
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and this is the sixth meeting of the Support Organization and Advisory Committee Accountability Work Team for the 50 WG ICANN Accountability Work Stream 2. It is 0500 UTC on the 8th of September, and we have – I've seen at least one lot of apologies come through, I saw Greg Shatan's apology come through, and if anyone else has any other apologies – my granddaughter is not offering an apology; she is offering an opinion – if you could make note of it in the chat so that staff know we'll have it recorded. Even though there's not an enormous number of people on the call today, we will take our roll call from the Adobe Connect room participants list. So if you are in audio only – in other words, if you're only on the telephone line – if you could let us know now, and we'll note your name as an attendee.

Not hearing anybody. Let's assume that who we have in the AC room and on my lap – and there is only one person on my lap; she's fifteen months old – in the attendees for today's call, any really errant typing that comes through the chat will be probably my granddaughter and not me, but you all know how badly I type. And at this point, I'm going to mute before it gets even noisier, and hand it over to Farzaneh and Steve to get our call up and running. Over to you, Farzaneh.

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.

FARZANEH BADI:

Thank you, Cheryl. Farzaneh Badi speaking. Hi, everyone. So, during our last session, we decided that it would be good to start with Track 3, which requires us to propose a detailed working plan on enhancing SO/AC accountability. And during the last session, to start that, we decided to ask the SO/AC – I worked hard with Karen’s Accountability Team [AUDIO BREAK] mechanisms that they have in place. So we would be wise to start a group discussion on that, and then our other agenda item would be about what have we actually interpreted working plan, which is actually in the Track 3, which says that “propose a detailed working plan on enhancing SO/AC. So, what do we mean by “working plan”? How do we come up with the working plan? And then, the other agenda item would be on the new bylaws on SO/AC accountability, which we think that we should also focus on and get a clear idea of what bylaws say about SO/AC accountability. I will pass it to Steve at this point. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Hi, Farzaneh. It’s Steve DelBianco. So this is just under the part of the agenda where we’re reviewing our last call. I did want to try to resolve any ambiguity about – if Karen and the staff could load the slides that we presented on the last call, go to slide three – we were recounting the fact that Recommendation #10, which is also known as Annex 10, in the work that we did on our final report, was then translated by the lawyers into the new section of the bylaw regarding these independent reviews. These independent, external reviews required by the board every five years of every SO/AC with the exception of the GAC. The part that was new was little Roman numeral three, which indicated that the review is to determine whether an SO/AC is accountable to its constituency

stakeholder groups, organizations, and other stakeholders. It looked like there was some ambiguity, whether the words “other stakeholders” – I wonder if Karen – thank you, Karen – whether the words “other stakeholders” are outside the SO/AC, or are they inside? Thank you, Karen. And if – go to slide three, if you don’t mind. Thank you very much.

So, please, everyone, you’ll see at the bottom of the screen, that’s the language from the new bylaws. And for the absence of doubt and ambiguity, I went back to Annex 10 – which this came from – I went to page 1 in Annex 10, which Karen’s going to load in just a second, here – and you’ll see where that came from. So it’s very clear that all of this is internal accountability. All of this. There’s plenty of time for us to discuss the external accountability – that is to say, an SO/AC being accountable outside. But let’s not have any mistake here. The bylaw we just quoted is about internal. And the proof of that is right here on our final report. We’ll give you a moment to look at that. The key phrase is “its respective,” so their respective constituency stakeholder groups, their organizations.

So I think it’s pretty clear that our final report, approved by all the chartering orgs, focus these independent reviews to take a hard look, not just at the effectiveness of each SO/AC, but whether the SO/AC was accountable to its respective stakeholders. And that sort of returns us to our touchstone of what we mean by SO/AC accountability, and makes it clear that the question we raised at the plenary last week and on this call last week was, “To what extent do we need improve an SO/AC’s accountability internally, as well as externally?” But this bylaw is all about internal. Thank you, Farzaneh. I hope that clears that up,

and we can move on with the rest of the agenda, if there's no discussion.

FARZANEH BADII: Thank you. Thank you, Steve. Alan, your hand is up. Please comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you. Steve, I'd like you to clarify. When you say "external," do you mean external to the – I'm not quite sure how to word this, but if we're looking, for instance, at the intellectual property constituency within the GNSO – "external" could mean "all of the IP lawyers in the world who are not participating in ICANN," or it could be "other parts of the overall community who are not intellectual property lawyers." Which "external" are you talking about when you say it is internal, not external?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Alan. I think "external" would be "everyone who's not part of the target constituency of an SO/AC." So in the case of ccNSO, "external" would be "other than ccTLD managers."

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That "external" – and if Karen would reload the slides – Alan, I think that's the answer you expected there, but I did want to keep a lot –

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I –

STEVE DELBIANCO: Go ahead, sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I wasn't really sure. And that's why I was asking, because we've talked about both kinds of "external" over the last month. And in the CCWG itself. So I wasn't quite sure which "external" you were talking about. The focus that I thought a lot of our work was on was, in fact, external to the group, but within the same species, as it were. That is, how do we make sure that the very limited number of people that are participating in ICANN are, in fact, representative of the wider group? And that's how I have been using the term "external." Now you're using it in the other term. So I think just going forward, we need to be really careful that we're clear on which "external" are we talking about in any given instance.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alan, thank you for that. I had Karen reload the slide, and we talked about both – we absolutely did – but I believe that by the word "external" here, I was speaking of "outside of its respective constituencies." For instance, the final slide that we presented at the plenary and on last week's call then looked for accountability beyond the SO/AC members. And in that respect, we looked at four ways in which today, the broader community outside of either the members or

the target members of an SO/AC are involved in four different ways. And that was on the fifth slide that we discussed. So I think that that broader community is what we mean by “external,” although we have, as you indicated, we have talked many times in this group, and one of our key requirements is to make sure that there’s plenty of participation and no barriers to entry, so the target members of an SO/AC are able to participate. Then, Karen, if you go to slide one, you’ll see where that is reflected in the bylaw that was handed to us in this group. The Work Stream 2 bylaw for us says, we were supposed to look at improved processes for participation. Participation is the second line from the bottom on the slide, and that’s taken verbatim from the Work Stream 2 bylaw. So that participation was a reaction to the stress test from NCI about barriers to entry. So if a group of IP lawyers found that they somehow couldn’t join the GNSO, that we would find a way to make it open to them. Not the best example, Alan, because I believe they could find their way into anything. We need to look at both; I was just clarifying that the independent review section – as you pointed out, that was new – is new, but it is explicitly for internal accountability. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADI:

Thanks, Steve. Kavouss, your hand is up. Please comment.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

I think some of these words like “external,” “internal,” were put in the Work Stream 1 in the [inaudible] without knowing what it means. If we take GNSO, my beloved group, what does “external” mean in relation to

that group? Does “external to the GNSO” mean “other SO/ACs”? Does “external to the GNSO” mean “those people who have some interest in the activities of the GNSO, but do not participate in those activities in a physical or any other way”? Or it may be totally people outside the structure and constituency of ICANN, [inaudible] different than people externally make such action. So I don’t think that people were thoughtful when they put “external/internal.” This just came like this. This is the activities of the Work Stream 1. Some of the midnight session were coming from people, 14 participants approved having the group, no time to discuss, approved going to their own group, approved going to ICANN, approved [inaudible], approved – and so on, and so forth. So we don’t know what does it mean, “external,” and what does it mean, “internal.” Internal GNSO with so many top constituencies is very, very difficult to understand.

FARZANEH RADII:

Thank you, Kavouss. Alan, it’s your – [AUDIO BREAK].

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I’m going to both agree and disagree with Kavouss, because I think the problem is a little different than what he is describing. The problem is that each of our groups are different. As an example, the ASO has a very limited constituency as it is, and the people who are on the ASO are selected by their own constituency. If they are not represented, it’s because the people who put them there don’t care and aren’t paying attention. There is no wider community outside. In the case of the GAC, each of the GAC members is responsible to their own

government, and the GAC is responsible to make sure that it provides a forum for these people in a fair and reasonable manner, but not necessarily to the other governments who aren't there. So each of the groups – and I'll go on and when we come to the review of each – of talking about the groups – I'll talk a little bit about the ALAC and At-Large – but each of the groups is very different. And internal versus external and the wider community, whatever that is, will have different meanings in each. So it's fine to use the words "internal" and "external" in the documents, but they're going to have to be interpreted and have – there are going to be nuances of how we use them in each case. And they are not going to be repeated over and over in the same way. So, I think going forward, we need to recognize that. Thank you.

FARZANEH RADII:

Thank you, Alan. So, we can move on – if there are no other comments, we can move on to our next agenda item. Okay, I can see Sebastien's hand is up. Sebastien, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes. Sorry to be late to raise my hand. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. Yeah, I think we are talking about [inaudible] elements here, and maybe we need to figure that out by, I will say, circles. You have the first circle; it's the one inside any group, SO/ACs, or constituency, or RALO, or whatever, and that's the first circle. And then you have a larger circle; for example, it could be all ICANN SO/ACs, and then that's external to the SO/AC, but internal to ICANN. And then you have the whole world, and that's external to the SO/AC and external to ICANN. And maybe we

can try to frame what is the accountability to all the groups within ICANN, and to others outside of ICANN. Maybe it's something we can help to figure out and maybe, thinking about what I am saying, there are three circles. The first one, it's the smaller organizations within ICANN: constituencies, RALOs, and then there are the SO/AC's, and then ICANN, and then the rest of the world. At least, it's how I figure it out. Thank you very much. Though of course, it's maybe not a circle, but something elliptic, or whatever. But it's a design we may have in mind to discuss this issue. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII:

Thanks. Steve, your hand is up. Would you like to make a comment?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

I only wanted – this is Steve DelBianco – what [inaudible] something that Alan pointed out with Sebastien's circle metaphor. Sebastien, the first circle is probably the active members who show up at an SO/AC. And then the second circle, which Alan pointed out earlier in the call, might be people that are eligible to be members, but are not, for whatever reason. They may not care, or they may not find it acceptable. So in the ccNSO, the first circle is the ccTLD managers who have joined and are active in the ccNSO; the second circle is all ccTLD managers, including those who are eligible but just don't participate; the third circle, I think you indicated, was the rest of ICANN; and maybe the fourth circle is the rest of the world outside of ICANN. And I think that is somewhat useful, and I appreciate the metaphor. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII: Thanks. Okay, so we can go to the next agenda item, which is what are the current SO/AC accountability mechanisms? And what we could do, as this is [inaudible] in relation to propose a detailed working plan for enhancing SO/AC accountability, which is one of our mandates. So the question is, what are the current SO/AC accountability mechanisms, and we could talk about – we could have a group discussion now – and then ask the leaders of the SO/AC about this question, or send the question to the list. I think we – Kavouss’s hand is up. Please, Kavouss, take the mic.

[AUDIO BREAK]

FARZANEH BADII: Kavouss, we cannot hear you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I said, discussion on those four circles is just inconclusive, and we should come back to that. I don’t know whether we should take those circles from inside the ccNSO to the outside world, but I have no problem that someone makes a list of that, but we need to come back to see [inaudible] Sorry, I wanted to read [inaudible] back to you [inaudible] discuss existing [inaudible].

FARZANEH BADII: Thank you, Kavouss. So – well, if there is no group discussion on the question that we have in the agenda, then we can continue this discussion that we are having, as well, which I think is the question of

who we are accountable to, but - okay. I don't see any other hands. So then, to go back to our previous – okay, yes, Kavouss. Please.

[AUDIO BREAK]

FARZANEH BADII: Kavouss, we cannot hear you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I think you said that you wanted to raise a question to SO/AC. The question should be quite simple: “What sort of accountability is currently being effective or effected, or is done in your SO/AC?” As simple as that. Or we have to find a solution in the type of question which is easy to understand. I have no problem. Either we could have it quite quickly and send it to the SO/AC and get it back, but it may not be so quickly. Some of them are not too quick. In the case of GAC, this could not come back until GAC has the fiscal meeting. In some others, maybe quicker. So, we have to find out the [inaudible] and formulate the question if you want to be effective, unless you wanted to postpone it to the next meeting. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII: Thank you, Kavouss. So, would you agree with the – agree that we send the question to the leaders of SO/ACs, or do we send it to the group to discuss, to get a list, the mailing list that the [inaudible] has. Any comments on that?

[AUDIO BREAK]

[CROSSTALK] Cheryl, your hand is up.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Farzaneh. I would say that, within our group, we should compose the question with appropriate background, so that we all agree what the question is, and then how we route it to the leadership of each SO/AC is more of an administrative matter. But we ought to be consistent about how we ask the question. Before we even finish that, I think it would be so helpful to have one, if not two, members on this group who are familiar with the accountability mechanisms of their respective SO/AC to walk us through how they do it today. I honestly believe that that walk-through will instruct us in how to make our question, or phrase our question, in a way that will be easier for others to respond. We should have an idea in mind of what it looks like, and then ask the question of everyone. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII: Thanks, Steve. Alan, your hand is up. Please comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I was basically going to say what Steve said. In the case of At-Large, you have one chair and one ex-chair sitting on this group today. That isn't the case in most of the groups, so I think there's no choice but for us to formulate the question and then send it out.

STEVE DELBIANCO: But Alan, if you – [CROSSTALK]

FARZANEH BADII: That's great. I can see –

STEVE DELBIANCO: I'm sorry, Farzaneh, I was just following up with Alan – [CROSSTALK]

FARZANEH BADII: Okay. Go ahead. Go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. Thank you. Of just possibly that if Alan and Cheryl, in the positions that you are, can you talk to us about at least your view of the mechanisms, such as they are, within the ALAC for this accountability, this internal accountability of the ALAC today. And maybe it'll spark the rest of us to do the same sorts of investigations in the places where we work today.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure, I'd be glad to.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, were you asking me to do that this second, or were you just asking me if I'm agreeing?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, right now. Go for it.

ALAN GREENBERG: [inaudible]. Right now, okay. Okay, first of all, again, there are nuances in how we use words. If you look at the case of the GNSO, there is a GNSO council and there is a GNSO, which is the wider community. In the case of the ALAC, the ALAC is comparable to the GNSO council. The wider community is called At-Large. Now, we are in a curious situation in how we've written the new bylaws, that we talk about the GNSO equivalent to ALAC, which it isn't. The GNSO is the larger community, and the GNSO council is their arms and legs, as it were, within ICANN, to actually carry out activities, and the same is true. So although we are always talking about accountability of the ALAC, what we're really talking about is accountability of At-Large. The external review that we have periodically is, nominally, a review of the ALAC; but, in fact, it's a review of At-Large. So put that in the background as I'm talking.

So the real issue is, how is the ALAC, as the arms and the mouth, as it were, of At-Large answerable, accountable to the overall unit – to the overall community that is At-Large, which in turn, is representing the needs of 4 billion users. The first-order answer is, people turn over and most of the people on the ALAC are named by the outer community. So at some level, one would hope that if people get returned, or selected on the ALAC, it is because the community that appoints them believes that they are, in fact, going to represent them. And so, the simple mechanism of how the people are selected is how it is accountable. The

same as the councilors for the Business Constituency on the GNSO are selected by the Business Constituency, and presumably, they're not picking people who will go rogue and do something else. So the mechanisms by which people are selected to represent the organization is a very large part of the accountability mechanism. And of course, how well those groups take their – how seriously they take their responsibility and how much they understand that by picking who they pick, they are impacting the results – well, just like how we elect political leaders in the real world. Some groups take it very seriously, and others pick people based on qualities that you might not think are the right qualities that they should be picking their leaders based on. This part of our world is no different than the rest of the world.

So to a very large extent, our accountability mechanisms within At-Large are based on how people get promoted to the top of the pyramid, where they're in a position to act on behalf of At-Large. And the real accountability depends on how importantly they take their responsibilities. But there's a catch to it. Just like ICANN is a multi-stakeholder group, like the GNSO is a multi-stakeholder group, At-Large is a multi-stakeholder group. We have people from various diverse cultures, geographic regions – they don't all think alike. So, if you say, "Is the ALAC acting on behalf of all of the users?" at any given time, there are some who support what we're doing and some who object to it. The validity of our mechanisms is based on how well we can weigh those and try to find the middle ground. So the accountability of At-Large, I think, is wholly dependent on how seriously people all the way down in the pyramid take their responsibility. I can go on for hours, but I think that's the summary.

FARZANEH BADI: Thank you. Thank you, Alan. I can see Steve's question. He's asking if At-Large has a procedure document charter, or other document where this is described.

ALAN GREENBERG: You bet. Well, the answer is, because we're a distributive organization, we have many documents. The ALAC has a very formal set of rules, and a formal process by which those rules are changed. The RALOs, each of the five regional organizations, have their own set of rules that they operate under. And each of the At-Large structures within the RALOs are each independent organizations that have their own rules, also. So it's a very distributive model. But yes, all the way down the pyramid, there are rules; some of which we have access to, some of which are none of our business, because we don't delve into the business of the individual organizations that are our members. But there are processes that are within our control as to how they interact with us.

FARZANEH BADI: Yeah, that's good. Thank you very much. Sebastien, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Farzaneh. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. First of all, I would like to be sure that it's clear that when we – when Alan was talking about At-Large – it's in the sense of At-Large within ICANN. Because this [inaudible] with capital letters, with small letters, and that's a different meaning, and that's where I think one day, somebody needs to

come back with a name for the “At-Large within ICANN” different to the “At-Large to the whole world.”

My second point is more a question of methodology. I appreciate the input of Alan, but I think really it would be better to ask each SO/AC of each group within ICANN, to come back with an answer, with a collective answer, because I think the way we present it is important. And I will let you raise the issue of the accountability within At-Large, within ALAC, but I think it will be better to have this discussion within each group and to come back to this group. Thank you very much.

FARZANEH BADII:

Thank you, Sebastien. That comment is noted. Kavouss, please go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

I tend to agree with Steve. Let us formulate the question, send it to SO/AC, and see what happens. I’m sure that if the question goes to ALAC, it is not Alan Greenberg who replies. Alan Greenberg who conveys the replies [inaudible] ALAC. Whether they want to go to the At-Large, and so on, so forth – that is up to them. But for the time being it is better to concentrate on the usefulness of this question, formulate it and send it, and wait for replies. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII:

Thank you, Kavouss. Okay, so we are now through – we have decided that we formulate the question carefully within our group, and then we will send it to the leaders of SO/AC for them to discuss it with their

group and come back to us. The other thing that we might want to discuss is the interpretation of – what do we mean by coming up with a working plan, enhancing SO/AC accountability? Because the term “working plan” was actually used in the proposal of CCWG, and it was said that we’d need to work on a working [AUDIO BREAK]. So I was wondering if [inaudible] had a comment on that. If you don’t have a comment or any kind of idea of what this working plan should entail, then – yeah, okay, I can see Steve. Steve, please.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Farzaneh, the slides you have on the screen is what our charter is in the bylaws. And the key words are for us to “review and develop.” So, we are supposed to review SO/AC accountability and to develop ways to improve the processes for its accountability, transparency, participation, that are helpful to prevent captures. So that’s on the screen in front of you, so we should start with each of the SO/ACs, where we do a review of its accountability mechanisms today, such as what Alan described. And it’s possible that a good bit of that review of the status quo will be handed to us when we look at the staff briefing paper for this group, which I believe staff should have ready for us by the end of the week. So there’s a – I’m hopeful that the review part would be covered by the staff review, and then we begin to develop these improvements to the process for accountability to its constituencies, look at the transparency about what happens in SO/AC, the participation part is the idea that our eligible members of an SO/AC, are they actually participating or not? And finally, how are we doing at making sure that the SO/AC is not captured by eligible members who somehow steer it away from its

intended mission? So I think that review and development are the key verbs there. Thanks, Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADII: Thank you, Steve. Just to clarify [inaudible] just one second to clarify this. So, you are suggesting that this working plan has to work on the transparency, participation, and the mechanism to prevent capture. Am I correct?

[AUDIO BREAK]

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. I'm sorry, Farzaneh. All I did was put up our exact, literal charter and found the verbs in there that I think tell us the work we need to do, and exactly the four tracks we need to do it on. Sorry, I don't mean to use the word "tracks." The four areas that we would develop improvements in. I did say that the word "review" could be deferred for a week because it's possible that staff's report will take care of much of our "review" part, and we can then focus on the "develop" part. I hope that helps.

FARZANEH BADII: Yes, thank you. That's very helpful. Kavouss? Please –

[AUDIO BREAK]

STEVE DELBIANCO: Not hearing you, Kavouss.

FARZANEH BADII: Sorry, Kavouss, we cannot hear you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: [AUDIO BREAK] – not talk to this group. Review and development should be based on reviewing the accountability, reviewing the existing transparency, reviewing the existing participation, but we don't review that. We just publish ways and means how this review and development should be done. This group is not reviewing the ccNSO accountability. This is not up to us. We are not mandated to do that. We just establish the process – how this review is to be done – and suggest it to the CCWG, and then go to the ICANN board. So, we are not responsible for review; let us make it quite clear. We don't have such qualifications to review. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII: Thank you, Kavouss. So with that comment, Steve, would you like to answer it – oh, Alan's hand is up. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, just one comment. Our job is not to review accountability; but our job is to try to understand what accountability means. And we're talking about asking each AC/SO so that we can get a better grasp on what the concept means, not so we can pass judgment on them. Thank you. At least, that was my understanding.

FARZANEH BADI: Steve, please go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. I agree with Alan; and yes, Kavouss, we aren't doing a review of the ALAC. But in our review of each SO/AC, we would look at their existing processes with an eye towards understanding what they are. We're supposed to review what the processes are – not review the ALAC, but review what are their processes – and then to suggest improvements to the process, to improve accountability, transparency, participation, and prevention of capture. There is no review of the group, but only a review of what its processes are.

[AUDIO BREAK]

FARZANEH BADI: Sorry, I keep muting myself. Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I think that part of the question is to reformulate it. I think the main theme would be to each SO/AC, what is the status of accountability, or level of accountability that prevails in your group? What is the situation or level of transparency, and what is the level of participation, and ways and means that you [inaudible] SO/AC suggest to further improve that? This is the [inaudible] also, the skeleton of the questions, perhaps more elaborated, explored, expanded by those highly qualified experts – not me – and then send it to the [inaudible]. That's all. But we are not doing it, we're just asking questions based on the replies that we have received from various [AUDIO BREAK], compare with them the

applicability to the scope of each group, whether this group would have some further comment on that, and then send it forward. So we should have one question which has three parts. It's a very, I would say, diplomatic model that's just asking the questions, and to see what the reply would be. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADI: Thank you. Thank you, Kavouss. Okay, so I think we have – Kavouss, your hand is still up. Was that your old hand or a new one?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: No, I'm sorry. Old hand. Sorry.

FARZANEH BADI: Okay, thank you very much. Okay, so I think we have reached – we have covered our agenda items, and we have an actionable item to work on the question we want to send to the SO/AC leaders on the mailing list, and discuss it within the group. And that's about it. If anyone – okay, Steve, yes. Please comment.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah, thank you, Farzaneh. Steve DelBianco. As one of the three rapporteurs here, our job as rapporteurs is to write down and take action from what the group decides. So I want to be clear about how we phrase this question for the SO/AC leaders. You would all, of course, review the draft before it's sent, but it strikes me that the question we put to them will probably fit on one sheet of paper. It would start with

the slide you see in front of you, which is what the Work Stream 2 bylaws said about our group. In other words, it says who we are and what we were told to do. I think we should follow it up with Recommendation #10 and #12, which are the second and third slides – Karen can scroll to that, if you wish, or Brenda – we should follow up by explaining that that bylaw came from and refers explicitly to the Final Report Recommendation #10 and #12, and that gets into the discussion of the different things we’re supposed to look at, so they understand why we’re asking them. And we probably don’t, in this question, have to ask each SO/AC the extent to which they are accountable outside of their target membership. We don’t even know to what extent we need to look at that, and it’s probably not part of the question we want to put to them. So we could say that – I would suggest to you that the rapporteurs could take the first three slides on the screen in front of you – you can all scroll now – the first three slides, which is just documenting what we were asked to do, both by the final report and the bylaws, and take those three slides and have them end with a question in italics: “Would you be able to point us to the resources, the documents, procedures that you have, and any other explanatory texts if necessary, making every attempt to explain the four dimensions of accountability, transparency, participation, and prevention of capture?” How does that sound?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Kavouss, is that an old hand, or – Cheryl; this is a response to Steve. If that’s a new hand, go ahead briefly, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I don't think that we could raise the question that's formulated by Steve, saying that to what extent you are accountable to the external of your group. This is not the question. We could mention that how the issue of accountability is dealt with in your group. That's all. And then go to transparency, and go to the participation. But we're not talking from the very beginning, external or internal. If you ask such questions, you will have answers requesting further clarification by "external" and "internal." In some groups, it may be easy; in some other groups, like GNSO and ALAC, it may be difficult. External – you have the three layers, as mentioned. So we should say, how your group or your constituency, or whatever you named the SO/AC, deals with the accountability, and leave it to them to say this. But you're not talking external, internal accountability, internal accountability – you make the question very complex.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Kavouss. It's Cheryl here, and I want to make it really clear, as Steve did in the chat – at no point did we say this question would have anything to do with external accountability. That is not anything we're asking about. However, I think the way you framed your general question will give us a good introductory text as we ask the specific questions of each of the AC/SOs about their accountability mechanisms.

[AUDIO BREAK]

FARZANEH BADI: Steve, please go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Farzaneh and Cheryl, everyone else on the team – if, in fact, the staff briefing paper, the issues paper that they’re preparing for our group already delineates any of the accountability mechanisms inside of the SO/ACs today, well then I’d like to know from staff what’s in it. I’ve yet to see a draft; perhaps some of you have. But if it does, let’s not send that question out. The staff’s just about to answer much of it for us. So if anyone from staff, or anyone here who’s seen a draft can speak to the briefing paper that’s coming from staff – thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Steve, it’s Cheryl again. Look, I’m not going to put staff on the spot. Nobody, as far as I know, other than staff, has seen any drafting of it yet. Obviously, it will be with us shortly, so we can do some rough capture and drafting of text that we would find desirable to send out to the AC/SOs if, indeed, we need to. In the next couple of days, before the close of the week, we should have the document by close of week, or at latest, early next week. And I think you mentioned that we would, in fact, take some time to review that document before we go live with any such questions for the AC/SOs. And even my granddaughter thinks that’s a good way forward. So let’s leave that for confirmation on the list, but we can certainly start – we need to, anyway – the capture from today’s meeting to put a very light framework of what we would want to be asking when and if we need to ask them.

Farzaneh, so back to you and Steve to close the call and [inaudible] any other business. It is possible that, should we discover that we need the

time to digest – a gargling noise contributed by the granddaughter – to digest this staff document next week, that we may look at reviewing our call next week. But we'll do that when we know exactly what's going on. And I might point out that I was on a CCWG call while this child was born, so if anything, she interrupts me [inaudible]. Over to you, Steve and Farzaneh, to wrap it up in a somewhat more quiet manner than I'm going to do. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADI:

Thank you, Cheryl. Okay, so we're going to – if there is no other business, and if there are no other comments, we are going to – Sebastien, yes, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, sorry. Just Sebastien Bachollet speaking. About "any other business," I just want to raise one point – not to be answered or even discussed today, but – I really think that this group needs to take advantage of the exchange during the Hyderabad meeting, whether we are with our work, it will be useful to exchange with others, and not just the CCWG, but maybe the leaders of SO/ACs. And if we can frame some question or some ideas about what exchange we can have during the Hyderabad meeting, it will be good. I think we can leave that in to the end of the co-rapporteur. But if you can come back to us in one of the future meetings, it would be great. Thank you very much.

FARZANEH BADI: Thanks a lot, Sebastien. [inaudible]. Okay, if there are no other comments, we are going to adjourn the meeting. I don't see any other comments. Okay, thank you very much, everyone. Oh, Kavouss. Kavouss's hand is up. Please, Kavouss, comment.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Yes. [AUDIO BREAK] What time is our next meeting, Thursday? Sorry, yes. Next Thursday?

FARZANEH BADI: Yes, it is always on Thursday, but I'm not sure [inaudible], I'm not sure what time it's going to be next week. I have [AUDIO BREAK].

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Because we have so many other meetings, and we should know which one. A few people like me, we have meetings from 3:00 to 5:00, from 5:00 to 7:00, and now we have from 11:00, so there are so many meetings. It is better to know in advance, if possible. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Kavouss, the – Cheryl here – the rotation of call times is exactly the same each following week. We will follow exactly the same rotation as we have before, and I believe they'll be all advertised, but I will ask staff to do it again if you have lost the link to the master file of meetings. We are all aware, because we are all in all of these meetings, how many are on at the moment.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: There is no master plan, sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, actually, I think you'll find that Bernie did send a link out to a complete run of the master plan for our work. Certainly I saw such a thing, and if you haven't, I'm deeply sorry for that, but I'll make sure you find a link for it very, very soon. And with that, I think we can wrap this call up, and thank each and every one of you for the time you've taken today. Karen, if you can ask Bernie to track out that link again and send it through the list, and – here we are, Karen's actually put it into the chat for you, Kavouss. So if you would like to click on the link in the chat that Karen Mulberry has just re-posted to us all, you will find the link of not just our meetings, but all of the sub-group calls. Hopefully that will help your planning; it certainly has helped the planning of the rest of us. Thank you, one and all; thank you, staff, and thank you for your attention today. Thank you Steve, thanks Farzaneh, and we'll talk more and don't forget, we're always online. Bye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]