

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. You've beat me to it, I should say. Can we get the recordings going? That was fantastic. Thank you very much.

My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and I'm one of the co-rapporteurs on this Design Team, which is focusing on the Support Organization and Advisory Committee accountability work. We're having our call at 19:00 on the 11<sup>th</sup> of August, unless you're me, which then it's 05:00 hours on the 12<sup>th</sup> because I'm a day [inaudible] in Australia.

If I could remind you all, the basic administration includes muting of your microphones whilst you are not speaking. It also includes trying to remember to introduce yourself when you take the microphone, and of course, all the usual rules of courtesy and timekeeping will apply.

We have a fairly discussive agenda. Today's agenda is very much designed for you to interact and talk with each other and come up with what we hope will be the basic of an opinion piece on one very key part of our work, and that is the concept of the Mutual Accountability Roundtable.

To that end, if you are on the Adobe Connect room, if you use your raising of your hand, which is a little icon you'll find variously around, usually on the left side or the top of your screen, unless you're on a phone, where then it's sometimes on the right-hand side of the screen, if you are just on audio only, if you have only phoned in, could you let us know now?

Not hearing anybody, we'll check on that again later. If that's the case – John, are you just on audio?

---

*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.*

---

JOHN CURRAN: No, I'm on both.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You're on both. Terrific. I saw your microphone ping and I thought you might just be on the phone. Right. Okay, so that means we can manage our queue from the Adobe Connect room.

I'm going to start off by letting you know we will take our roll call from the listing of attendees at the Adobe Connect room. We've established no one is on the phone only, so nobody needs to be picked up from there.

For our attendants, I am unaware of any apologies, but they can be sent to the list. If they come in the next few hours, we'll add those as formal apologies.

Speaking of apologies, here's one from me and Steve and Farzaneh. We have interacted and developed our agenda with each other on our e-mail. We have copied in the MSSI staff, assuming that that would be the best way for them to be up-to-date with what we're doing today and to send it out to the list.

That was the wrong this for us to do. It won't happen in the future. We will be sending our agenda out directly. So I apologize. If you can imagine me down on bended knee – it won't be a pretty picture – but please feel free to imagine that. So, so terribly sorry that the agenda did not go out in a timely manner to the list, even though we developed it in a timely manner. We had our wires crossed with the administrivia part of it all.

---

With that, that's all call admin and roll call over and done with. To some extent, it's also part of the welcome, but I would like to see if either Steve or Farzaneh would like to make any opening remarks.

Steve, anything from you? He may not be coming off mute. Farzaneh?

FARZANEH BADI: Hi, everyone. No, I don't have any remarks. Just a minor [inaudible] from NCUC and NCSG and one of the co-rapporteurs for this group. Thanks.

CHERYL LANDGON-ORR: Thanks. Fantastic. We're going to put you to work very, very shortly when we get to Item 4.

Steve, have you managed your unmute at the moment?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah, Cheryl. Sorry about that. I was still laughing about you apologizing on one knee. But, no, nothing further to add to that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANDGON-ORR: Thank you. I thought at least some of you who know me well would appreciate that image.

Okay. All right. Let's take a brief moment – and I do mean a brief moment – to just review our last call. As far as I know, we had no specific action items that raised out of that call, other than to start

---

interacting on the list and to start thinking about where we are in terms of our mandate and our required work.

Without ticking off a list of action items, which obviously we will start to develop as we go through these calls, I'd like to open it briefly by just reminding you that, at the last call – and anyone who wasn't able to call the call, I trust you've been able to review the transcripts and recording – we looked at the basics of where we were out of Work Stream 1 in terms of Support Organization and Advisory Committee accountability. We established that we all understood the baseline of what was going to be our body of work.

We also established that, whilst we felt it wasn't necessary a highly complex task, there was going to be, to some extent, work we can do sooner and work that will take a little longer. So we probably find ourselves in a situation where we will be trying to report – in other words, have some of our work established and agreed in consensus by us go through to the CCWG, come out of the CCWG with whatever final iteration happens there, and hopefully seek some public comment by both Copenhagen and the following later-point meeting. So we will discuss that again a little bit later, time permitting, when we look at our next steps.

One thing that has happened since our last call, however, is that we had, I believe, with the exception of perhaps only one of the Work Stream 2 DTs, an initial meeting. Some of you who will have attended other meetings – I have a lot of noise coming from someone's line. Please try to remember to mute if you're not speaking. You may want to raise anything that occurred to you that is germane to our work here for

---

accountability that you have picked up from the beginning meetings of the other drafting teams. In particular you'll note we will be talking about dependencies with other DTs later in the call.

Well, that's as much preamble as I want to deal with. Is there anything that anyone would like to either raise now as a likely piece of Any Other Business at the end of the call or any suggestion of change to the agenda if you have some urgent matter that you want brought forward – shifting a number of agenda items around, etc.? Now is the time to do it. Or, of course, any comments on our brief review of our very minimal work to date.

I'm not seeing anybody's hand come up, and no loud intervening noises coming over the audio line. With that, I am going to suggest that the only business arising from last week's call to get us onto this week's is in fact the next agenda item, which is the discussion and evaluation of the Mutual Accountability Roundtable idea.

I am delighted to not only hand over to Farzaneh so I can have a sip of my very sweet black coffee – and there is a reason for that, not just the time again – but also to welcome Willie Currie, who is the author of this concept from our Work Stream 1 work, and who many of you who were active in Work Stream 1 will remember was one of our valued advisors.

With that, let's pull up the presentation. I'm going to hand it over to Farzaneh. Farzaneh, over to you.

---

FARZANEH BADI: Hi. Thank you, Cheryl. I have made this presentation just to facilitate the discussion on the idea of the Mutual Accountability Roundtable, which was put forward really when he was the CCWG Accountability Advisor. We invited Willie to attend our session to provide us with a rationale of why we need the Mutual Accountability Roundtable. Then we will go into the discussion.

Willie, is it possible for you to take the mic now?

WILLIE CURRIE: Sure, Farzaneh. Hello, everyone. Can you hear me?

FARZANEH BADI: Yes. Thanks.

WILLIE CURRIE: Okay. Well, I just want to make a few opening remarks on the issue of mutual accountability. Work Stream 1 really was focused on a formal structure of accountability within ICANN, what I would call on one hand vertical accountability, those instruments by which the members of the Board account, and secondly what I'd call horizontal accountability, in which various mechanisms are in place to review decisions. These were properly the focus of Work Stream 1.

I think what I was thinking with mutual accountability and the idea of a Mutual Accountability Roundtable was really that there's an informal structure of accountability that could be developed, and that is one in which the structures of ICANN, and in particular here, the SOs and ACs,

---

hold each other to account through the mechanism of an annual Mutual Accountability Roundtable.

My sense was there were a lot of issues related to trust and the culture of ICANN as an organization in Work Stream 1, which could not really be addressed because the primary focus was on the formal and very important mechanisms of accountability. So in a sense, the idea of mutual accountability is one which could be developed as a way of what you do when it's not a matter of a last resort. How do you create a space within ICANN where minimally the SOs and ACs can meet together with a limited agenda focusing on how they account to teach other? That was just the idea.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] populate?

FARZANEH BADII: Yeah. Okay. Thank you very much. Okay. Great. Are there any questions or any comments on the remarks Willie just made? Okay, Kavouss? Oh, yes, Kavouss. Can we unmute Kavouss?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Kavouss, Cheryl here. We see your comment in the chat. Would you like to take the microphone? There you are. We can hear you now.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: [inaudible] with a summary of conclusions for each of the roundtables. I don't want to talk and talk and talk. I have attended many, many

---

roundtables during the last many years. It was just to say your views, demonstrations, and formalities. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII: Thank you, Kavouss. As I said in the comments, we actually have that question right at the end of the presentation which I'm going to make, which is going to be brief. We will discuss exactly the question that addresses your comment. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Farzaneh, is it okay for me to speak? It's Steve.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just go ahead, Steve. Someone needs to mute, as they're dealing in their kitchen, I believe. Farzaneh may have lost audio. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you very much, Cheryl. In the chat, I posted a statement from the Work Stream 2 Bylaws that we approved as part of the CCWG proposal. In the Bylaws, this group here is trying to tackle the charter of evaluating the Mutual Accountability Roundtable. To do that evaluation, we want to understand completely what it could be descriptively, and then what it should be normatively and to react.

To Rinalia's point, when Willie was describing it in an e-mail earlier in the CCWG process, there was a suggestion that maybe it could replace the public forum. But that by no means was the prescription, and it's not what the Bylaws require us to do. Let's just be open-minded about



---

what a Mutual Accountability Roundtable would accomplish, who the audience would be, and what the procedures might be.

But before we head down [inaudible], let's understand to whom the SOs and ACs are accountable in this Mutual Accountability Roundtable because, really, in the previous call, we tried to make it clear that each SO and AC was accountable to the global Internet stakeholders that that SO and AC was created for. So the Commercial Stakeholders Group has this accountability to the businesses; not registrars and registries, but businesses who register and use Internet domain resources. The ALAC is the At-Large, end user, and registrant community.

So each of those communities, then, wants to hold the underlying AC and SO accountable to it, and that's what we're thinking when we started setting up our framework for this SO and AC accountability.

So I would ask you, if you look at mutual accountability, is that a matter of putting the leaders of the SOs and ACs in a circle to hold each other accountable, or does it extend from the leaders of an SO and AC to be underlying members outside the circle so that their actions are accountable to that stakeholder group?

I'll stop there, Willie, and give you a chance to expand. And everybody should settle down on replacing the forum. That was merely something Willie put in when he was discussing, generally speaking, what and where it might fit into the ICANN meeting structure. That's not what we're here to talk about yet. Okay?

Go ahead, Willie.

---

WILLIE CURRIE:

Thanks, Steve. That's certainly the case. That idea was a hypothetical regarding the public forum.

But on your question, I would assume that the underlying members or stakeholders in any one SO or AC structure have already a system of holding that structure to account, and that's what the roundtable would do: provide the leadership of each structure to engage with the others on a level which is informal, not necessarily in the same way as the membership would hold the Board to account.

Matthew has raised the point of: "Well, would calling one another to account cause reluctance to attend?" I think a lot of attention would have to go into how you create a safe space where people do feel comfortable about raising issues, and perhaps even on a fairly narrow agenda to start with, so that it doesn't descend into a space where people flame and attack each other.

Just on Steve's point, it's not necessarily the kind of SO/AC accountability back to the global Internet community. That is a much more complex question.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Cheryl, before we move onto the next speaker, could I quickly respond to Willie?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Certainly, Steve. Then what I'll do is take the queue after you. Go ahead.

---

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Okay. Thank you. Willie, it's Steve DelBianco. And SO and AC is accountable to its underlying target community through a function today of these organizational reviews that every several years will examine how effective the AC and SO structure is at representing its underlying community.

We discussed in detail the fact that those reviews – well, I guess they haven't been very effective, right? We don't know [inaudible] means. It's not defined. It's up to the community to work that out, and we haven't done a good job about that. And we need to work harder on that internal SO and AC effectiveness at representing and being accountable to its external community.

Turning back to your particular internal view, I'm going to paste into the chat what you and Jan Scholte proposed a little while ago with respect to the way this accountability would work. I've just pasted that into the chat. This is the words that you used. Notice I'm not focusing on when and where this would occur because it's not supposed to replace the public forum. That's why we're not going to talk about that.

But I thought it was intriguing that the way you were envisioning this roundtable was that the leaders of the ACs and SOs, along with what you showed here with the Board and the CEO of ICANN, would take a single issue and then have I guess a best practices discussion about how they, in their constituency, tackle the issues. What they discovered was successful and not successful at being able to bring the underlying community in, understand the issue, and come up with a proposed response.

---

I think we should position it as, by sharing best practices learned, there's an opportunity for the ALAC, for instance, to learn from the mistakes I made in the Commercial Stakeholders Group, or vice versa, or a chance for the ccNSO to learn about a best practice that really works well in the GNSO.

So I put that on the table. Those are the words that you used several months ago when you circulated that – almost two years ago, actually when that was first circulated. Is that still what we're talking about? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I'm going to run this queue and then we're going to get back to the PowerPoint because we want to perhaps seed even more discussion and interaction. I know what's coming up on this PowerPoint presentation. I'm sure you're all keen to get through it. I know I am.

Now, Kavouss, first of all, is that a new hand or an old hand?

ALAN GREENBERG: It came up after mine, so it must be a new hand.

CHERYL LANDGON-ORR: Okay. In that case, we have Alan, and then Greg, and then Kavouss. Alan, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I put my hand up originally when Willie had said that the ACs and SOs are responsible to their community. He assumed

---

that there was already a given. I don't think that is a given. I disagree with Steve also. I don't think the organizational reviews really do a good a job of doing that at this point or do a job at all, an in fact –

STEVE DELBIANCO: Oh, gosh. That's what I said, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: May I continue? Thank you. In fact, the CCWG suggested that we add that as a responsibility for the organizational reviews because I don't think they even consider that in some of the cases.

So I think we need to do a level set among the whole group as to just where we are right now. Certainly one of the problems that was discussed last week or at the last meeting is that, in some cases, the community we are responsible to is such a small subset of the overall community that it's not clear that we can really say we represent X, or even represent the interests of X. So I think we have a fair amount of work to do.

In terms of the overall suggestion, I don't think it's at odds at all with the fact that we are accountable to our own communities. I think there has to be a level of mutual respect and belief that the other groups are representing their communities if we're going to work together effectively.

So I like the original concept. I'm not quite sure of the implementation. Thank you.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. Indeed, if we would assure about that at this early stage, we wouldn't be reporting in Hyderabad and wrapping this up very, very quickly.

Greg, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: [inaudible] Let's do that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not hearing you, Greg. Can you check that you're not muted?

GREG SHATAN: Sorry. I was muted by the unseen hand, not myself, for being obstreperous. In any case, this concerns me on a number of levels. First, I think – this has already been said by Alan – Willie essentially assumed away a large part of what I think this group was put together to deal with, which is accountability of SOs and ACs to their community, both those who are active and members and those who are not active but essentially represented by or free riding on or both those who are active.

To assume that any, let alone all, of the SOs and ACs have solved the accountability would be to assume entirely too much. It's like assuming that we've now achieved personal space travel. It's just not happening.

There's all kinds of informal accountability, and there's rough and ready accountability. People get elected or not elected. People get held to account in the ways that organic groups hold each other to account. But

---

are there structures or methods or anything like that? Not that I'm aware of.

If that's not our job, then I think that calls into question a large part of what this group was brought together in my mind to do.

The idea that SOs and ACs are accountable to each other? I guess in a community sense there is mutual accountability because we're all part of a larger community. To my mind, accountability is one side of a coin, and the other side of that coin is oversight. To my mind, creating a kind of "everyone is looking everybody else's shoulder" system of formalizing that sounds like a prison, where you've got a certain amount of the prisoners assigned to be trustees to see who else is screwing up. It sounds to me like a very difficult situation, even though it was described as a safe space.

Sharing best practices might be a safe place. I've seen that Chairs of organizations are already getting together and talking about what they're doing, and that's certainly a space and group that should be better structured. I'm not sure whether it's an accountability issue. We have to think about what accountability is. Is sharing best practices – I'm not sure that's even really within our remit. It's a good idea. I think discussions have actually started in some other places on something along those lines, but I don't see why that's our job.

So I think we need to think about the shape of the table, so to speak, which is: what are we here for, and what is this trying to accomplish, and what would it be like to live under such a regime? Thank you.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Greg. Any psychology student basically at their 101 level knows how some of those incarceration experiments worked out, so perhaps we don't want to go too far down that track. Or maybe we do. Who knows?

Kavouss, over to you, and then we're getting back to our presentation, and hopefully –

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. First of all, either we talk about mutual accountability that means each community is mutually accountable to other communities. This is one issue. The other issue is that a community is that SOs or ACs in accountability of community. They are two different. As far as the mutual accountability of communities with respect to each other, I have no difficulty. You have roundtables or [inaudible] you have some sort of discussions and after that some conclusions to make it clear any shortcomings or any difficulty to address the issue of mutual accountability. This is [inaudible].

With respect to the accountability of each SO and AC with respect to their community, it's very difficult. I don't know if [inaudible] is accountable to all communities composing or consisting of GAC. The representative in the GAC can be responsible and accountable to our government. We are not accountable to any other government. This is a specific situation in the GAC that should be addressed, and I have raised this at the CCWG several times.

So the idea may be good, but the implementation has serious difficulties [inaudible]. I don't know why we need such additional processes or



---

additional steps. However, once again, mutual accountability between all communities or SOs and ACs, I have no problem if you have criteria, if you have the implementation. Accountability we discussed with community I don't think that you can establish that. I don't think that ALAC has established any accountability with respect to the four million from which the ALAC is composed. It is very difficult. We should be very careful, and we should not have any additional implementations [inaudible] any problems.

The last thing: I'm firmly opposed that Chairs of SOs and ACs getting together and talking and completing [inaudible]. They are not representative of the entire [inaudible] of authority have not been given to them because it depends on the subject. If police have [inaudible] they have to do something, you have to discuss it with GAC and we have to have by consensus. I believe that the Chair of the GAC represent us in any such roundtable. This is a very difficult implementation. It's absolutely impractical.

Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Kavouss. As we can tell, we are looking forward – and I am certainly looking forward – to a [hail] and hearty discourse on not only our review and discussion on the Mutual Accountability Roundtable concept, but on a number of things to do with the accountability rationale that was a recommendation out of Work Stream 1.

---

To set the stage a little further on this, I'm going to take it back to Farzaneh and continue on with our PowerPoint. Over to you, please. Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADI:

Thank you, Cheryl. These slides are based on really the recommendation, and I have drafted a couple of questions just for discussion.

The recommended format is that the roundtable meets once a year. It's a roundtable and comprises of the Board, the CEO, and all Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, who are represented by their Chairperson. A Chairperson will be designated by their roundtable. So and ACs will be represented by their chairpersons.

The other thing is the roundtable topics, which stipulates that each roundtable may pick one or two key topics to [examine]. Then each participant could give an account of how his or her constituency has addressed, indicating what worked and didn't work. Then this could be followed by a discussion on how to improve matters of performance.

One of the questions is: is the mutual accountability roundtable a viable option? Which we can discuss, and then we can go over on the format and other topics and discuss the Mutual Accountability Roundtable as a whole.

I would like to put forward this question: is it a viable option?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Farzaneh.

---

FARZANEH BADI: [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Greg, I was going to ask: is Kavouss's hand up? I believe it isn't an old hand. This is a new hand. Kavouss, over to you. I assume you will be responding to the question that Farzaneh has posted to this group at the end of this presentation, and that is specifically is: is a mutual accountability roundtable a viable option? While you're speaking, I'm looking forward to having other hands come up so we can hear a variety of opinions.

Over to you, Kavouss. Not hearing you. You may still be muted. Okay, well, assuming everyone can still hear me, whilst Kavouss looks at working with staff perhaps to solve the audio problem, let's pose that question to everybody. Is the Mutual Accountability Roundtable a viable option?

If you put something into the chat, please do feel free to also put onto the audio record. It does make it easier for people when they are reviewing it.

Just looking at some of the things in chat, I see John has just made a statement in chat. Could I encourage you to take the microphone, John, and speak to your point? John, followed by Steve, and then I think I saw Alan's hand briefly. Put your hands up while John's ahead.

We can. We can hear you fine. Go ahead.

---

JOHN CURRAN:

Okay. I think you can hear me. As I put in the chat, the Mutual Accountability Roundtable could be a wonderful thing. It's hard to [determine] whether that's the case and the specifics about how it should be set up, until we say what it is we're trying to solve with the Mutual Accountability Roundtable. Depending on what that problem statement is, the specifics would be very different.

If it's to improve best practices of accountability in the ICANN SOs and ACs, you'd set it up differently than if it was to be an organization that accredits that all the SOs and ACs are serving accountable to, which would be different again than if the problem it's trying to solve is a roundtable, which was set up to allow the SOs and ACs [present] their progress and accountability.

So I'm not adverse to it, but before we try to work out specifics, it might be nice to have a [inaudible] somewhere [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much, John. Wise words as ever from you. Let's go to Alan, and then Steve, and then if it's Kavouss's hand still up, we'll go to him.

Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. The question of viability really comes down to partly what John was saying of: what are we trying to achieve and what problem are we trying to solve? When I look at, say, bringing together all the Chairs of the ACs and SOs, it doesn't necessarily cover, as Greg was implying or

---

Steve was implying, the specifics of the Business or the Intellectual Property Constituency. If you bring all of the Chairs of the subgroups into it, it now becomes a group of 45 people. So that becomes impractical in a different sense.

If it's just the seven ACs and SOs, other than things that are directly related to the kind of discussion we've been having of accountability of the Board, in many cases there's few common ties between all of them. The interests are very diverse. There are subsets that gather together to discuss particular things. But I'm not sure how crucial or important or relevant a discussion among all of them is about accountability-type issues because they come in such different flavors.

Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. Moving now to Steve and then hopefully Kavouss will have his audio issues solved. Steve, over to you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Hey. Thanks, Cheryl. From Slide 3, it corresponds with what Willie circulated two years ago. It strikes me that he positioned a goal for this mutual accountability roundtable, but he did not state that it was solving a particular problem. So it's just as relevant to evaluate an idea upon its stated goal as it is to evaluate an idea by starting with what problem you're solving.

So the goal is simply stated on Slide 3. It's to improve performance of the SOs and ACs by giving an account of how the constituency address

---

the issue, indicating what worked and did not work. That's on Slide 3, and it's the same thing Willie put in an e-mail two years ago.

So I would ask for us to be a little bit generous and not require the definition of a problem statement but suggest that our goal is to improve SO and AC accountability – I don't think there's any doubt about that; the Bylaws even require us to do that – and that the immediate discussion is on evaluating Mutual Accountability Roundtables as a potential tactic that would improve performance by sharing discussions of what worked and didn't work. I'm quoting Willie on that.

With that, it's worthy to continue the discussion, but I personally cannot evaluate whether it would improve performance without having a better understanding of what might come up. In other words, it's almost as if it's something we ought to try before we're asked to buy. Thanks, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Steve. I'm going to try for Kavouss now, but I see Greg has raised his hand, and I may move to you, Greg, if Kavouss's microphone is still not working for us. Kavouss?

Kavouss, we're still not hearing you. Go ahead, Kavouss. I see your microphone seems to be active [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

---

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Hello. Excuse me. Are you calling me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Kavouss, we can hear you. Your hand is up. Did you want to say something about –

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead. Go ahead then, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Until we know the usefulness of this roundtable, I am not in agreement to put it in a formal way. Getting seven people or seven heads of the SOs/ACs together and discussing something without having any delegation of authority I don't think is useful. They can get together. They can have their coffee. They can have their tea. They can discuss anything they want, from politics to commerce and so and so forth. That is not useful.

The idea was not properly mentioned, and I request, distinguished colleagues, to not insist on the ideas of two years ago. We need to see what is the purpose, what is the usefulness, and what is the output and how it's composed and how we implement the output. This is very, very important.

---

I don't think that we have to create another step here. This is totally unnecessary. We are not yet convinced that this is necessary unless we know the results. We have all steps, and that is almost sufficient.

But nothing prevents the people to get together and to have coffee and tea and discuss whatever they wish, and then they come to the meeting and express their views to their communities, and it up to the communities to say yes or no. But we don't want that the head of the SOs/ACs decide anything on behalf of the people in the name of the roundtable. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Your points are noted, Kavouss. Thank you very much. Going to Greg now.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. I think this is way ahead of where we are and should be. Putting aside the question of SO/AC accountability to their members and to other members of their SO, who may not be part of their constituency stakeholder groups, for those that are split up that way, which is I think still a huge part of the discussion here, even if we talked about the concept here, we haven't established in any way that there is such a thing as mutual accountability or what it means and how it might work and how that accountability from one SO or AC to another or one SO or AC to the community of all SOs and ACs or to the global Internet community or to any other community. That's completely blank to me.

This is like building your garage for a vehicle you haven't seen yet. You don't know if it's a racecar or a tank or a plane. So I think, from a design



---

point of view, we actually do need more than a problem statement. We don't even know what the problem is yet, much less what solutions there might be and whether this is in any way related to either the problem or the solution.

I think that this might be a very interesting thing to discuss, or completely irrelevant. But there's a whole set of discussions about accountability conceptually and practically within the ICANN community that really need to be discussed before we know whether this is at all meaningful.

Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Greg. I can't imagine a better segue to our next agenda item, actually, which of course is our discussion on our work plan and where we should go.

Ladies and gentleman, I want to remind you all that, of course, this is simply the very, very beginning of our conversation, and this is a topic to get us started. It is a topic we need to deal with, and that is to look at, discuss, and to evaluate whether or not, indeed, the concept of such thing as a Mutual Accountability Roundtable would be of any use in our construction, which is a much larger construction, of looking at Advisory Committees and Support Organization accountability.

Now, amongst the chat that I was reading during the call, I've seen a tendency to say, "This concept of a Mutual Accountability Roundtable may or may not be the thing, but we don't know what it is that needs to be actually done yet." What we need to do is to take a step earlier on in

---

the process and to either fairly formally or fairly informally start to identify what each of us believes would be resulting in an externally viewed and internally trusted construction or framework, whereby the component parts of ICANN, the ACs and the SOs, could deem themselves running in an accountable fashion. Notice I didn't say to whom they were accountable. That's a conversation you need to have as well.

With that fairly broad wrapping up of where I think we are in our conversations, I'm going to ask that we actually put on hold the answering of the question on I think Slide 5, where Farzaneh asks, "Do we or do we not think a Mutual Accountability Roundtable is an answer?" because it seems to have a reasonable amount of support that we need to spend far more time framing the question.

However, I will remind you that we have to come to answer that question, as it is articulated in part of our job description. So we will have to come back on it.

Now, as much as I enjoy all the metaphors that have been shared today, what we are looking at is almost a green field. I'm going to put my metaphor in. Don't necessarily come to these conversations with a firm accept-or-reject of a particular model. Let's do some lateral thinking. If you think you've got a concept, share it with us. Let's make sure we respect all the concepts put forward, test them, and run them through some hypotheticals. Some will make the end cut to go to the CCWG as a suggested framework or proposal. Some will not, and that's okay. That is what a bottom-up development of something should look like.

---

Being mindful of the time, this takes us very much into next steps. Now, I'm going to ask staff to make sure they captured the chat, which I'm sure they always will do, but particularly I thought there's been so much good information on today's chat. I don't want to lengthen our meeting by reading it all to the record, but I do think we should make sure we capture that chat and that we share it as part of our meeting outcomes to the list.

I'm also going to suggest to you that, as part of our work plan, we look to being able to perhaps be able to report back in, shall we say, two if not three weeks to the CCWG some sort of progression on the identification of what we mean by AC and SO accountability. So what I'm looking for is perhaps the generation of a document that is going to be able to be edited by all of you.

I'm happy to make sure that anything that goes to purely e-mail list traffic is also copied to a wiki copy. I don't think it matters if you want to use a Google doc or any other form or framework. Let's decide what sort of share editing process you'd like to operate with, and then just get on with the job. If it means that we have to use one or two them to suit everybody, that's okay. But we will have the wiki as the ultimate repository of our outcome.

To that end, I'd like to make sure that each and every one of the members – the active member participants, but I also welcome any of the observers who want to get into this and make a considerable and significant contribution to the structure that we're going to hopefully be coming up with – and by "structural," I should probably use the word "framework" as a proposed set of concepts to give the CCWG to

---

consider. It would be nice if we could say we we're at at least an early if not highly progressed stage of our drafting in the next two to three weeks. So a lot of online interaction, as robust and as rewarding as today's call will be is going to be something I'm sure that all of us will be calling for.

I also want to reassure people – and we'll put this up on our wiki space – that one of the mechanisms of operations that this DT should be running under is one that's now well-established in a number of PDP or non-PDP work groups throughout ICANN, and that is the very good practice – and I like good and best practices, by the way – that says we never decide any one thing at any one meeting. We always have any notes taken, any outcomes developed, and any supposed consensus or objectives agreed to captured. Then they are copied to the list, so people who were not at any particular call have a good opportunity to have their interaction and commentary, if indeed any comes. And then at one of our future meetings, there will always be a second and possibly third – and I don't mind if it even goes more than three – meetings on anything.

If we speak to that as a general rule, it should mean that it's okay to change your mind. It's okay to be influenced by other people, and it's okay to come up with new concepts. You don't have to pack everything into our 60-minute calls.

Ladies and gentlemen, can I ask: does anybody object to us getting started with concept work? If one of you wants to do a white paper on something, that's okay, too. Start putting things to the list and capturing

---

them as well onto a shared space on the wiki. You can let us know on the list what other sorts of tools you might be interesting in using.

If I don't see any objections, I'm going to assume that that's a good way forward.

Kavouss, you're objecting to mutual development of commentary and concept and the use of mailing lists. Is that correct? Go ahead, Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Hello?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, we can hear you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Okay. Thank you very much. You have not taken any position that's very good. I think the best way would be, at least if possible, that a short document be produced, taking into account the subject and comments made in the chat. We need to know the purpose, composition, output, and the status of this. We have to clearly mention the two issues: the mutual accountability with respect to each community to each other and accountability of a community with respect to the composing countries or issues of those because these are the two different issues and we have to really have [at that point].

Then, after that, we try to make comments on that and have something. The idea is not sufficiently mature. It may be good, but we need to have

---

an idea as to whether it has some merit to do that. We don't want to add other steps without any output. So we need to have output.

Once again, I strongly oppose that the chairs of any constituency or any

–

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Kavouss, thank you. Before you step off your soapbox, I want to thank you for being absolutely supportive of the proposed way forward of us working on a structural document or framework. We will get started on that and hopefully have at least a progress report to give back to the CCWG in the next 21 days. So that means getting onto that fairly shortly. The rapporteurs will undertake to make sure that some of the materials we have observed here today are appropriately captured and put as just thought pieces, if nothing else, onto a wiki page and copied to our list.

But please, if you have some suggestions, if you have some thoughts, put them to the list. Make sure you have edit rights to the wiki. If you don't, staff will be able to assist you with that. That's the MSSSI staff who will be able to assist you with that. Let's get this ball rolling.

Well, that's enough metaphors for the day from me. I believe that today we have started I think in a very firm footing. One thing if I could prevail upon Willie, having listened to our discussions today on the Mutual Accountability Roundtable concept, I wonder if there's anything you might want to put together or contribute to help us, perhaps even on a purely hypothetical scenario system, understand more accurately and completely what it was that you envisaged, or indeed your vision of

---

what our mutual accountability roundtable format, as captured on Slide 3, may in fact mean now, recognizing that this is a concept that we do need to review and discuss. But it may be, Willie, if you have the time, we would very much value some additional input from you, and I'll ask Farzaneh and Steve and I to work directly with you on that in the next week or so as well.

We will be meeting next week. If memory serves, that will be and 05:00 UTC call. So we are sharing the pain, ladies and gentlemen. We are rotating through the three available call times. I want to thank each and every one of you today for what I think is a great beginning of discussion because this all has to come from you. We work out what we can mutually agree on, and then we have to get it out to the CCWG, where it will be pulled apart and revised anyway. So this isn't an end game. It's a beginning.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you, staff, for your support. Please make sure we capture the chat. If you have been joining us at a particularly unfriendly time, I, as an Australian in the Antipodes, which is always an unfriendly time for ICANN calls, do empathize with you, but hopefully the next call at 05:00 UTC will be able to suit at least some of you.

Thank you. Call ended. Bye for now.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**