RECORDED VOICE:	This meeting is now being recorded.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Thank you. It has got a great turnout, and I appreciate all of that. And there was quite a bit of activity on our documents for our last call. The agenda, which is displayed on the right, we will definitely note everyone who is in the Adobe, unaware of any apologies that we've received via email.

My co-chairs will pipe in if they know of any.

We will review, briefly, our last call and action items coming out of that. And then a discussion about to whom SOs and ACs are actually accountable to. And that's our last discussion of that very topic, as we explore the table that opened up the bylaws, and said that these periodic reviews of the ACs and SOs, the ones that the Board is required to do every five years by an independent reviewer, they always looked at the effectiveness of the SO ACs.

But now, as a result of our work stream one changes to the bylaws, we also looked at a connection of accountability to the underlying community that they represent. And each of the reviews will now look at that. So Alan, a number of us were discussing that, trying to make sure that we understood what the intention is, which [standing?] on accountability.

And the end of our call, without any clear consensus, of course, it's still early to do that, but given that Tuesday was the full plenary call, we had

---

a great opportunity to present a progress report on where our group is. We've had more calls than any other work stream two group, and frankly, I think we've made more progress than most of the others.

So the co-chairs of CCWG and the plenary, asked us to give a brief update, and I said, well while we're at it, I'll present sort of the dilemma, the question we're considering, the key question about the accountability to the members of a SO AC, for the bylaws or accountability to the broader internet community outside of the membership. Hoping to learn a little bit from our colleagues in the full plenary, but frankly, think of it as a dry run, where if this document represented where we are, represented an idea like that, the plenary, I can give you a preview if there was a lot of confusion.

So, nothing new there. So if there aren't any other comments, I thought I would dive into the five slides we presented to the plenary, if you could put that up first, staff.

None of this is new to you, but Farzaneh and Cheryl will help me to recap the sort of discussion that ensued. It probably went on for 15 minutes or so on the full plenary call, and I think it does inform us about the rest of where the CCWG is coming from. It's only five slides, so I'll go through it quickly. Remember the work stream two section of the bylaws says that our group, our job, was to review and develop, according to the final report, this roman numeral three, which was SO AC accountability, and we had to, at a minimum, look at improved processes for accountability, processes for transparency, and processes for participation, that are helpful to prevent capture.

So that's what's in the bylaws for our charter. Now since the first sentence of that charter says, to the extent set forth in the accountability report, I'm going to turn to the next two slides, which discuss what's in the accountability report. And this has all been in our Google Document, discussed it several times before.

So the second slide says that two recommendations really charter us on work stream two, one is rec 12. And rec 12 says to us, we should look at accountability in the ATRT process. And there is a line in there about accountability in the ATRT. We should evaluate the mutual accountability roundtable, propose a detailed plan about enhancing accountability, and also assess whether the IRP would be applicable.

Farzaneh organized our Google Doc to have tracks that map to these four items from rec 12. The second rec coming out of our final report, is recommendation 10, and it's on the third slot. It had suggested that in work stream one, that we wanted the bylaws to be changed so that the review of SO and AC accountability mechanisms occur in the independent structure reviews that I just spoke of.

And that is why, roman numeral three, was added to the independent structural reviews. And it asks the question, whether the SO AC is accountable to its constituency, stakeholder groups, organizations, and other stakeholders. I believe, based on the work that we did in CCWG, that the, its constituencies is repeated, its constituencies, its stakeholder groups, its organizations, and other stakeholders that are members of it.

So I read recommendation 10 as internal accountability, not external accountability. And the word internal means the members of a constituency. So if that's what's out there, [inaudible] the plenary, that we had a question. And of course, this was coming out of our last call. And our question was, should we seek to increase the accountability of each of these SOs and ACs to the global community beyond its membership?

Not just to its members themselves. Because places like, things like capture and participation, are really about a SO and AC accountability to the target group that it's supposed to serve. And our bylaws are pretty explicit about what each of us in our SOs and ACs, who are the members, who are the target communities.

So, when I put this question up there, I thought an example would help. And I'm not picking on the ccNSO, it's just an example. So I said that, for example, the ccNSO was created with gTLD managers as its members. That's in the bylaws, not even arguable. I think someone asked in the Google Doc, does it include ccTLD managers who don't join? Well, it doesn't.

Our current bylaws say that the members of the ccNSO are ccTLD managers who join the constituency, but I think we can also suggest that if there is a whole target population of ccTLD managers, many of whom don't even join, you would want to ask the question from the second slide. Is the ccNSO open enough? Is it welcoming enough so that its target membership is joining and participating? Because if they're not, then we're not fulfilling the true mission there.

So the final slide represented in this plenary, and I'm happy to get some help from Farzaneh and Cheryl on the discussion that occurred, was that Farzaneh and staff had highlighted for me that there really are several ways in which each of our SOs and ACs are currently, already held accountable beyond the SO and AC members.

Just really very quickly, some of our SOs have liaisons. The bylaws require that GNSO have a liaison from, for instance, ALAC, SSAC. And so that liaison is part of the deliberation of that particular AC and SO, and certainly gives you transparency. I don't know for sure that it delivers on accountability, but it means that the rest of the community can see what's happening inside a ccNSO or GNSO.

Second, some SOs and ACs have to consider public comment on the policies they develop and submit to the Board, and that is an additional element of transparency. It remains to be seen how a SO and AC has to then consider those public comments, particularly when they come from members of the global internet public outside of their membership.

That's going to require research because when we just discover how it's done in each SO and AC because they're different. And that's not required in the bylaws. Third, the Board itself of ICANN has to approve any SO and AC policy or decision, that falls within the purview of policy development, for instance. And when it approves that policy, the Board is supposed to make that decision in the global public interest, not just whether a particular GNSO policy serves the members of the GNSO.

So that's the third way in which there is a broader global public interest at the point of approval. And finally, every five years when the ATRT, the accountability and transparency review team comes together, it's supposed to assess whether ICANN decisions are supported, and accepted, by the public and the internet community. That's not new, folks.

This is… All of these items are part of the existing bylaws for over a decade. So there are ways in which a SO and AC is held accountable. And then we opened it for questions, and the discussion was not particularly robust, but we did end up settling on many people believing that the preferred tool to hold any given SO and AC accountable for the global community, with the [inaudible] of what a mutual accountability roundtable might be.

But I have to confess, the people on that call Tuesday had a very different view of mutual accountability roundtable, then what is on our document, because we were basing it as a sharing of best practices and lessons learned, exactly the way [inaudible] described it in his May 25th email.

But there are some on the call who believe that there was far more accountability then would be in that roundtable. The roundtable is a discussion, so it certainly brings transparency, but at least as it was originally conceived, I would hate for everyone to suddenly assume that the usual accountability roundtable delivers this accountability to the whole world. So I'll stop there.

EN

Farzaneh and Cheryl, do you want to go first? If not, we'll just open the queue.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Steve, if I may? Cheryl here. I just wanted to explore, and Bernie did allude to this in our plenary meeting, and using the example of the ccNSO that was outlined in the slides. Of course, as you stated, you indicated is it opening and welcoming to other ccTLD managers to join, that's an aspect. The other aspect, of course, is, and this is, in that example, the way that the ccNSO has operated, and I think very laudably and demonstrably since its inception.

There is no barrier to engagement and involvement to non-member ccTLD operators. And in fact, what we have seen in that particular SO, over the, many years it has now run, over a decade. That it has always not only been open to, but actively pursued the opinions, and has ensured place at the space of the policy table, and practices, and rules of procedure and development tables for non-ccTLD manager, so non-member ccTLD managers.

And in fact, if one looked at the highly active participants over the years, one would be surprised to see that some of the most vocal and influential people in what we see as the ccNSO, had in fact, has still not joined as members, or have only recently joined as members and have taken leadership positions.

So, that's another measure. And I think that's a valid accountability construct. And we may find some of the other ACs and SOs have

EN

similarly unique but specifically valid aspects to their accountability. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: This is Steve. Thank you Cheryl. Go ahead Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADII: Oh yeah, so just, I have a discussion point, and also a point that kind of like going back to the question, to [inaudible] SOs and ACs are able to, and that towards the, as one of the questions that was related to these other questions, if SOs and ACs are accountable to the [inaudible], and then the question, the answer that Mathieu Weill, he responded that as a ccNSO appointed member, I can assume quite a bit of assurance that the ccNSO is not expecting that is to be required more, to be more accountable to the community.

So, I think this is important to know, to note that also Alan Greenberg mentioned during the last call that when we say stakeholder group, what do we mean? Do we mean the actual members? Or do we mean the stakeholder group in general, who are not even members? And I think we might want to, it was in our group to come up with an answer that whether the accountability that we are looking at is solely restricted to our members, and then when…

And also when we look at other aspects. We might want to look at it when we are answering the question what we are accountable for. So these are the two questions, I think, just go hand in hand. But I think, the most important question at the moment is, whether there… What

we are looking as accountability to the members, and not be close to the wider stakeholder group, or and also what we are accountable for?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you Farzaneh for clarifying that. That was very helpful. This is Steve DelBianco. I did want to note that we don't have really have any doubt about SOs and ACs being accountable to their members. The bylaws make that clear, and it's part of the reviews that now occur. The question we're proceeding is, do we need to enhance CCNO's accountability to the global internet community? Or GNSO's accountability to the global internet community?

And once we answer that question, I think the how you hold them accountable ends up requiring us to explore specific mechanisms, whether it's the existing structural reviews, the Board's decisions, or perhaps something new like the mutual accountability roundtable.

So why don't we take a queue? I guess we'll start with Christopher Wilkinson on this discussion of accountability. Go ahead, Christopher.

We're not hearing you.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: ..provided for, already in the bylaws [CROSSTALK]…

STEVE DELBIANCO: Christopher, we just now heard you. So if you were saying anything, before the words just now provided, you should start over.

EN

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Okay, I'll start over. Well first of all, Steve, I think you're right, and I agree that the accountability of the SOs and ACs is very largely provided for in the bylaws and the longstanding practice in ICANN. I think that is not really an issue. That is the accountability of the SOs and ACs to their members. And if it's not sufficient, or adequate, or deteriorates, I think it's really a matter for the members to correct that.

What we're talking about here, in my view, is essentially the accountability of the delegates and representatives of the SOs and ACs, in the new structures created by the transition. Their accountability through their SO AC. This is important, it means that third parties, or other SOs and ACs, need to have confidence that the delegates that are representing other SO AC, are accountable to their entity, and what they're saying, and what they're voting for, what they're doing, is a reflection of the policy of that SO AC.

This is the gist of the directive against eventual capture. It's the, obviously it's not automatic, improve quickly. People have to take positions in conference calls and in meetings, under circumstances that they cannot consult all of their members or their SO AC on the spot. But I think that is the issue that needs to be addresses in this case.

We should be looking at the incremental new accountability requirements that arise directly from the transition and the creation of several new entities, in which the SOs and ACs will be represented. Thank you.

I've already lowered the hand.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Steve, you might be muted, and you might want to take the next person in the queue [inaudible].

FARZANEH BADII: Yes, thanks Cheryl. So there is no one in the queue. I just wanted to add, that also in regard to the NAR and the mutual accountable roundtable, it was meant during the plenary that it could be used as a soft approach to understand the approaches of other SOs and ACs, to accountability. And so, we can look at it as not, as a kind of like a soft approach, if it does not bind SO and ACs to each other, or to accountable to each other, but it is good for presenting best practices.

So that was all commissioned as well. What I think… If no one has any comments now, I think we could also go to question number two, which is, what are the SOs and ACs accountable for? And this is often [inaudible] because, if you look at our Google Doc, and during our meetings, it was mentioned that, this group of these accountability of these SO and ACs have to be clarified.

And a couple of other people that its scope should be established. So if we can go to question number two, what are SOs and ACs accountable to? We can get some comments on that. What are they accountable for?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Farazneh, it's Steve. It's in Google Doc. I want to point out to folks that on pages three and four, I created a table that took from the bylaws

how each of the seven SOs and ACs are created by ICANN, and who their memberships are and what their role is. You could suggest at a minimum that a SO and AC is accountable to perform its role. It's accountable to perform its role.

So let me just give you one example, I'll pick ALAC. The bylaws say the ALAC role is to consider and provide advice on the activities of ICANN, in so far as they relate to the interests of individual internet users. It's a similar role described on each and every SO and AC. So at the bare minimum, you would say that what we are accountable for is the performance of those roles, and there may not really be anything else they're accountable for.

And earlier we debated the idea of, how do we know whether ALAC is performing that role? Well, the first place you check is with ALAC members. Are the members able, are they able to hold its organization accountable for making those decisions and communicating them effectively for the rest of ICANN? And then we examine the second level question of, is the ALAC also accountable and how to the broader internet community?

So, is that, so Farzaneh, let me just do a little bit of a dialogue with you since I don't see any other hands up, does that begin to answer what the SOs and ACs are accountable for? And that is the role, verbatim role, of each SO and AC in the bylaws where the SOs and ACs are actually created.

I might ask staff to put up the Google Doc, if they don't mind.

This table that I was speaking of is contained in the Google Doc on pages three and four.

Matthew Shears, if you have audio, I know you've been very active in the Google Doc [inaudible] comments. If you have audio, it would be great to have you weigh in with some of the things that you added to the Doc and explain them.

MATTHEW SHEARS: I don't want to jump the queue, but I'm happy to do so, if you wish Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: You are the queue, Matthew. There is no queue other than you.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Okay, perfect. So, I think what you're describing, Steve, I think is a very useful point of departure. What I wanted to do was just, in terms of embellishing that a little bit and thinking that what we, as a community, throughout the past two years or so in developing the accountability proposal, is just to refer us back to the, one of the annexes of the final proposal, which is, which deals with the methodology that we use.

And in that methodology, we did actually, as a community, outline some key criteria for measuring accountability. So if it's possible to go to the very last page of the Google Doc, I think it's useful to actually look at those. It's actually Appendix C, which is called Background and Methodology of the Final Proposal, the final accountability proposal.

And in that, it reflects a number of discussions that we had quite early on in the working group, which is really to kind of understand what we meant by accountability. And you'll see that, you'll see that in the Google Doc, at the end, I don't see it on the page, but anyway, I'll just go ahead and read it.

It talks… In Appendix C, it talks about the accountability is comprised of four dimensions, which I think we should, we probably might want to consider as a part of our overall scoping of this issue, and those dimensions are transparency, which means that, in this case, a SO and AC is answerable to its stakeholders by being open and visible to them, consultation, which means that a SO or AC continually takes input from and explains its positions to the stakeholders.

A review means that the SOs ACs actions, policies, programs are subject to outside monitoring and evaluation. And redress, which means that the SO AC makes compensations for any harms of its actions and omissions, for example, by means of policy changes, reforms, resignations, financial reoperations, etc.

Now I think there is value to us considering how we might look at these particular interpretations on accountability. I think one of the challenges that we face, and I think this is perhaps a bigger issue, which is how we scope this particular issue. We can scope it relatively narrowly, but the, if we're going to focus on, for example, as I've suggested, where we look at really on the working plan on how we bring about enhancements to SO and AC accountability, it is going to require us at some point in time, to define how we're going to do that.

What we mean by a working plan. What we mean by enhancing accountability. And whether or not we're going to have to consider some form of criteria, or some way of measuring, how successful that accountability is. After all, we are tasked with trying to pull together recommendations on how that accountability will be enhanced.

So I think, we're going to have to at some point in time, grapple with the scope of what we're trying to do. And if we agree that we need a set of measurements or criteria to actually assess or for the SOs and ACs to assess themselves, how much they've met, and what they've done in terms of accountability, then I think there is some use to looking at, in addition to some of the criteria that we've already been talking about, some of the things that we've used through the process over the past two years.

So, I think there are some big issues that we have to answer, one of which is gain, what do we mean, or how do we interpret, enhancing accountability? What do we mean by a working plan? And from my perspective, I think, I'll throw this in the mix now because we've talked about it a little bit, the things like the mutual accountability roundtable, are very possibly quite important. I think, in a way, they're secondary to us understanding some of these more fundamental issues about how we're defining enhancing, how we're defining the working plan and things like that.

So my suggestion, which is kind of a long way of answering your question, Steve, and I apologize for that. I think we have to really kind of focus in on what we want to start with, and starting with the working plan, which is, in a way, our deliverable, and we need to sit down and

EN

have a good think about what we mean by the various elements of that working plan. Thanks and sorry for taking so long.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Matthew, thank you. This is Steve DelBianco. I sincerely appreciate that insight. I would say that you raised the right question, and I would like to take this opportunity and disagree with your potential answer. When you add an Appendix C, the background and methodology of defining accountability, in the four dimensions, it contains things like redress, it contains things like respect for legislation, due process, jurisdictional operation, security performance, and it's clear that we, the CCWG, we created those criteria of accountability about two and a half years ago, when we were trying to ensure that ICANN, the entity called ICANN, was accountable for its actions.

I don't think we should apply the very same criteria to each SO and AC, which is a small group created inside of ICANN, with a very constrained role, and a well-defined population of potential members. So while it is useful to dive into our documents, we do that all of the time here, if we take what you've proposed for ICANN accountability, and try to map it onto the SOs and ACs, I'm afraid much of it will not apply, and actually won't key us up to get any better progress on our tasks.

And for those of you seeking to read what it is Matthew is talking about, it's on pages 15 and 16 of the Google Doc. I think I explained in the chat, it doesn't display well when you render a PDF from a Google Doc, particularly in the font that Google Doc associated with Matthew Shears. It's sort of a baby blue, and it doesn't render at all.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Steve, Cheryl here.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So, I pushed back on you [CROSSTALK]… Yeah, I wanted to ask, how wedded you are to those ICANN accountability measures for the SOs and ACs, and then we'll go to the queue.

Go ahead Matthew.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Steve, no you're absolutely right. The reason why I've put that in there is because… Can you hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: We do, yeah.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Okay. Thanks Steve. No, you are absolutely right. I am not suggesting that we apply the same kind of criteria that we have applied for ICANN the organization as a whole. But what I'm suggesting is that we have addressed and looked at various criteria, and I think that there is probably some value to looking at those criteria, assessing whether or not they're appropriate to measuring accountability and seeing how based on that measurement, it's possible to enhance accountability.

EN

So I think it's not so much a matter of applying it lock, stock, and barrel, but it's more a matter of looking at what we've agreed and what we've explored in the past as possible criteria, and then using those or not. I think there is merit in looking at those, but I completed agree with you, that a number of them will not be applicable.

I think we still probably, it's probably worth while looking at the things we've already talked about, and discussed at some length in the past, if we're going to go down the root of assessing and measuring some form or another, the accountability of the SOs and ACs. So, but I agree, but that was more my intent to kind of show that we have discussed various criteria in the past, and that we could use those, but we obviously have to have a greater discussion about which ones are applicable. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Matthew, while I wait for others to raise their hand, this is Steve DelBianco. Whatever kind of criteria they use for accountability, remember, the bylaws instruct our group, the bylaws have a charter for our group, and we're supposed to look at improved processes for accountability, transparency, and participation that is helpful to prevent capture. That was on slide one.

The way you look at those four dimensions, it depends upon whether you're addressing the members of a SO AC. You and I together in GNSO, GNSO might be developing a policy for the next round of generic TLDs. The accountability to the constituent parts to the GNSO, for the purpose of developing that policy, is something entirely separate from trying to

answer the question, is GNSO's policy development process adequately accountable to people outside of GNSO?

And that's why we have to literally look at it in two places. Karen Mulberry has pasted onto the screen, the actual appendix that Matthew and I have been discussing. And I thought I heard somebody speak, go right ahead please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, this is Cheryl, who I think, still metaphorically, had her hand up. If not actually because I'm not in the AC room. The reason I asked for the microphone at the finish of Matthew's first invention, was because I wanted to make some points which are very much in synch with the ones that he then made in his clarifying follow-up.

I think the exercise Matthew has proposed, perhaps not so much a mapping as you've described it Steve, but rather an overlap, let's look at the overlay of those original constructs that we worked on for ICANN wide accountability, and see where there is a meshing, where there is use, where we believe as a work team, that there could be merit of exploring one or more of those aspects, and I think there will be more than one, as applicable to the specifics of our AC SO accountability.

But I think that's an exercise well worth while pursing in the next real piece of our work. And so Matthew, if and when I ever get our new [inaudible] routers and get back onto the internet, I look forward perhaps working with you and seeing is there another way we can, in some fabulous form, or graphic form, help others understand what the benefits of that could be, because I think that could be something that is

a nice piece of foundational work, and it will then give us some subsection within our work plan to follow on in more detailed discussion, recognizing that there could very well be still variability between various ACs and SOs.

So, yeah, I'm sorry I'm in the bath, literally. And blind to what's going on in the AC room. But may I just say, [inaudible]…

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you Cheryl. And Farzaneh, your hand is up.

FARZANEH BADII: Thank you Steve. So going back to the question that [inaudible] of the accountability. First, well you have [inaudible] questions popping up about to whom we are accountable to, and what we are accountable for. So I think, and I kind of, we address them and we never finalize them.

So I thought perhaps, I think there are certain things that you mentioned, in the table, is okay, but I would like to get some feedback from the ASO members, for example, that raised the issue of the scope of accountability. For example, [inaudible] mentioned that a lot of the policy discussions are not taking place within ICANN, while [inaudible] their discussions take place within ICANN.

And so what sort of accountability do we mean when we say, accountability of the ASO? So we are talking here about like limited accountability for some of the SO and ACs? Or do we have to clarify

EN

that? So I think [inaudible] I don't know if she's hearing that. But and also, if we can…

Yes, [inaudible]. So, if we can also think a little bit of what we are accountable for, we achieve in our document, we have representation and also outreach, but I think we need to come up with a plan that what is it, what sort of mechanisms should we have, and of course, the ALAC is not accountable for providing water for 4 billion internet users. It is limited to the ICANN mission, and yes.

So, it is limited to ICANN mission, and also it is SO… Then the question comes up that, so are they also limited to their members or the stakeholder groups? I think if we can understand accountability as accountability for the four things that we said, representation, inclusion, transparency, and reporting [that?]. And so, if we can consider it a minute kind of, the scope that we're talking about, then we must have a clear vision.

I [inaudible] will also have an answer to who are we accountable to, and what are we accountable for. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you Farzaneh. I noted in the chat, I know staff is scrambling to give us a viewable piece of our Google Doc, but they actually omitted the top part where Matthew laid out five of his ideas for what we can look at, representation, inclusion, transparency, reporting, responsibility.

EN

Appendix D was added by Matthew to show what it was CCWG did when we said, what is ICANN's accountability mean? So, that's right, Matthew, I understood.

So the contention here is to believe that we're starting with a clean slate, and can invent a lot of this from whole cloth. And yet, endeavor to show what the bylaws asked us to look at, as well as what is in existing structural reviews of ICANN and ATRT. And that's because the bylaws that created us says that we are to review and develop, not just develop a new, but review and develop.

So I truly believe that our charter is to look at the ways each AC is accountable to its target community and members, and ways in which it is accountable to the broader internet community. And if we review those first, as to what the status quo is, that should identify for us whether there are gaps.

And I understand Matthew's point that if you have criteria established ahead of time, then gaps become more apparent in that criteria. So I fully accept the idea of that, so we have to both conceive of criteria, like Matthew has helpfully done, but we also have to pay attention to what we are supposed to review.

We are supposed to review the current mechanisms against that criteria. And the plenary call that was held on Tuesday of this week, these are just the fruitions selection of the ccNSO as the example, as far as he indicated, that immediately brought a reaction from the ccNSO members on the call, like, what are you kidding me?

ccNSO isn't accountable to the global internet, it's accountable to the ccTLD managers, and they're the ones that define what accountability is for the purposes of, is the ccNSO serving its members? So we can expect some pushback from each of the SOs and ACs if we try to invent new ways, beyond what's in the current bylaws, for them to have to be in a different way accountable then they are today.

So I'm not suggesting that we are afraid to go there, we should go there, but we'll have to be rigorous in our discussion, and begin to surface it for the full plenary as really just a sanity check, so we don't end up prescribing something that we can't get adequate support for. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Please, go ahead Cheryl, because we don't see your hand up. Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I know. I'm on the telephone. I couldn't agree with you more on that, and one of the things I wanted to suggest as we come towards the close of today's call, is building on the contributions of the Google Doc and the two aspects that we need to look at. We've got some of them in the tables already, but I'm thinking what might be an interesting exercise is to start to create another metric which allows us to basically gauge or capture the current state of each of the ACs and SOs in accountability matrix.

If we could also then cross-reference that with some of the criteria that we deem universally, or perhaps, less so, applicable, then that's just a bonus. But the point made by the ASOs is one of as specifically valid as the point I made on behalf of the ccNSO earlier, and that is, the way that the SO works, of course, has a very robust, open, and accountable, and transparent, and indeed, very low barrier to entry and engagement, policy development process, which functions well and truly outside of ICANN.

That of course is a value proposition for accountability that we need to recognize, in a status quo aspect. Now that may never be a particular best practice that is applicable to other ACs or SOs, but if we capture what is actually happening now, and then have a look at the matrix on the compare and contrast, we may be able to start sifting out some specific recommendations that might help float all of our boats a little bit higher. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you Cheryl. I'll note at the table, we started at page three and four of the Google Doc, is the beginning of that analysis, for each of the SOs and ACs. It describes how the bylaws created us, it describes the current mechanisms that are supposed to be used for accountability, the independent review of the ATRT. But it doesn't…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm well aware of that, and I'm suggesting that we also ensure that we reach out to each of the ACs and SOs, hopefully via the representatives and members they have in our work chain, to embellish that with

specifics, such as we had come in from SO and obviously an example of the ccNSO.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Exactly. I was only going to add that what you've described would be the next column of that table, that's all. And that we would begin to get the data from those who know those SOs and ACs the best. So I think we violently agree. And then there is two more in the queue, Athina and then Matthew.

ATHINA FRAGKOULI: Yes, hello, thank you very much. So I understand that, of course, you know, for our work it is useful that we have certain criteria as a point of reference, and I understand also that the group realizes the particularities of SO and AC, and we cannot have this criteria as a hard criteria, let's say, for… In fact, that should be fulfilled for each SO and AC, even the particularities for each SO and AC.

So, I would like to note down that these are not hard criteria, so we do not give the impression that each SO and AC has to really, you know, tick all of these criteria, but these are more like points of reference. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks Athina. Matthew.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Steve and Cheryl, I think you've pointed to something, and Athina as well, I think you've pointed to something that's absolutely critical for the success of this group, which is we need to work with the SOs and ACs. We cannot be imposing some account mechanism from this working group.

So I think that the assessing, the engagement and the assessing of the accountability mechanisms and tools that the SOs and ACs have, has to be undertaken by them. I think what we need to do is really look at encouraging a frank assessment within the SOs and ACs of their accountability tools and mechanisms, and perhaps from that, we as a group, may be able to determine at a kind of overall level, the meta level, if you will, what enhancements might be possible as recommendations, as a part of this working plan that we eventually will deliver.

So as you say, I think I just wanted to reinforce the absolute imperative of not us deciding something in isolation, but working with the SOs and ACs, and as Athina said, being very aware of and working with them at the same time. Thanks.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you Matthew. We have to talk about this in a previous call, but as one of you rapporteurs, I would like to request now that before our next call, can the members of each, the members on the phone who are part of this group, if you are a part of GNSO, can you try to come back to the next meeting by diving into the GNSO procedures and surfacing

the way in which the GNSO does an internal enforcement of accountability?

Same thing with respect to Alan and others of you, Cheryl, who are in the ALAC, the ASO? I don't see that we have representation from ccNSO on the call, but we certainly have GAC members on the call. I don't think we have any SSAC or RSAC. But we are supposed to have members from each and every AC and SO be part of each team.

I don't think we went out and deliberately recruited them, but if we are missing a perspective then you are going to have to do some active outreach to request that each AC and SO help us understand a way in which they have accountability mechanisms in their own internal procedures, which are not in the bylaws of ICANN.

Because all I had done on the table in pages three and four, was what the bylaws say about outside independent reviews of the ACs and SOs. There is certainly a very rich fabric of accountability mechanisms that Cheryl and Matthew have talked about that are within each and every SO and AC.

So, we have just three minutes left. Matthew, is your hand still up?

And then Cheryl and Farzaneh, I'll turn it over to you for a closing words with a couple of minutes left.

FARZANEH BADII: Thank you Steve. I have nothing else to say. Thanks a lot for participating this week.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And Cheryl, if there is nothing further from you, thanks to everyone helping move this along. Hopefully by our next call, we can put some meat on the bones on the table in three and four, pages three and four, to indicate accountability mechanisms and structures that occur inside a SO and AC, and hope that gets us on the same track.

Matthew, at the same time, please try and continue to flesh out the slide criteria for accountability. Thank you everyone. Have a wonderful rest of your week.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]