
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Welcome to the beginning of all the [inaudible] exciting things we're going to do about the accountability of the Support Organizations and the Advisory Committees. Not aware of the numbers that are here today because of something in the Adobe Connect room [net]. My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and I am one of the rapporteurs for this group. I'm assuming that both Steve and Farzaneh are on the call, so I will ask them to briefly introduce themselves right now.

FARZANEH BADI: Hello, everyone. My name is Farzaneh Badi. I'm an NCUC member, and I'm the rapporteur for this group.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Steve, not hearing anybody. Steve may not be on the call as yet. What we'll be doing is a very quick round robin. I'm assuming that we will take the attendance from those in the Adobe Connect as listed. I will ask if anybody who is on audio only, if you're only on the phone bridge, try and let us know now so we can record you as present.

If you're only on the phone bridge, let us know now.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Hey, Cheryl. I tried to do this earlier but was muted. I represent the Commercial Stakeholders Group on the CCWG, and I'm with the Business Constituency and glad to be a co-rapporteur with you. Thank you.

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.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent, Steve. I did wonder why I wasn't hearing your dulcet tones. Let's not mute Steve. That isn't a good look.

I'm not hearing anyone else saying that they're on audio only, so we will take the attendance from the Adobe Connect room. We have a number of apologies, and we will be noting those apologies that have been sent either to the list or to myself and Steve and Farzaneh. We will make sure that if you've sent your apologies, it's recorded as such.

Now I'm finally in the Adobe Connect room. I can see that we've got about 25 people in the call. If I'm able to, I'd like to ask you all to now just take about 25 to 30 seconds to briefly introduce yourself, as Steve has just given you a good example. We'll start off perhaps alphabetically from the attendees list, which means if somebody who is identifiable with the phone number ending in 8999 could identify themselves, then we'll move on to Alan and Alejandra, etc. If you're the person with 8999 as your phone number, please.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: It's Adiel from ICANN [inaudible] program. I'm the Vice President on Technical Engagement at ICANN.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm Alan Greenberg. I'm affiliated with At-Large, and I'm Chair of the ALAC.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alejandra.

ALAN GREENBERG: He's written in the chat. His name is Alejandra Reynoso from the ccTLD, .gt, and member of the ccNSO council. He's listening only. Sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Alan, for acting as voice. Athina.

ATHINA FRAGKOULI: Yes. Hello, everyone. I am Athina Fragkouli. I'm the head of Legal Advice NCC, and I'm here as the ASO liaison to the CCWG. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Avri.

AVRI DORIA: I'm Avri Doria. I'm a member of the NCSG, and on the Cross-Community Working Group, I've been acting as the ATRT expert, I think it is, or basically institutional memory. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's more than just institutional memory, Avri. Thank you, and welcome. Berry?

ALAN GREENBERG: Berry also doesn't have his mic enabled. Oops. He says he's here to assist in ICANN GNSO policy staff and only observing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, and Alan, I think we can officially make you the voice.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will gladly give it up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, go for it. My voice is fading, as you can tell. I'm there, for whatever reason, twice. I'm not being greedy. It's just the bizarre nature of the technology that I'm using.

I'm Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I'm one of the members to the CCWG from the At-Large Advisory Committee. I hail from the Asia Pacific region. Let's move on to Christian.

Hearing nothing, let's move on to Elizabeth.

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess I'll be the voice again. It's Alan speaking. "Hello. I am on listen only. I'm Betsy Andrews, ICANN staff. I work in the Development and

Public Responsibility Department as a researcher, and I also manage the online learning platform called ICANN Learn.”

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Alan, for voicing for Betsy. Farzaneh, we heard from you briefly, but from whence do you hail within ICANN?

FARZANEH BADI: Cheryl, did you ask me a question?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. Just identify where you are from within ICANN.

FARZANEH BADI: I’m an NCUC and CSG member.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADI: [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Isaac, over to you.

ISAAC MAPOSA: I'm with At-Large, and I'm out of the [inaudible] program from AFRALO.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Isaac. For me, the audio was very faint. You might need to adjust your microphone to be a little bit closer.

ALAN GREENBERG: Isaac, we heard that you were speaking but couldn't hear what you were saying.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Isaac was saying that he was At-Large and from AFRALO, if I heard well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sebastien, acting as voice of Isaac. Jorge? It might be someone else not connected to audio. Juan? I can hear typing. If you're on audio only, just introduce yourself in chat. Kavouss, please introduce yourself briefly.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, [inaudible].

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Cheryl, maybe you can repeat to Kavouss what you asked too because he was [clearly] disconnected for long time. Repeat what we are doing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sebastien. Kavouss, just briefly introduce yourself, where you come from from ICANN.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I am from ICANN. I am from GAC, and I'm interested in this group. I'm [making for] 15 minutes connected, disconnected, connected, disconnected. It's very strange way of running the meetings for the first time. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Kavouss. I doubt it's the way we're running the meeting. The vagaries of the telecommunications system from the various countries we're in and how we are connecting to the Adobe Connect system I think is at fault there. Welcome, and I hope your system and connection is stable for the rest of the call. Mandy.

MANDY CARVER: I'm with Government Engagement, ICANN staff.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Fantastic.

MANDY CARVER: Observer.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm sure you're more than just observing. Sam.

SAMANTHA EISNER: Hi, Sam Eisner, Deputy General Counsel at ICANN. I've been active within the CCWG for the Work Stream 1 process and will continue to support the group during Work Stream 2.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Fantastic, Sam, and welcome. Sebastien, for your own voice this time.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. I'm At-Large, ALAC, EURALO, and member of the CCWG on accountability. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Can you hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can, Seun. Go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. Member of At-Large, affiliated to it now as well and a participant of the CCWG. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Steve, you kicked us off already, so let's jump you and move on to Tatiana.

TATIANA TROPINA: Hello, everyone. Tatiana Tropina from Germany and CSG, NCUC member.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Tijani.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: He writes before that he was not connected by audio, but Tijani is from At-Large, ALAC, and AFRALO and member of the CCWG on accountability. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, the voice of Sebastien. Tom Dale.

TOM DALE: Hi. Tom Dale from The Independent [inaudible]. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Is there anyone who has joined us now on audio only or who we've skipped out of the listing of participants who wants to introduce themselves?

KAREN MULBERRY: [inaudible] Cheryl, this is Karen Mulberry. I'm with ICANN staff.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Karen. Welcome. Of course, we would hardly be able to do this without you. Brenda, seeing as you are the one who makes all the magic happen behind the scenes here and you're at the top of my listing, anyway, would you like to briefly introduce yourself?

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, Cheryl. This is Brenda Brewer. You get lots of e-mails from me, so please open them. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Brenda's from ICANN staff, and she literally makes all the magic happen, along with Karen. Is there anyone who has missed out?

Great. Welcome, one and all. We're not a full complement of participants and observers in our group, but I think it's important that

you all get to at least hear each other's voice and from whence you come is identified.

What I will ask you to do is something that I failed to do, and I just started to speak [inaudible]. That is each time you take the microphone, if you can remember, introduce yourself. "My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr." Then continue on. If we are working with any of the transcripts or recordings from any of our calls, it does make it easier when people are going over this to have the reference for who is speaking. It does make life a lot easier.

Also, if you have difficulties or some issue with microphones or getting any sort of connectivity and technical details, those of you who are familiar will know this with the Adobe Connect room. It is possible to send a private chat by going into the participant list and selecting somebody. Brenda in particular will be the woman who will be able to assist you with a dial out or some sort of technical assistance during our call. Please, remember to make very good use of our chat space. We will collect the chat at the close of each of our meetings as part of our informal record. I admit that I for one get frustrated with my inability to type effectively without spelling mistakes, but we will copy and utilize the chat, as well.

If I can ask Brenda to load up the presentation that Farzaneh has put together to give us a very brief, five to ten minutes background on the topic that we are going to be looking at, which is of course the Advisory Committee and Support Organization accountability. We're going to hand the floor to Farzaneh. Over to you, my dear.

FARZANEH BADII:

Thank you, Cheryl. Hi, everyone. My name is Farzaneh Badii. I'm the co-rapporteur for this group. I put together a presentation, just to give you a background on what the accountability of SO/ACs [is about] and what we should discuss.

Can I go the next slide? Thanks.

In Work Stream 1, it was suggested to include the review of Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committee accountability into the independent periodical structural review. This was implemented in the new Bylaws in Section 4 of Article 4. If you go to the Bylaws, in the new Bylaws you can see that SOs and ACs are in fact subject to independent periodical reviews.

I think it's the next one. Next slide. Can I go to the next slide myself? [inaudible].

What are we expected to do? I have taken this up from the final supplemental proposal of the CCWG. One of the things that we have to do, we have to evaluate the proposed Mutual Accountability Roundtable. What we have to do is to see if it's viable, and if it's viable, how to implement it. The other is to develop a detailed working plan on enhancing SO and AC accountability, and the third is accept whether the independent review process would also be applicable.

Next slide. Thank you.

What is the Mutual Accountability Roundtable? This was suggested by one of our advisors to the CCWG on accountability. He suggested that to

have the most Mutual Accountability Roundtable in a way that every SO and AC and the Board is accountable to each other. It has both academic stand – and now we have the document that he came up with – it has both academic angle and also pragmatic angle.

This Mutual Accountability Roundtable meets at each ICANN meeting. It could possibly replace the public forum and consists of the Board, [CO] Supporting Organization Advisory Committee, and the Chairperson. Then a couple of other administrative things that [inaudible] suggested. But the main point is to discuss how to have this Mutual Accountability Roundtable and how to set the topics and how to use this as an accountability enhancing mechanism.

Can we go to the next slide?

This second task, as I said, is the working plan on enhancing the SO/AC accountability. We need to work on a working plan. What we have to do is consider the comments that were made during the public comment period on the third draft proposal. Then we should discuss it within our group and discuss the comments and come up with a working plan.

Can you go to the next slide? Thanks. This is the last slide.

Independent Review Process. We have to discuss whether the SOs and ACs should be subject to the Independent Review Process. The Independent Review Process is in our new Bylaws. If I'm not mistaken, it is in Section 3, and also the Section [4] 3C has some of the [claims] cannot be [dropped] against some of the issues that we have to look at when we are discussing whether SOs and ACs should be subject to Independent Review Process.

Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Farzaneh. If I can ask Steve to take the microphone now and take us through the background part where we are looking at our mandate. Steve, I believe you're going to be referring to some of the slides that you used in your five-minute rapid talk that we did in Helsinki. Over to you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Hey. Thank you, Cheryl. It's Steve DelBianco with the Commercial Stakeholders Group. For all of you who were present the day before the Helsinki meeting, we did a series of lightning talks on a number of the Work Stream 2 topics. I did one on the SO and AC accountability, the subject of our group, where I just presented a very few slides that I can recap for you now.

The first is that several of our stress tests, which were all done in annex 14, shined a light on this notion of accountability. We had a stress test on rogue voting, if you guys recall that. Alan Greenberg in particular, I think you coined the phrase rogue voting, where the representative to the empowered community might indicate a preference to support or oppose the exercise of community power without really having the full consent of their underlying AC and SO that they represent.

We also had stress tests that were suggested by the Commerce Department of the United States. Secretary Strickling was worried about internal capture. That would mean that a subset of members of an AC

or SO would find a way to capture the decisions made by that AC and SO for their interests, as opposed to the broader interest of the community that that AC or SO is supposed to represent.

Stress test 34 asked the question about whether new members from the global Internet community, if they tried to attempt to join an AC or SO, like the GNSO or the Business Constituency, would they encounter barriers to entry where it's difficult for them to get in, to obtain voting rights, and to really be able to represent their interests of a broader Internet community?

All of these were among the stress tests that took a look at it, and we came up on the next slide with two mechanisms to answer those stress tests. The two mechanisms was that any disenfranchised member of an AC and SO – that could be a new entrant trying to get in or an existing AC and SO member – could challenge a Board's decision if it followed the advice based on that move. [We have] reconsideration around and IRP. An IRP, Independent Review Process, looks at the ICANN Bylaws. The new ICANN Bylaws require an open, transparent, bottom-up multistakeholder process.

If, in fact, I tried to join the Business Constituency and there was a barrier for me getting in, and the Business Constituency took a vote that effected a GNSO policy, at that point, we'd have both reconsideration and the IRP as a way to challenge that. We use that to answer stress test 33 and 34.

Then I wanted to mention while I'm on this that the Mutual Accountability Roundtable that Farzaneh brought up a little bit earlier

and that we're going to talk about suggests that the roundtable would be a way to share best practices among all the different ACs and SOs, but it would not, for instance, solve problem number one on the slide in front of you because a Mutual Accountability Roundtable is mostly the ACs and SOs speaking to each other about how they handle accountability, whereas what I've identified here for number one is that there has to be a way for an aggrieved party to surface a concern. We think we need to give them mechanisms to do so, as opposed to counting on their leadership saying something in an accountability roundtable.

I only share this because I don't believe the accountability roundtable gives the ability to remedy problems, as much as it is about sharing best practices.

The second potential mechanism that we said could be done to solve stress test 34 was periodic reviews. As many of you know, the Bylaws already call for organization reviews of the ACs and SOs, other than the GAC. They're supposed to look at two important items: whether a change in structure or operations is desirable to improve the effectiveness of the AC and SO, and whether that council or leadership is really accountable to its constituency, stakeholder groups, and other organizations. Really, that is the core of what we are supposed to look at with AC and SO accountability.

I'll add my personal opinion that thus far, these organization reviews called for in the Bylaws have not been particularly effective at surfacing issues that generate actual change. I have not seen, from my perspective in the GNSO where I live, that we've come up with really

dramatic improvements to the accountability as a result of these organization reviews. But I realize they're a work in progress, and we can possibly do better if we continue to apply it.

Let me jump to the next slide please.

Work Stream 2 Bylaw that we discussed on the previous set of slides had these three elements. I think, Farzaneh, you already covered that, so we can jump to the next one. This was just my proposed approach, not by any means the default or how we would start. It's a lightning talk. I believe that an SO and an AC, as they do outreach within the target community, we should measure it by the effort that's expended and the measures that are taken to bring outreach in. You can't just measure outreach by the results.

I know from personal experience in the Business Constituency that despite the efforts and significant expense – it's almost a third of our budget, the dues that we raise from our members that's spend on outreach – we can't always come up with specific, concrete results from every continent, from every business community around the world. Sometimes there just aren't enough interested parties that want to engage within the Business Constituency, so I think that the effort ends up being what we have to look at, and not just by the results.

The second is that we are accountable to the stakeholders, those who show up, those who believe that it is worthwhile to participate and assert their views. If they put a lot of time into showing up and helping to create a position and assert their views, I don't believe it's anybody's business to second guess all of that by suggesting after they've made

the decision that there may have been members of the global Internet community who didn't participate in the decision and thereby try to invalidate or change the decision.

Finally, I think that the effectiveness – the word effectiveness shows up in our Bylaws. It's what the organizational reviews are supposed to look at. The effectiveness of serving the target community is more important than whether an AC or SO decision was made with the full participation of all conceivable stakeholders who, while they may have been aware of ICANN and its organizations, did not choose to participate.

That proposed approach, I tried to lay out. We're going to have to discuss things like this over the months ahead. Then I thought I would close, Cheryl, with an update on where we are in trying to synchronize the apparent collisions between ATRT3 and Work Stream 2, including our SO and AC accountability. I think you had that on agenda item four, so I can quickly put up a single letter in the Adobe chat. This was a letter that was drafted while we were all in Helsinki as a result of the time we spent late in the day Sunday discussing this apparent clash between ATRT3.

A lot of you understand that the Accountability and Transparency Review Team, or ATRT, is supposed to begin its third iteration in the next few months. When you look at the scope of the ATRT, there's a lot of overlap. Namely, six of the nine Work Stream 2 topics, including this one, are issues of accountability and transparency, which ATRT3 would also consider. The timing of these two is particularly troublesome if ATRT3 looks at many of the exact same issues and comes up with different recommendations. But even if they came up with the same

recommendations, it's an incredible duplication of effort from the community of volunteers that's already pretty well extended.

We considered a number of options late in the day on that Sunday in Helsinki. There's a list here on the bottom of this letter. The co-Chairs of CCWG and several of us have tried to work out where we came down on the preferred option. It's our belief that option three was the preferred option of synchronizing ATRT3 in Work Stream 2. Option three suggests that ATRT3 should be convened as soon as possible, but it be given a more limited scope of trying to assess how well the previous ATRT recommendations have been implemented. Then the Work Stream 2, where we are today, would handle the new recommendations for accountability and transparency in six of our nine Work Stream 2 projects. Then any time in the next five years when ATRT4 convenes, it would take over its full responsibilities of assessing all accountability and transparency topics and make recommendations.

One of the reasons for this split of duties is that the new Bylaws for Work Stream 2 give considerably more power for the community to force ICANN to implement recommendations in Work Stream 2 than we would have if the same recommendations surfaced in an ATRT3. This is our one shot to try to overcome resistance from ICANN Legal, the Board, or management if we come up with recommendations that are challenging for the corporation to accept.

Cheryl, that summarizes what I thought you had in mind for agenda item four. Turning it back over to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Steve. What I'd like to do now is briefly open the floor for anybody on this call who wants to make a comment or put a clarifying question to all of us now and the presenters. Basically limit yourself, however, to the groundwork, the presentations that have just been given, the founding principles and mandates that we are going to be working on, or any particular matter.

I want to compliment those of you who have been utilizing the chat, as well. There was some excellent discussion about the Mutual Accountability Roundtable going on in the chat. I think it's important that we recognize that these are the very earliest of our days together, and there is certainly nothing set or fixed. Our work is ahead of us to basically look at and design a set of recommendations that we can take back to the full CCWG about how we think the matter of who watches the watchers. In other words, the specifics of how we can be mutually satisfied in our Empowered Community in the new model that ICANN will be working in from now on. Who watches the watchers? How the Advisory Committees and the Support Organizations can understand each other's processes, and how the rank and file membership and interested parties operating within each of those sectors and parts of ICANN can ensure themselves that they have a predictable and transparent accountability framework to operate in.

Let's open the floor briefly. Either just make yourself known by jumping in on the audio or putting your hand up in the Adobe Connect room.

Go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. Good day to all. First of all, I think we should be very careful not to replace the public forum, which is perhaps fully open to everybody, with any other mechanism such as roundtable, no matter whether the member of roundtable is what you have said or whether it's more extended. Public forum is an environment that people lively and clearly explain themselves, raise the questions, comment, and sometimes constructively criticize the issue and so on, so forth. I don't think that we should replace this public forum by anything. Whether you have roundtable or not, I have no problem.

My second comment for you is that we are opening an issue of SO/AC accountability. No problem, but it should be opened in a way that we could close it at some times to have some results. More opening and opening [inaudible] and let us say [IDS] and without any results would not be beneficial, so those [cultures] should be very careful when they're opening the issue.

I see some of the elements that Steve DelBianco mentioned should be mentioned by effort, not by results. I cannot agree with that. We should always measure the things by results. We have results-based project. We have management results budget, but we don't have by effort. Who can measure the efforts to see that? I don't agree [with] the new elements that really waste the time. You open the discussion. People talk and talk and talk at the end, so on and so forth. We should avoid to put new elements like this based on the effort but not the results.

Some important, positive element I see in this discussion is when ATRT3 should start and how should it start. That is something very, very

positive. The remaining, we should be very careful, and I thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Kavouss. I would note that Matthew Shears in the chat, who has not got an audio connection at the moment, also raised the very similar point on the proposed approach where he asks, “How would the effort be measured?” I would now turn to Alan Greenberg. Alan, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The concept of measuring effort rather than results is interesting in that I think what Steve was saying is if you're going through the motions but you don't end up recruiting new people, that should count. I sympathize with that.

I think the real challenge that we are going to have and that the AC/SOs have is with those groups that have a huge potential constituency. At-Large has three or four billion users. Business Constituency has a near infinite number of businesses. Some groups like the GAC have a limited number of governments, so that one's easier to quantify. The others, I think the challenge is going to be recognizing success.

For At-Large, I don't believe it would be viable if we could contact and consult with three billion users or even a billion. That's a process which we just don't have the mechanism to handle. What we do need is to make sure that we have representative input to make sure we are covering the territory, not necessarily as a huge percentage of the

possible members. Recognizing success is going to be one of the challenges that we're facing as we go forward.

Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. I notice both Steve and Tatiana are having an excellent discussion in the chat, so if either of them would like to take the audio link and voice some of those opinions. Steve or Tatiana?

STEVE DELBIANCO: I'm willing to try to reiterate that if we could point to success and results about outreach achieving its intended goal, then that alone would be fine. But there are times when an AC and SO will not be able to achieve a significant degree of success at expanding its outreach, particularly if it's targeting a part of the world where there aren't very many willing participants who want to engage in the ICANN process. They're not showing up at ICANN meetings. They're not in working groups.

In those instances, before we judge the AC and SO as failing at outreach and accountability, we should take a second look at whether that AC and SO is expending effort to do the outreach. Is it trying to recruit members of its community from that particular target part of the world? If that effort is significant, then I don't feel it's justified to claim that that AC and SO has failed in its accountability. It is doing the best it can do to recruit from that part of the world, but even those efforts alone are not always enough.

That's where maybe an accountability roundtable where other ACs and SOs share their best practices where they may have had some success at recruiting active participants from that part of the world, then we can try new tactics. Results are the first look, but they shouldn't be the only thing we look at in assessing whether an AC and SO is delivering on its requirement to do outreach to the target community. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Steve. Before I go to Athina, I'm just going to take a moment to voice an opinion myself. Of course, we may need to look at a slightly more basic indicator, as well. That is whether or not each of the ACs and the SOs are operating within the ICANN construct. Not necessarily going through a specific outreach and engagement process, but whether or not they are demonstrably open and able to be approached and interacted with in a known, transparent and predictable way, and indeed what those methods of communication and interaction may be.

As you can see, we've got a few things ahead of us on our discussion. Let's go to Athina first, and then back to Kavouss. Over to you, Athina.

ATHINA FRAGKOULI:

Yes, thank you very much. The whole project is about ICANN's accountability. Of course, SOs and ACs have a role and several responsibilities within the ICANN structure. I believe we should be very careful of that because for example, the number policy discussions are not taking place within ICANN. They're taking place elsewhere, and ASO has a very specific role there. This role is to channel policy proposals that are made elsewhere.

Some of the accountability tools and measures we discussed might not be applicable in the ASO, for example. I would suggest that it might be appropriate to lead a little bit the scope of this SO/AC accountability in the role of each SO and AC within ICANN. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Athina. That's, again, taking us back to the skeleton that we need to start constructing for our work. We actually probably need to do a compare, contrast, and capture of what the key features of each of these component parts, these Board organizations and the Advisory Committees of ICANN are in terms of the mandate and mechanism of operation.

Kavouss, back to you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: [Now I'll] give one simple example to Steve, and then propose some alternatives. I think the example is a jobless person making tons of efforts here and there, days and days, nights and nights, and weeks and weeks, and find nothing. No job, nothing earned, nothing back home, and nothing to eat. How we could evaluate what he or she has done? I don't think that effort could be replaced with result. Perhaps we could retain the results, but putting some element including efforts made on certain circumstances and certain conditions that mention, for instance, by At-Large. Yes, there are four billion people. The efforts [do] something for them. They cannot contact them one by one, but still this activity should be counted. We have to have a mixture, not 50-50, but a mixture of them both: results and effort. But nothing that's based on

efforts and not the result. The result's an important issue. Without results, it is not counted at all.

Secondly, we cannot take At-Large as an example because this is not a good example. Governments are limited, 162, but each of those governments are representing, at least in many cases – I'm sure there is [inaudible] – millions of the people. See, those billions that Alan's counting is in the government. I don't think there's any people coming to the GAC representing its own view. Representing of government, and government usually representing the public. I don't think we could compare GAC with the At-Large. This is not a good example. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. Thank you, Kavouss. Let's go to Alan and then briefly back to Steve before we move on to our next agenda item.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I think Kavouss has said a fair amount of what I was going to say. I was going to say it a different way. I disagree with Athina, but I don't think she's going to be displeased with how I disagree because the ASO has achieved 100% penetration. They fully represent the whole group that they are meant to represent. Outreach to the sixth RIR doesn't make a lot of sense right now.

Each of the groups are different, and we're going to have to use different measures of success, whether it's success of the effort or success of the results. They're quite different, and how we measure it is going to have to be different to the extent we can measure it. For GAC,

for instance, yes, there is a finite number of governments. The question is, are we reaching the right parts of those governments? How are we even supposed to make that judgment call, assuming that judgment call is within our mandate?

There's some complex questions, but it's certainly not a one-size-fits-all issue. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. Steve and then briefly to you, Farzaneh.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. Steve DelBianco with the CSG. The ICANN Bylaws, when they do organizational reviews, look at the effectiveness of that particular AC and SO, but the word "effectiveness" isn't defined in the Bylaws. Instead, that's something that is figured out by the independent consultant that ICANN ends up hiring to do the actual organizational review.

We can do better than that. We can attempt, in this Work Stream 2 project, to suggest what effectiveness really means. The effectiveness of an AC and SO is something we should propose in our write-up. The effectiveness could be a function of the adequacy with which it represents the targeted group of global stakeholders that it was created to represent.

Kavouss, measuring results alone won't do it. I never suggested ignoring results. I said results alone aren't enough, that we look at results, but also look at effort. Since, Kavouss, you asked for an example, in the

Business Constituency, an example would be that 30% of our annual dues are targeted for outreach. That means translating our Business Constituency brochure into multiple languages and distributing it at ICANN meetings. It means underwriting trips around the world to IT conferences for the business community, where we present what ICANN does and what the BC does in an effort to recruit new participants in the BC and new participants for ICANN.

There are ways to measure that level of effort that's expended, but you never measure effort alone. We always look at results and effort. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Farzaneh, very briefly.

FARZANEH BADII: I just wanted to direct our attention to where we are discussing these things. When you're talking about effectiveness, are we talking about in the Mutual Accountability Roundtable, or are we actually at the – what we are talking about detailed plan on enhancing SO or AC, or are we talking about [RIC]? Because they have been at risk in some areas, while they have not been at risk in others. I think we should be able to be more systematic [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Farzaneh. The clock is running against us at the moment, so what I am going to propose we do – and I trust my two co-rapporteurs will go gracefully down this pathway with me – is that we post to our

list. We start using our mailing list to further the discussions and interactions on this very important, and as you can already see, possibly contentious in some places, accountability of Support Organization and Advisory Committee interactions on our list.

We will, at the moment, ask you to have in your calendars our weekly meetings, which are going to be on a call rotation time. We will publish our calendar of weekly meetings rotating through the times of 13:00 UTC, 19:00 UTC, and I believe it's 05:00 UTC, in that order. Our next meeting would be – I'm a day ahead of you all in Australia, so I believe it's the 11th of August at 19:00 UTC. It may be, once we start getting a little more record and writing and drafting done on these topics, that we might skip a meeting or two. But if you mark it in your calendars now, we can do a little bit of planning and make sure that people are, to the best extent possible, not double booked.

We will also ask that you start looking at what we have discussed today and formulating some of your opinion pieces for discussion and interaction on the list. I recognize that list traffic and discussions will be brought up and reviewed at our meetings, and most importantly, that at no meeting will any "decision" be made or assumed consensus be called for in a single meeting. We will always have a second and indeed possibly even a third reading and discussion before we deem agreement, or indeed measure and record the lack thereof on any particular measure, recognizing that we need to work synchronously and asynchronously to be fair to those who can make the calls, as well as those who cannot.

With that, at the top of the hour, I'm going to very briefly call, having skipped over agenda items both five and six. Note that they will be major agenda items for next week's call, and of course, for our online interaction in between now and then. Is there anyone with any other business?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I'm sorry. Yesterday in another meeting, IOT, I request our distinguished host if possible to have a master plan of schedules because many of us involved in many, many, many groups and sometimes we really miss to catch the actual time and actual day and so on, so forth because some of the meetings are published much in advance, [inaudible] September. Is it possible to have the distinguished host to provide a weekly or fortnight master plan of all meetings organized with the CCWG main, and plus any other subgroups and sub-subgroups? It would help us a lot. I thank you for that, if they can do that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Kavouss. Karen has already noted that the master calendar is posted on the wiki page already on the Work Stream 2 wiki. What we

might do is make an action item to send to our list the link to that page, just to make sure you have ease of access to that.

Ladies and gentleman, your time is valuable, and I, on behalf of Farzaneh and Steve, want to thank you for the time you spent with our kickoff meeting regarding the Support Organization and Advisory Committee accountability discussions that we're going to be having over the coming months. It is important work. "Who watches the watchers?" is a critical piece. It's a foundational piece of our accountability framework for ICANN in general. The primary interest to focus on our next meeting next week will be to discuss and evaluate one of the proposals. That is the Mutual Accountability Roundtable.

Thank you, one and all. I would very much like to thank staff for the note taking and the support they've given us, and look forward to hearing more from each and every one of you online, in chat, and at our next meeting.

Thank you, and bye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]