

---

FARZANEH BADII: Hi, everyone, and welcome to our third meeting on the SO and AC Accountability. Unfortunately Cheryl cannot, I don't think she can make it today, but I'm going to go through with you and Steve and I are going to go through and – yes, Cheryl is joining – and so we are going to go through the agenda items and have a discussion.

So in our second meeting we had a lively discussion about the Mutual Accountability Roundtable and we compiled those comments and made a Google Doc and also a pdf which we shared with you on our mailing list. Those comments also include what we should focus on and Steve's presentation and a couple of other points.

There were a couple of things that were raised in the last call which you can see them in the agenda item. I'm going to ask, Steve, are you there?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes, Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADII: Yes. Okay, great. So if you want to add anything, and then we can just go through the problem statement like agenda #4.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Sure, Farzaneh. As we promised on our last call, rapporteurs put our heads together to try to summarize the work of our first two phone calls, and that included the work of the discussion we began in Helsinki on the Sunday meeting. And that document was what we circulated a

---

*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.*

---

couple of days ago. The first four pages try to summarize what was charged to us in Recommendation 12, Recommendation 9, and remembering as well that the Bylaws themselves reflected that, but so did Recommendation 10.

So it was surprising to me that three of the CCWG recommendation specifically looked at SOAC Accountability. It wasn't just in the Work Stream 2. The three of them did. And the way in which Work Stream 2 frames the problem for us is it's to really take a hard look at how effective an SO and AC is at its mission. And the effectiveness problem is that the word "effectiveness" is not defined on these organizational reviews.

So I suggested on page three of the document that one of the things we ought to consider is whether we define what effectiveness is for the context of – is an SO and an AC effective at representing the interests of whatever target group that SO or AC is intended to represent?

And I mentioned two aspects of that which was the outreach of an SOAC, and I think that is about measuring how well that SO and AC members represent the global community that they're supposed to target.

And another was the representation. And in that respect you look at decisions that are made by an SO and AC and ask whether those decisions represented the interests of the target group. Very difficult for us to measure from some global perspective whether everyone in say the GNSO, all their interests were represented by a GNSO Council decision. I don't understand how we could second guess those

---

decisions. And therefore I ended up concluding in the document that we need to focus very hard on the outreach aspects, and in that regard look at results and if results are not easily measured or come up short, we'll have to look at the efforts as well.

And then the last three pages of that document summarize, as Farzaneh just indicated, they summarized Willy Curry's Mutual Accountability Roundtable, and then Farzaneh was good enough to put in almost two full pages of a discussion that occurred on our last call. I think the agenda today indicates we don't need to burn a lot of time rehashing comments that were made on that.

If any of you feel as if we missed some of the comments that you made on the first two calls, the Google Doc that we circulated is available for all to edit. So I do hope that you can insert your edits to that document and we wouldn't have had to maybe spend an inordinate amount of time on this call reviewing all of that.

So that would be my summary of our problem statement, is to try to understand what effectiveness is in terms of an SO and AC being representative and accountable to the target group that was set up.

Thank you, Farzaneh. Over to Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Hi, Steve. Just firstly an apology to everyone for my lack of interactions to your Thursday, my Friday, after this call I had a minor surgical procedure, very routine, done on my Friday, your Thursday, and I am actually unfortunately had complication on Tuesday so I'm in hospital at

---

the moment and have been for several days. Sorry about the background noise. There are other patients here.

To answer Kavouss's question first of all. Kavouss, I can assure you when I say you are in the queue it means that you will be the first person if no other has their hand up, and I see nobody else with a hand up, to raise the points that you've put in chat. As you know, the co-Chairs, and me in particular, do want to make sure that we are fair and make sure we do not obstruct or make anybody's life difficult. We recognize that you have concerns about the document that was circulated. We recognize you have significant contributions that you made to the document. As Steve said, we would have hoped that such contributions would have come into the Google Document, but if it hasn't already been done – as I say, I've been busy bleeding as opposed to reading – so I don't know if your comments have been included or not but Steve will be giving you reasonably a time along with everyone else to air your views.

If you note the agenda, ladies and gentlemen, we realized out of last week's call that a full, frank, and fearless discussion on the MAR – the Mutual Accountability Roundtable – whilst it will be on our agenda at some stage, will certainly is a little bit ahead of the game to even have a good discussion to date. We will continue to work on it as one option because it was mentioned in our mandate, and we'll do that both online and in our meetings and our lists.

So that's it from me. If you'll be self-controlled in repetition and recognize that we will stop our meetings on time regardless of who's speaking and that includes me, that's going to make all our lives very much easier. So I'm going to hand over to Farzaneh now, and I do hope

---

that you will forgive me for being predominately mute for the rest of this call.

Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII:

Thank you, Cheryl. So as Steve laid out the problem statement that we want to discuss, in our last call members did actually ask for clarifying concepts which was: who are the accountable actors? And I thought it would be good idea within the group to discuss this and so we have three scenarios in place.

One scenario is that the SO and ACs are accountable to their stakeholder group. The second scenario is that they're accountable also to other SO and ACs. And then also they are accountable to the public global Internet users. So we need to consider these three scenarios and then see which actors fit in these scenarios, and also consider which tools we use for holding them accountable in our group.

I will stop there if anyone wants to comment or discuss. Yes?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Hey, Farzaneh. On page two of our summary document we recounted how some of the Stress Tests – in particular four of them that were suggested by Secretary Strickling – took a look at whether a AC and SO had been captured internally by a subset of its members who had a narrower interest than the broad of the stakeholders that that AC or SO was supposed to represent. And also the notion of excluding entrants. And those Stress Tests, they really fit nicely with scenario one in the

---

sense that an SO and AC which are created in ICANN's Bylaws are accountable to the stakeholder group that the Bylaws say that they represent. So scenario one fits that rather well and would suggest that the AC and SO, as they come together within ICANN and make decisions about policy, that they are accountable to the stakeholder group that the Bylaws said that they were to represent. So I think that fits rather well.

With regard to scenario two and scenario three as laid out in the agenda, I fail to see how an AC and SO is actually accountable to other SOs and ACs, and nor did I see that in Recommendations 9, 10, and 12, from the CCWG plan. And I don't think that an SO and AC is accountable to the global public Internet users. Instead it's accountable to the global set of stakeholders that that SO or AC was created to represent within the mission, that is, that ICANN has since that SO and AC only exists for the purpose of fulfilling ICANN's mission.

I realize that some SOs and ACs have broader purposes and broader activities outside of ICANN. John Curran and others have been very clear on that and I think that was helpful for me to understand that. So we don't wish to interfere with that at all. This is only within the ICANN context. So I would suggest that scenario one makes sense, and I don't support the notion of scenario two or three.

Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII:

Thank you, Steve, for the comments. Anyone else has any? Okay, Kavouss, please.

---

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

I have sent you a substantial message raising certain questions of importance. We need to know how we could implement that SO [if it] is accountable to SO Y or AC Z. In what sense is it accountable? How you can make GNSO accountable to GAC? In what sense they are accountable? And how you implement that accountability? And if the one who should be accountable does not respect that need for accountability, what you do? You escalate the matter? You take IRP? And what to do? All of these mentioned very detailed in my one and a half page document that I request you put it on the screen.

And also I raise another important point – a specific situation of GAC. GAC cannot be accountable to any SO and AC for [it's] a specific construction. We as a representative of GAC representing our own government. We are only accountable to our government. Individually and collectively we are not accountable to any other government that is against in the law of the treaty and international treaty. There's no government [unsubordinated] under any other government. So it is a very difficult situation to treat the GAC case.

And then we come into the lower [stage] I mentioned in my e-mail. How the contracted party of GNSO will be accountable to non-contracted party? How the registrar will be accountable to registries, or registry to registrar? There are so many details here that it is difficult to identify. It is difficult to discuss. It is difficult to have rules. And it's much more difficult to implement unless you have another new Bylaw about accountability.

---

So the whole idea even [it's] three times repeated in our CCWG one, that idea coming from one or two persons and [other] participants make any comment and intend to write it. I have no problem with that, but it is not implementable and it doesn't work. And I don't think that the Chair of any SOAC have any authority to get together and speak on behalf of their own constituencies and held them responsible or held other responsible. They are just Chairs unless they have given a written mandate by their constituencies.

So the whole issue is in question. Please read my mail. Very detailed. I thank you very much.

FARZANEH BADI:

Thank you, Kavouss. That was very helpful. We have tried to capture your comments in the chat and also I listened to the recording when we made the report. We also added them. I am going to add what you said on the mailing list, the e-mail that you sent. I'm going to also add that [on] there.

Back to our three scenarios. I wanted to get more feedback from our group what they think about these scenarios, which one should apply, which one should not apply, and why. Anyone would like to make a comment?

Kavouss, your hand is up. Is that an old hand?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Sorry, old hand. Yes. I'm sorry.



---

FARZANEH BADII:                      That's okay. Steve?

STEVE DELBIANCO:                      Thank you, Farzaneh. I wanted to clarify one thing. I don't support accountable to other SOs and ACs, and accountable to the global public Internet users. But I do want to acknowledge that in Willy's suggestion of Mutual Accountability Roundtable I don't think accountability makes much sense there. But part of what Willy's document laid out was that when a Mutual Accountability Roundtable came together – and you'll see this on page four of our document – where each SO and AC gives an account of what worked and what didn't in the year under the review, followed by discussion on how to improve matters of performance, and that's a learning space for improvement. And I get that. So sharing best practices, what worked and didn't work, is completely appropriate for the ACs and SOs to do with some regularity, and we would certainly learn from that. I'd love to learn more about how the ccNSO works, you compare that to the way the GNSO works.

But that is not the same thing as being accountable to each other. And to Kavouss's point, if the GNSO tries to learn what works and doesn't work in the GAC, it doesn't mean that the GAC is accountable to the GNSO. So in some regards it's unfortunate that Willy chose the title, "Mutual Accountability Roundtable" because I think it's gotten a number of folks spun up that there's this cross AC and SO accountability.

---

But as I read what Willy has in the document – and this is on page four – he just submitted it to us in May of 2015 and went through it on the last call, there isn't really an accountability to each other. It's really just a sharing of what worked and didn't work. So I think in that regard it makes sense, but it's not truly accountability.

Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII:

Thank you, Steve. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, Farzaneh. I guess you Farzaneh, Steve, and some other are very ahead of my thinking of that, but even if I will say something will may sound in agreement with what was just said, it just my feeling and I didn't study that in too much detail yet. But we have organized ICANN with a new set of Bylaw and with this accountability with this enhanced global [to this] Board must be accountable to us as a full community. And I don't see how we can't have accountability or whatever word you want to use, but something between us, between all the SO and all the AC. We need to, for example, to be sure that when rule are set up in one constituency SO/ACs, they are followed. I know that it can be done within the SO and within the AC but I guess it's also important for the other to know it's going well and the right direction.

It's why I really think that this mutual accountable whatever system we want to put in place is important. It's important because we are now as a group of SO and AC part of the decision making, not just as one plus

---

one plus one but altogether. And we need to be sure about the other. Not to say that we have to just to follow if something is going wrong, but also if something is going well, it could be useful for the others. And it's both sides of the coin I think we need to discuss.

Sorry if it's not so clear. It's [also] maybe the middle of the night but it's just very early in the morning for me and maybe my brain is not yet working well and maybe it's never working well. But that's okay. Thank you very much.

FARZANEH BADII:

Thank you, Sebastien. It was clear. I can see Kavouss's hand up. Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. Now the situation it's likely explained by Steve differently. I don't have any difficulty to have a roundtable discussion, a roundtable exchange of view, but not roundtable mutual accountability. Accountability has a very specific legal meaning everywhere in every organization inside and outside the ICANN, and mutual also. If you replace "mutual accountability" by some other things, as Steve mentioned, if I correctly understood that at the end of each year or some time, Chairs of the SOAC no doubt with discussions already taken in their group get together and review the situations and found shortcomings, some of the things that need improvement in order to increase the productivity, efficiency, or take any other action or take any steps I have no difficulty at all, but not call them mutual

---

accountability. Accountability is a very, very, strong, heavy, and legally weighted terms.

Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII:

Thank you, Kavouss. So, yes. Thanks, Steve, for raising the issue of the name of the mutual accountability because it was also raised on the previous meeting that we had with the group that it might be better not to call it mutual accountability because also some of the group members raised concerns that why should let each SOs and ACs take each other into account and this round table might become a name change space.

Let's just put the MAR aside for the moment and I want to know if we have any comments or questions on the scenarios. Do you have any ideas on these three scenarios? As Steve laid out, he believes that scenario one applies to our group and to our mandate and we should work on. Anyone else has any comment on that? If you don't I will move to the next agenda item.

Okay. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes. Thank you very much. I guess from what I have tried to explain, I really think that this group must be in charge of something cross community. Yes, we can evaluate something inside each other our group, but what we do as a full – I would say group or community or committee or whatever name we want to give – but how we are

---

accountable and we work to as a Board accountable and now we are working on us to be accountable, and so accountable to whom? We can say we can be accountable to the Board, but we can also say we need to be accountable to the other participants of this full group. And I really think that it's not just the first scenario. We need at least to look to the second one.

The third one, it's an interesting concept, and my feeling it's broader than Work stream 2 is that is ICANN accountable to the world? And I hope that when we have the accountability of the Board, the accountability of [each] SO and AC, and some sort of accountability between the SO and AC, we will have an organization well fit to be accountable to the world.

Thank you.

FARZANEH BADI:

Thank you, Sebastien. So I can see from the chat that Jordan does not support getting too hung up on who should SO and AC [be] accountable to. And we noted that point. If there are no comments, I'm going to go to the next agenda item which is – I should also raise this point that in our previous meeting some of the group members stated that perhaps MAR should not be discussed at this stage because we need to first lay out the problem and then think about the mechanisms. That's why we have the problem statement up there today in our agenda item and I think as a problem is clear, some are not clear on whether SO and AC should be accountable to each other or the global Internet users.

---

With that I am going to go to the next agenda item which is our work plan. I think we could suggest that... Sorry, yes.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Before you jump to the next agenda item – I probably butchered this when I said it earlier – but I did spend a great deal of time in the first two pages of the document that we circulated trying to answer your challenge of what problem are we solving. The way I did it was to look back at the three recommendations from CCWG that specifically pointed out aspects of SO/AC accountability that we were supposed to look at in Work Stream 2.

Some of them arose from those Stress Tests on internal capture. Some of them talked about excluding new entrants who try to get into an AC or SO. And one recommendation specifically pointed to the ATRT. And finally, one recommendation specifically points us to something Rinalia brings up every time, which are these periodic organizational reviews that the Bylaws have long required. Those are those reviews of the GNSO that occur every three to four years, or the ALAC.

So a problem statement for us is the easiest part of our project. It's all already written down because hundreds of us spent over two years on the recommendations of CCWG. So I feel as if people are not spending enough time just reading the work that's already been done, and I would just invite you to read pages one and two of that first draft document. All they do is lay out the Charter for this group and the problem statement we're supposed to solve. If we lock that down, it'll be so much easier for us to fulfill what our Charter is.

---

Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII:

Thank you, Steve. That was a very nice segue to the next agenda item because the next agenda item... I think if we have some issue specific [tracked] it would make this more focused we are working on and also capture the comments of the group and come to conclusions easier.

So I'm thinking perhaps we can have different tracks based on different issues that we are tackling here. So one track could be the problem statement, so if anyone has a question about that they can go and [read] on that and they can be in separate document – and could be in one document but separate topics. For example, we could also look at the tools to solve the problem. That can be another track. So I wanted to get some comments on whether this is a good approach to continue our discussion on the SO/AC accountability.

We have to come up with various issues and discuss them among ourselves. Some of these issues have already been dealt with. For example, the problem statement is in the first two pages of the Google Doc that we shared with you, and we can go to other issues and deal with them.

Anyone has any comment on that? Is this a good approach? Yes, Kavouss. Please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Farzaneh, if you give it another name rather than mutual accountability, and if you further elaborate that the real purpose of that and then

---

connect that in one way to the other to be the forum, perhaps with a [pre-forum] roundtable discussion or exchange of views and what they have to do. In a way that in one hand identify problems, difficulties, among various partners and so on, so forth, and the other hand, facilitate discussions at the forum and so on, so forth, if possible, it will work. My difficulty is that first we need to be sure that something has a meaning and applicability and second, criteria to apply that. And third, if it is not applied what we can do? This is the difficulty.

I don't want that this accountability goes to some sort of escalation and so on, so forth. It's an A and B – whether A will be one person or it would be a community. So the whole idea should be reviewed to see whether the idea that we had now is a [stand] after all these things we have done or we need to review it and give it a new name and new task and new course of actions which is practicable, implementable, and workable.

Thank you.

FARZANEH BADI:

Yes, thank you, Kavouss. Those were very useful comments.

If we are done with that, then we can just go to discuss the effectiveness which was in our document. Brenda, can you upload the Google Doc, please?

Sorry, go ahead, Seun.



---

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay, thank you. I think Steve made some points about how we could actually approach this. What Kavouss was saying is about unless we do this, [let's talk about it]. I think we need to stay focused on what the objectives are which is actually from the CCWG proposal. So let's look at each of the objectives. Actually, there are [line] items you can actually say, "Okay, under this objective which is [inaudible], why do we address this under the next objective [inaudible] problem statement that we addressed. I think we should go by that.

I'm not [start] looking for other things that are not probably part of the objective. I don't know what is presenting on the chat on the AC, but I think going the route of what we already know as the issue and then addressing that before we then go to what is not the issue maybe is a better approach.

Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII:

Okay. Thank you, Seun. So we can move on to talk about effectiveness. Steve, go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Hey thank you, Farzaneh. So picking up on your idea of some tracks that we can follow, again, the recommendations made it clear that one of the tracks was to evaluate the Mutual Accountability Roundtable. And we've already done some work on that track. We're starting to mature that a bit. Let's set that aside for now. A couple of other tracks – do you guys recall – our Charter specifically asks us to assess whether the IRP –

---

Independent Review Process – should be applicable to SO and AC activities. That’s going to be an interesting one. We haven’t begun any work on that, and I know it’s a little late on this call to start that from scratch.

And there are two other tracks that I laid out on page three of the Google Doc. So if you scroll to page three under “Effectiveness” – and I know I heard Farzaneh mention effectiveness a few times – I think that our Charter makes it clear that the word effectiveness is already in the ICANN Bylaws because effectiveness is what the organizational reviews look at. And we don’t define what the word effective is, and so we have an opportunity to see if we can put some meat on the bones to say that the effectiveness of an AC and SO can be assessed by the following ways. And I have proposed two. They’re not the only two, but they are two ways.

One is outreach and then the representational nature of the decisions that they reach. And that’s the two little paragraphs that are on page three. We discussed this briefly in Helsinki and on our very first call, and I heard quite a bit of push-back on the idea of only looking at effort and I didn’t mean to imply it was effort alone. But I try to lay it out here – Alan and others said, “Try to find results to show that outreach has been effective,” because we have members of an AC and SO that demonstrate coverage of the target community across the world.

And I’m suggesting that if those results come up short of true representation in a statistical analysis way, then begin to look at the level of effort because it’s possible that that SO or AC didn’t work hard enough at the marketing and recruiting that outreach requires, or that it

---

was not open and accessible when a new entrant tried to join, which may not even be exclusionary activity. It might just be that our vocabulary and the acronyms that we use and the complexity of what we do in GNSO makes it unapproachable to a new entrant. And therefore we might need indoctrination and onboarding and training and educational resources.

So when we dive into the effectiveness of an AC and SO's outreach, we ought to look at its results in a statistical way, and then if that's not a perfectly represented global stakeholder group, then look at the level of effort and try to assess how we can make that effort better.

And I'll close by suggesting that that would be one area where I would turn to the other ACs and SOs – ALAC seems to have a very effective regional structure – and ask whether parts of that can be imported to something like GNSO. We might even use regional structures to increase the effectiveness of our outreach. I would hate to wait until the annual Mutual Accountability Roundtable to learn about best practices, and I wouldn't. And if it looks like our level of effort wasn't working I'd reach out to the ALAC right away and ask for advice on whether a regional structure would help the outreach in GNSO.

Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII:

Thank you, Steve. Kavouss, you can –

---

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

I think Steve is the designer of this fix. The whole idea of accountability mutual coming from him. He was working on one of the element of the AoC with the first effectiveness of GAC. And then we extended that to everything.

Effectiveness is two sides. One is intraeffectiveness, the other is intereffectiveness. If [it's a] GNSO, interaffectiveness is the effectiveness of one house with respect to the effectiveness of the other house. Who is going to judge that? Is the contracting members going to examine the effectiveness of non-contracting members? And if they found that they are not effective, what they can do? Can they escalate that and bring it to the IRP? It's such a very complex issue that [inaudible] is discussing this still and implementation and so on, so forth. Do we need such a complexity? Or intereffectiveness? That GAC judge whether GNSO is effective or not? How you could do that? Some of the area of the work of the [DNS] is so specific that it's difficult for any other AC or SO to go to the details and make any judgement that whether they are effective because they are certain circumstances, certain conditions, doesn't give rise to any difficulty? Would it be an effective... Why we need to push the finger on the effectiveness of things? Let us have the exchange of views to a roundtable and find informally to see whether there are some shortcomings, some missing or some area of improvement and try to raise it appropriately but not [at], it doesn't get anywhere. This would be another Bylaw or another IRP and so on, so forth, and may destabilize the whole process that someone trying to judge the other one saying that you are not effective then putting the dispute why you don't have that knowledge to say, "I am not effective, I don't have that knowledge that allow you." What is

---

these things? Please, Steve, be a little bit [frankly] and a little bit practical. It doesn't work this effectiveness. That was between NTIA and ICANN when they put effectiveness of [judge]. They wanted to know whether [judge] is effective or not [inaudible]. It's now extended to everybody. This doesn't work. Just doesn't work.

Thank you

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Hey, everyone. I put into the chat something to clarify. Kavouss is thinking of the word effectiveness that was in the Affirmation of Commitments which was signed in 2009, and one of the things it looked at was the effectiveness of the GAC's interaction with the rest of ICANN. And that word was there in the Affirmation and it's still there today. Completely apart from that, Kavouss, the Bylaws, I guess, for over 15 years have required periodic organizational reviews of each SO and AC except GAC. So this is not about GAC yet. But in the Bylaws it is long called for organizational reviews, and when they occur they look at two things; whether any change in structure or operations – look in the chat and of course this is in the document that I prepared and circulated this week – we're supposed to look at whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness. It's been in the Bylaws for 13 years.

And three, whether that organization, council, or AC is accountable to its constituency, stakeholder groups, and organization. That's the internal accountability to the target group. So this is what Rinalia was talking about, that we have among our Charter to understand what the

---

Bylaws already require in terms of organizational reviews. And they don't apply to the GAC yet. Jordan Carter asks the question, "Surely they should." If Robin Gross was on the phone, she would be the first one to say that it was something she wanted to have done two and a half years ago – to add an organizational review of the GAC. That didn't emerge from the CCWG recommendations. We can resurface that here.

But Kavouss, please don't misunderstand. The word effectiveness is in the Bylaws and has been for over a decade and that is why it is on the table for us to decide whether the word effectiveness bears some explanation or whether we should explore how to make that mean something. And if we don't do anything with the word effectiveness, it'll mean whatever the consultant wants it to mean. And I say consultant because ICANN typically hires an outside consulting group to perform these organizational reviews.

I don't know that ICANN has ever tried to explain to them what effectiveness is supposed to be, and if they don't know what effectiveness is supposed to be I don't know how their reviews make any sense at all.

FARZANEH BADI:

Thank you, Steve.

Okay, so I think we have around eight minutes left. Alan, please take [inaudible].

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I think Steve's last comments bear a fair amount of thinking. I've looked at a fair number of the past reviews of ACs and SOs and I don't think in general they do look at what we're talking about today, about effectiveness in how they are representing the groups that they are supposed to be representing. Moreover, it's a really difficult job, because I don't know what the metrics are. Steve made reference to the fact that ALAC is successful and it has its regional organization, and we do have a very strong regional organization. How well these people are actually embedded in our process and participate in our process is a different question.

Let's face it, ICANN is doing a bunch of arcane things, and to the vast majority of people in the world, yes, it may ultimately impact them but through a set of processes which they're never going to really focus on and understand. So it's fine to say how well does the Intellectual Property Constituency represent all Intellectual Property lawyers, but the vast majority of them are never going to want to be involved. And somehow we're going to have to factor in that kind of thing when we're trying to measure effectiveness and how well we are doing in representing the constituencies that we say we do. I don't have any of the answers for this, but I know it's a really difficult problem because it's one that certainly within At-Large we're fighting with all the time.

Thank you.

FARZANEH BADI:

Thank you, Alan.

---

Okay, so with that if there are no other comments, I'm going to finish the meeting, and what we are going to do is we will make... I [seem to receive] messages from Tom Dale, GAC Secretariat, about what sort of mechanisms GAC has for accountability. So we will take note of these comments and the discussion that we had today, and we will make a sort of like four tracks. We have the Mutual Accountability Roundtable – I know that some have a problem with the name so we will take it into account. I will definitely do that, Kavouss. So we will take into account the comments that you made about the name and any other comments. We have gathered extensively on that issue.

Then there are two other things that we have to work on. One is the internal SOAC accountability mechanisms that we have to work on. And the other thing is the Independent Panel Review and discussing whether an SO and AC should be subjected to them.

So with that, if there are no other comments We can finish the call. Okay, I don't see any other comments. Yes, definitely, Kavouss, we will post your comments.

Thank you very much. Bye, everyone.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**