let's us not to go too much in theory. Let's us limit ourselves to something is possible and limit ourselves to something which will be self-regulated during the process.

You remember the views of the ICANN Board at the beginning about Work Stream 2 that this is something that will be done during the process after the transition, but the people insisted and we have this exercise so far so good. But this particular mutual accountability I have serious problem how to implement that. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Kavouss. And next in the queue I have Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Leon. And sorry, Kavouss, but we are starting the work here in Work Stream 2 and we need to do it. I think it's important to discuss this mutual accountability. We have developed a better accountability of the Board to the community. We have developed therefore better trust within the Board and the rest of the community. Now we need also to work that among the SO and AC who are the community. And that's important we discuss how we can do that. A roundtable is one solution. I see here with interesting presentation my advisor rapporteur that, for example, they talk about liaison. Maybe one way could be to enhance the capability or the duty of the liaison maybe to have a liaison mandatory to each and every SO and AC.

We are really just starting this work and we need to do it in depth, and I am sure we will find some good way to enhance mutual accountability in the future because it's really needed. I think we have three layers. We are talking about accountability for each group, accountability between each group, and accountability to the whole community. And if we are able to do that, it will be great. Thank you very much.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Sebastien. So I guess at this point what's clear to me is that the subgroup is asking the wider group for feedback. So

we've heard many points on the question raised by the subgroup and I would encourage this discussion to continue in the list so that as Sebastien suggested, the group could gather this feedback from the different persons in the CCWG and go back to the subgroup and of course come back to us with their findings or their proposal to address this question.

So are there any other comments at this point on this issue?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Leon, let me just thank the co-Chairs and everyone in the plenary for listening to and responding this way. It's helpful to hear that and we'll continue to monitor your suggestions on this external accountability. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Steve. Thank you, Cheryl and Farzaneh, for this presentation and of course for feeding [that up].

And next subgroup to present is the Ombudsman Subgroup, so for that I will hand over the floor to Sebastien Bachollet. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Leon. I will try to be short. We were asked to have a report and I thought that this subgroup can give you a short report. I will go quite quickly to the first slide that members and the participant and that's when we met and there's a few chair table but in just to keep one place. What is important is that we develop a first, first draft of a

document and all the items are listed in this document. If there are people in this group who would like to have more information or to have the link to the document itself, feel free to ask either staff or myself. But it's important that we try to put all the ideas or topics we have to.

I must admit that I have done this document prior to our preparatory call yesterday and I have to add everything about ATRT because it's not here and it was kind of discovered yesterday that we have to do some more work on that and I will include that in our work plan before our next call hopefully.

The other point, and it's also important for you to know that we have a liaison from our Ombuds Subgroup and we want to have with all the other groups to be sure that if something is raised in one subgroup about Ombudsman it's coming straight to us and the reverse, if we have questions to the other group it will go. I hope that it will be a good way to have the exchange between the subgroup from our Ombudsman perspective but for other perspectives also.

Some issue – we are working on also looking at the Stress Test to see if there is something linked with the Ombudsman activity. And ATRT even if it's not on this document yet, and as a subpoint it's coming from the CWG on Stewardship and what is the role of the Ombudsman on PTI. We would like to have some advice on how to go in for that topic because it seems that there is something written in the ICG but we are not sure that it's already translated in any Bylaws. And if so, is it our duty to make some proposal about the Bylaws on that topic or is it under somewhere else to be sure that coordination is well done.

And my last two slides are about the evaluation between the current ICANN Ombuds Office charter and operation against industry best practice. We have taken some document from the International Ombuds Association, but if you have other document ideas where to find industry good practice, please feel free to come to us. And for the moment, the evaluation will be done through these topics. Once again here, if you have some ideas they will be welcome. We will try to have a document ready for ICANN meeting, at least the first draft, ready for the Hyderabad meeting. I think it's important to have something done by some working group for Hyderabad. I hope it was clear and I am ready to answer a question or to take feedback. Thank you very much for your attention.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Sebastien, for this presentation. At this point I would like to open the floor for any questions or comments on the update provided by the Ombudsman Subgroup.

Okay, so I see no hands raised. No questions asked. So I believe that we have no more updates on the rest of the subgroups. If I am mistaken, please the rapporteurs of the corresponding subgroups do chime in to correct me. Okay, so we have no more updates on the subgroups.

And at this point I would like to turn the call back to my co-Chair, Thomas, for the next agenda item. Thomas?

THOMAS RICKERT:

We would now like to discuss the format for the meeting at the ICANN 57 meeting, the whole day meeting. And we had some discussion on this with the rapporteurs during the preparatory call yesterday. So what you see in front of you in the Adobe room is a sketch of the potential agenda for that meeting I'd like to show you through.

So we have the whole day, so you see the morning session and the afternoon session. In the morning we suggest to start with some general administration then a report from the PCST, so Bernie will give an update on the budget and cost situation of things. And then we would start with an update from subgroups and what you see here is that we have several sections including the word "sanity check" and "scope of deliverables." So the idea behind that is that we think we need to deviate a little bit and adjust to reality from what we had originally planned.

When we first thought about the Hyderabad meeting we thought that we would have interim results from the subteams to discuss with the CCWG plenary, or to be more specific, that we would receive reports and also discuss those with the broader community potentially.

What we see now is that subteams are at different stages. Some are in the process of scoping their work, others are still waiting for the staff papers and are eager to kick off their work. But even for those that have advanced and started working on the substantive results, we do not expect those results to be sufficiently matured to have a one day meeting that allows for the CCWG to discuss those interim results.

What we see, though, is that some subteams are trying to determine whether they are on the right path. The question that we get from Steve and his team this morning, I guess is a great example for that. Another example would be the Jurisdiction Subteam where we see that the group is still discussing whether the scope of what they're trying to do is correct. And since these subteams are not supposed to be working in isolation, we thought it would be a good idea to provide a forum for the subteams to present to the CCWG what these issues are, where they stand in terms of scoping, the level of detail that they want to put into their work, [followed] of an outcome that they're working on, and have the CCWG chime in on those aspects so that we can ensure that the scope of what the Work Stream 2 Subteams are working on is in line with the CCWG expectation and with the expectations that we raised with the community in our first report.

So that is basically the idea behind this. That's what we call the "sanity check." So we have two phases of updates from subteams and sanity checks of scope and deliverables. Again, this is just to ensure that we don't get a mismatch of what the subteams are working on and what actually our group has been expecting.

Then after the lunch break we would give the opportunity to subteams to put significant open issues stemming from the updates in the morning and the sanity checks in the morning to the CCWG plenary. And the idea behind this is we were toying with the idea of having face-to-face subteam meetings during the Hyderabad session but as you can imagine it is virtually not possible for ICANN to support 10 subteams with staff support, tech support, and facilities for remote participation. And at the same time it would be physically impossible for all those that

have subscribed to [inaudible] subteams to be in those meetings in parallel, which is why the Leadership Team yesterday came to the conclusion that it would be a good idea not to have face-to-face subteam meetings where only the subteams meet, but to allow for the whole CCWG to witness discussions on topics that are relevant for individual subteam work.

So we are planning to keep the team together in Hyderabad. Again, to put it in a nutshell, have the scoping and sanity check exercise in the morning and based on the results of that and potentially based on additional questions that the rapporteurs have brought forward, we would then have substantive subteam topic discussions in two sessions in the afternoon.

So I hope that this is a clear enough outline of what we suggest to do in Hyderabad, and I see that Kavouss's hand is up so Kavouss, would you please take the floor?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Sorry, it was an old hand. Thank you.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Kavouss. There are no other hands, so I would much appreciate if we could get a signal of whether you like this format or whether you have other suggestions to make. The Leadership Team does not want to dump this on you, but we thought we would come up with this proposal and then solicit some feedback from all of you. But I

see Alan is kindly checking green. That's pretty appreciated. And Sebastien's hand is up, so Sebastien please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes. Thank you very much, Thomas. I think it's a good proposal and we need to put some meat on that each subgroup need to work to prepare that. My question is more outside of this day what will be the interaction of the full group or the subgroup with the rest of the community as we have the chance to be in the face-to-face meeting in Hyderabad with a lot of participants maybe there are some group who could have some face-to-face meeting, not the subgroup but with the community who could be interested in the work. I know that it's a little bit early because we are not too much advanced in our working group, but it could be good to plan, I don't know, one or two topic of our 10 groups. Thank you very much.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thank you very much, Sebastien. Let's hear Steve first and then let's try to find an answer to your question.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

I wanted to support what Sebastien said, because when he and I reported out tonight and raised some of our significant open issues for a sanity check, the replies that we got were not as expansive as we expected. So I think that what we need to do is to tee up our sanity check questions, our significant open issues, in advance of our get-together so that people have an opportunity to think and respond. I

realize that even that won't necessarily get it done. It takes an ongoing dialogue and not all of you can follow every single one of the Work Stream 2 projects.

So I support the idea of trying to surface just the critical items that have significant question about them for which the broader group is needed. Because if we waited until first reading in front of a plenary, we could have already wasted an awful lot of time heading down a road that would bring a lot of objections from the broader plenary. So I think you have the good plan, let's just focus hard on the part one and part two. Thank you.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks very much, Steve. Avri's hand is up. Avri please.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. In looking at this plan – and I do believe that Steve is right and that we should have put out reports before we do the update sanity at the meeting – but I think that there's a difference between the immediate comments that someone gets and the comment that you get two, three hours later after the breaks and the conversations and breaks and the groups among people, and the lunch.

So while I think it's important that we, as you say, tee it up before we get there I do think that the opportunity and the way this is divided gives us the ability to introduce the topics, maybe get a little bit of conversations going in those morning sanity checks, but then using almost that parking lot type of construct that says, "Okay, we've seen

that there are three extra issues on it,” and then those are the ones that basically go directed into the afternoon.

So I actually do like the way this is setting up and really gives us three chances to introduce the topics, to introduce them a little bit more deeply with discussion, and then to dig into the [knotty] details. Thanks.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks very much, Avri. Just a little follow up question before we move to Kavouss. You as well as Steve and Sebastien [of course] were asking for more community interaction. Do you think that this format would be interesting for the community to attend? Would you particularly advertise that this is sort of the [paper] approach should come and witness discussions and chime in on certain questions that Work Stream 2 phase provides?

AVRI DORIA:

If you're asking me, I do. I don't expect that any of the community or any appreciable number of the community would have necessarily read all the pre-materials though some might have. And so I do think that for those that want to invest the day either online or on location to actually get into a panorama of what's going on in the morning and an in-depth in the afternoon on specific issues, I think it could be valuable. But I'm an addict so what do I know?

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks very much, Avri. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, Thomas. I think the face-to-face meeting is very expensive meetings. The budget for that you really need to compensate what we do. I think we should have very well preparations. We should not touch everything a little bit and get nothing at the end. We should focus ourselves on something which really are the key issues.

Sebastien talk about key issues. So what are the key issues? What are the key points? So these need to be clarified before and we need to concentrate on something and continue having some [introduc] discussion but not taking a little bit of something and then leave it as it is and we come back and re-discuss it again. So it is very, very, important to well preparing that meeting. Otherwise, it will be waste of money and waste of time. Thank you.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks very much, Kavouss. And I think no one will question your statement that we need to make the best out of everyone's time. Careful preparation is key, and I think if you like the format in general which I hear all of you do, then we should launch a call for proposals to all the subteams on questions that they would like to raise so that we can maybe put out some supporting material up for everyone's read well before the meeting so that at least we have maybe one, two, or three, the same questions that we need to discuss anyway, and then we will add to that issues that are identified during the morning sessions. But I think no one would disagree with your statement that we need to prepare well and that we should make the best out of everyone's time.

Any further comments on this? There don't seem to be any further hands raised, but I think that it's great that we now have a plan for approaching Hyderabad and as Kavouss stated, I guess the target is that we would close the day in Hyderabad with some concrete results and response to concrete questions that we have discussed amongst ourselves and where we have given the community the opportunity to chime in.

So that's excellent. We now come to AOB, and Kavouss, you wanted to raise a point under AOB so if you would kindly speak to that the floor would be yours.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, as I told in a message sent to you and others, each group of the nine need to prepare a progress report at the appropriate time and send it for the consideration of the entire CCWG. I think it's very important we know where we are. It is important also that the group listen to everybody. It is not fair that we [by cut] somebody even if he has some logical question. I raised many, many, question for this mutual accountability. None of them have been replied. I request Avri, I request Steve, and I request Jordan, to read those questions. If they answer half of that, I fully agree to continue to discuss mutual accountability.

[Sir], mutual accountability, it is not implementable. It's theory and theory, waste of time. [It's assessed] [Inaudible] Steve, he wants to implement that, he push for that in the second group, in the second stream, or Work Stream 2, it is not possible. It is waste of time. Let us listen to everybody. Thank you.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Kavouss. So your request is on the record now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thomas? I don't want to leave Kavouss's characterization of one of the co-Chairs pushing any particular predesignated or prefabricated outcomes onto the working group at this early age unanswered. I would like to assure the plenary that it is disappointing if Kavouss thinks that is the case, but as far as I can tell the co-Chairs are making a extreme effort to ensure that we are not predetermining or pushing any one view for or against any one thing. We do have a mandate to look at the particular aspect of accountability that Kavouss is particularly concerned about. And the group will do that. We are not prioritizing it. We discussed it early on and we will come back to discuss it again. But to characterize it as being a predetermination pushed by any one of our co-Chairs is simply one man's opinion. Thank you.

THOMAS RICKERTS: Thanks very much, Cheryl. Let's just pause for a second whether there are any further wishes to speak. That doesn't seem to be the case. And that allows us to close this call and announce the next meeting which is going to be on 13th of September at 13 UTC. Let me close by thanking everyone for their attendance. It's been an interesting and fruitful call. So please do continue the work, and subteams, if you feel like, we would like to encourage you to contribute even more. So I think it would be great to see even more traffic on those lists, and we're looking

forward to reading you on the list and hearing you at subteam meetings. Thanks, everyone, and bye for today.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, everybody. Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks, everyone. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]