
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. This is the seventh meeting of the Work Stream 2 Support Organization and Advisory Committee Accountability subgroup. And it is 1900 hours UTC on Thursday the 22nd, if memory serves me correctly. We have a group of people in the room and hopefully a few more, both active participants and observers for this sub-team to join us in this call. We recognize that rotating our hours may [inaudible] people [far as] more time zones convenient and others can join. And we have been given notice from a couple of people that we have people who will be joining a few minutes late anyway.

So let's not delay. Both Farzaneh and I are on the call today. We are hoping that our first co-rapporteur, Steve DelBianco, will be in a position to join us in a little while. That is dependent on when he is released from commitments. Apparently something's going on discussion-wise [really] an ICANN transition in the capital of America, at the moment. For some reason Steve is being called to talk to people about that. And we felt that perhaps that was his first priority. I trust you all accept his apology. We certainly wish him and the rest of the team who are working so very hard to complete discussions on the IANA transition with some semblance of accuracy and effectiveness all the very best. And for the rest of us I guess it's just theater we have to watch.

So noting Steve's apology, I'd like to ask if there's any other apologies that anyone is aware of, and we can put those to the record. And of

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.

course if you do have an apology and you are listening to this [audio in audio] a transcript later. If you send your name to staff we will note your apology, as well.

As has been our habit in [wasting] time, we will be taking the attendance from a listing of attendees at the Adobe Connect room. But if you happen to be on audio only, if you're only on the phone link, then feel free to let us know now, and we will include your name. Not hearing anyone, and not seeing any indication on Skype or any other sort of channels that someone is only on audio at the moment, let's take our attendance as listed and to be listed in the Adobe Connect room as read.

That's some of the administrivia for today's call. I have some extra administrivia, of course. One of them is if you would please be so kind as to identify yourself when you start speaking, I'll try my hardest to remember to do the same. And if you could do that also. But a very important task – now first of all let me ask if there's anyone who has updates to the Statements of Interest that are needing to be reported. Thank you very much. And remember that your Statements of Interest do need to be constantly updated. And if you have problems updating your Statement of Interest, please let staff know, and I'll be more than happy to assist you.

Now to the pleasantness at hand. And this is where I may have limitations in my language ability as an Australian. I'm quite sure many of you recognize that even English isn't my first language. We mangle the English language, apparently, and have some variation on it. But I want to note and welcome Yvette Guigneaux. Anyway, I'm sure she'll

identify how I should be saying her second name. Brenda and Karen are to be [overly] assisted by Yvette in our Work Stream 2 work, and I'm delighted. I think we might be one of the earliest groups to get to work with it. Welcome aboard of it, and we look forward to having a little extra pressure off our hard-working staff, as well.

The final sort of administrivia, which falls to me before I start sharing all of this with Farzaneh, is if anyone has any notification of any other business that we will be needing to come to by the end of the call and you'd like to let us know now – I will be calling for any other business again later, but sometimes there are people who have any other business that they wish to deal with.

And following that, I just wanted to respond to an email that arrived 20 minutes before the start of today's call to me from our member, Kavouss. It is as follows, and he has referred to it in a chat somewhat insistently. And I wanted to read it to the record and reply formally to him. It says the following, "Dear Cheryl, I hope you have not forgotten a complete list of questions that I, as a formal CCWG member, raised and yet to be answered. Regards, KA." Not really sure you, on behalf of Farzaneh, Steve and myself, Kavouss, that we had absolutely no intention of forgetting, ignoring or otherwise skipping over any of the contributions made by any of our members in our fulsome and future discussions. We are, however, quite aware that some of the questions we have in part, at least, felt we've seen the documentation and responses that we have been discussing to date. And others, we believe, may very well be dealt with to some extent when we get the staff's paper on accountability.

So when we do our review, and we are hopeful, as you will see in the agenda, that that will be done perhaps at next week's meeting. We will be able to then take a final listing of yours and any other specific questions and look at them as tasks or checkpoints for our future deliberations, at which meeting this will occur, or any of them that occur in which order I can't tell you yet. That will be up to us as co-rapporteurs as we go through our agenda.

It is, of course, interesting that we have not only your input to discuss, but the input of every one of our members. And most importantly, some of our work is going to be contingent on the feedback we get from the SOs and ACs. And it's getting the requested questions out to the SOs and the ACs that we certainly believe, and I like to think that the majority of our members and observers here today would agree with, has got to be our priority for at least this call. Once we have put out our request to the ACs and the SOs, then we know we have a small amount of time to perhaps deal with other matters until we get that feedback back. And of course some of that feedback itself may be germane and quite specifically relate to your questions, which to serve everyone's memory, were sent out to us all at the very beginning in an email document.

And I'd like to welcome Steve DelBianco. I'm delighted to see you're here, Steve. I thought they'd surely have you in the trenches up on The Hill, but we will now do a three-way split of our agenda. I will stop a diatribe and [wasn't doing a filibust]. I certainly wanted, however, to give Kavouss's question and recall for prompt attention to the questions that specifically he has raised in this matter enough care and attention

that he can be left in no doubt that we are taking it not as to be ignored, but as to be read and dealt with.

With that, I'm going to have a sip of my coffee and hand over our very next piece of work to probably Farzaneh. We were going to have a very brief review of our last call. Farzaneh, over to you and Steve as he wishes to drop in. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADI:

Thank you, Cheryl. Farzaneh Badii speaking. So during our last call we discussed how to put forward the question of the accountability in the [accounting zones] of SOs and ACs to SOs and ACs. And we discussed this briefly with the group, and it was decided that we'd reach out to the leaders of SOs and ACs and ask the question about their accountability and [account zones]. However, it is better to discuss this through our mailing list to come up and frame the question first and then discuss around the process of how we are going to approach the leaders and what will be the timeframe for the responses and other steps. That's all for me, Cheryl. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks very much. Farzaneh has caught me with a mouthful of my breakfast, so hopefully you will hear no choking sounds. You were far too prompt. Steve, anything to contribute while I swallow?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

No ma'am.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Darn it. You two are going to do the best to choke me this morning. I think I've regained my ability to breathe and speak and not be seen as a statistic of the Work Stream 2 Accountability process. All right, almost finished swallowing. That'll teach me. If we can now move to our third agenda item, we will – sorry, I should stop laughing in a moment. We will delve into – and it may very well be that some of you have thought on this and particularly some of you who are already leadership, or taking leadership roles within these [inaudible] ACs and the SOs may have particular contributions. But as it was agreed at our last call, it is going to be most useful if we have a list of specific questions about some bylaws, and indeed questions that can go beyond that. But some of that will depend on or be modified by what we now see in the review on the staff paper. But we'll come to that in the next moment or two.

We see bylaws, such recommendations 10 and 12. We do have particular questions that we could and should frame, so the posing of our question as co-rapporteur to this group is, can we start some of the drafting now? We would like to think that your answer would be yes, and then we can actually start doing that and cut the time a bit off of this call.

So to pose the question now then to you all, perhaps you'd like to indicate with a little green tick, or perhaps you'd like to raise your hand and speak to the matter. Either would be fine. If we get hands raised, we'll take those in advance of tallying up any agreement ticks. Do you think we should, as we do as rapporteurs, think we should get on to

starting some of the text for the questions to be sent to the SO and AC chairs?

I'm noting the [check versus] are saying the following. Co-chairs, you are referring to ask – sorry. I'm trying to get the check large enough for me to see and deal with 42 kilos of Great Dane which has just arrived on my lap. Co-chairs, you are referring to some questions from SO/AC. What are those questions? What is the expectations [that will] SO/ACs' reply?

I'll take this. Perhaps my lack of ability in the English language is even more dire than I was aware of. The question that Alejandra is posing to you all is, "Shall we, as we believe we should, start drafting the questions?" So to answer your question about questions, that's the work we're doing today. "What are the expectations that the SOs and ACs reply?" I would like to think that chartering organizations would take questions from sub-teams, which will be sent to them via the CCWG as a whole after the CCWG approve and finally sign off on any such questions. On our behalf from the co-chairs I would like to think that the chartering organizations would take that very seriously, indeed, and that they would respond accordingly.

So now let's move to Matthew. Matthew is asking, "Would you mind reminding us of the charter questions we are speaking about?" I'll be happy to do so, Matthew. But to take us back to our discussion in our last call, which I do admit was a fortnight ago now, not just a week, and that's why we need to stick to weekly meetings, the questions are to be limited to asking the SOs and ACs if they could provide us with some information on how they see their accountability and that those questions and what accountability actions they take, and that those

questions that we draft need to be based on what is in the bylaw charter and in our recommendations 10 and 12 from the final report from the CCWG Work Stream 1.

Steve, do you have any particular wording examples that I can offer our group here?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Cheryl, I just went back to the bylaws that established our group. This is Steve DelBianco. And I put into the chat the nature of the question would be that the chairs of each SO and AC that we would appreciate them pointing to us documents and procedures showing how they do the four elements of accountability to their target community that were put to us in the bylaws. And those were accountability to the target community, transparency, participation of members of the target community, some of whom may or may not be members, and how they prevent capture by any subset of their target community.

And that would be the technical question. We would also want to ask their opinion about the question we put the entire plenary about a month ago, which was the degree to which they believe they should be accountable to global stakeholders outside of their target community. And that was the internal versus external accountability question that we broached.

So both would be good questions, and as Cheryl has indicated, if the staff paper, which we expect next week, already documents their own existing procedures for accountability, transparency, participation and capture, we would not want to bother them with a question that has

already been answered by staff. So we probably don't send a question until we see the staff paper that we've been waiting on. Cheryl, I hope that helps.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

It certainly did, Steve. Thank you very much. You are far more articulate than I am this morning. Perhaps it's because you've had so much practice talking to difficult customers recently. You are more switched on than I am with only one cup of coffee underneath my belt. I hope that is helping some of you understand what is the purpose of our discussion in today's agenda. I noticed that Farzaneh also said we need to discuss the timeframe with the whole group [inaudible]. Yes, of course we do. If we have questions and they are finally drafted and we are about to send them to the CCWG for the plenary's consideration, part of what proper project management would call for would be that we give a suggestion and proposal that a timeframe of – and it may be 10 days, it may be 14 days, it may be that this happens to correspond with a time where we should say it could be returned immediately after the [heart] of that meeting. As a sub-team we'll discuss that and agree with it in a degree of consensus.

So without wanting to jump the gun, Kavouss, we can't say what timeframe we're expecting it because we, the work team, haven't decided yet. But obviously sooner rather than later would be smart. But knowing that we have face-to-face meetings and that some parts of our community would find it easier to make formal responses to specific questions coming out of face-to-face meetings, it occurs at least to me

without having disgusted it all with my co-rapporteurs, that that type of end date immediately after Hyderabad might be a smart one.

Kavouss, I see your hand up. I'm assuming that I have not answered any question you wish to verbally raise for the record. Over to you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Thank you. I am not saying that you have not answered, but my question is – my comment is, first of all, I see no problem if we draft questions which are clear-cut, [it's] possible to reply. The timing of the question is good because after going to CCWG, very probably some of the SOs and ACs would reply to that in their fiscal meeting in Hyderabad if not on the [visual records].

But my question is that, what is the purpose of that? If you receive the answers, I'm sure that the answer would not be a straightforward answer. I have been working on this. I think the answer would be more or less a very general, which may not help you. They put some words together, which does not help you at all. So let us think positively and optimistically waiting for the questions that we raise. I think, and I hope would not be [numerous], just a very few and very clear to answer because I'm sure that from the answers received it could be difficult to interpret the answers without asking additional questions. But let us remain positive and remain optimistic. Let's look for the question, what the question – I think Steve has already [adapted] some, I think that – let us look at that one. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Kavouss. And I can assure you that, like the other co-rapporteurs in this group, and I suspect every other one operating within ICANN will have had a healthy dose of both positivity and optimism firmly as part of their DNA. We'd never be able to deal with running meetings on such frequent schedule with so many diverse views. And I'm also going to assure you that, yes, we would like to keep our questions far from too numerous, but specific, which is one of the reasons we want to draft with you all, as soon as possible, exactly how we should articulate these questions. And I'm certainly not in a position, and I doubt that Steve or Farzaneh or anyone else on this call would be, to successfully gaze into some sort of crystal ball and predict how useful or otherwise the responses from the ACs and SOs may be to us.

But I am quite confident that if we, as a sub-team, were to make judgments and recommendations on the accountability of Support Organizations and Advisory Committees without outreach and engagement with those Advisory Committees and Support Organizations, that would be a rather, not only bizarre, but erroneous way forward. So we do want to go down this pathway to some extent almost regardless of how articulate, and useful, and specific the responses are.

But I'm relatively confident that certainly some of the ACs and the SOs will be able to give us quite specific examples. My own experience, for example, with the rules and procedure the ALAC means that they could quite literally, should they choose to, limit their responses to one or more of our questions to a link that will take us to all sorts of gory details about their own internal accountability processes and procedures. So let's wait and see what we get and then perhaps have

further discussion. I think, Sebastien, your hand was up at least – or Christopher. So over to you, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I hope that you can hear me okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, we can.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: And thank you. And thank you, the other co-chair. I think it's very good initiative, and we need to go as quick as possible to put in writing some of the questions, I guess how Steve wrote in a chat, it's already a good beginning of the question with document procedures for the four different items sent to each SO and AC. I would like to suggest that we add one point, and it's why it will be useful even if we have part of the answer within the staff document. It's to ask them if there are any departures from what is written on the day to day life of sometimes you write something and at the end you are false, or you are – or it's better if you do something differently. And I think it would be interesting to have the real world in conjunction with what it was suggested in the document or procedures within – by each SO/AC and other sub-organization to work on those topics. And thank you for all that. Back to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sebastien. Just make sure the notes reflect what you say absolutely and accurately, folks. You want to capture that. Christopher, over to you. Your mic is muted, Christopher. Yes, we can hear you, go ahead.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: You can hear me? [Thanks,] Cheryl. Three small points. I think this is the third conference call in 48 hours, and we all suffer from this regime. We're nearly half an hour into the call, and we've only heard from three participants. I really think the economy of time and discussion needs to be inverted. We need to hear far more from the participants.

Secondly, regarding the questions and the time delay, there is an English expression, "If you ask a silly question, you get a silly answer." If you ask the leaders of the SO and ACs about their accountability to their members, what do you expect them to say in reply? That they're not accountable to their members? And furthermore, the very answers to the questions will hopefully be subject to further accountability procedures within each of the SOs and ACs. That will take a long time. If you want to do it, do it. But don't expect a quick answer. Or if you do get a quick answer, it will be just one or two people filling in the forms according to their views as to what their own accountability is.

My final point is that the questions seem to miss the critical issue. The really critical issue today, and from my point of view the only issue of accountability that is relevant in Work Stream 2, is the accountability of the delegates of the SOs and ACs to the Empowered Community's decision-making procedures. How did they decide what to say, what

positions to take? How are we to be assured that each delegate to the Empowered Community's decision-making bodies is acting on an accountable and transparent basis vis-à-vis the members of it, of his or hers SO/AC?

That is the political issue. That's essentially how to avoid preventing capture. The rest I feel is going too far. You will not succeed – with due respect to the powers of conviction of our co-chairs – you will not succeed in getting the ACs and SOs each and individually to codify for the benefits of this subgroup the whole of their internal accountability procedures. And if we do, it will take forever.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay, Christopher. Thank you for your opinions on all of those matters, but I certainly think your second to last one we would like to try and look at in particular to frame a question which does ensure that we look at, if at all possible, in a simple and uncomplicated way what, if any, mechanisms of accountability the SOs and the ACs had in place or are planning to have in place to challenge that issue of the delegates to the Empowered Community and their accountability back. I'm certainly not familiar with, for example, every one of the actions that have been taken already by each of the ACs and the SOs to show how they will be selecting people, for example. So there is a bit to be done there, so let's make sure we also include a question that, as it raises that point. Regarding your first – I won't waste any more time responding to it because part of the issue of it being so far in the call and not getting through the discussion of [our possible] drafting of questions is because we've been responding to non-agenda items anyway.

And I would like to think that if we frame some of our questions cautiously and carefully, for example, let us consider the following. If we ask more specific questions, such as, “What, if any, existing and formal internal accountability mechanisms does your Support Organization or Advisory Committee currently have?” It may be they have been asking the generic question of, “How are you accountable,” or “Do you believe you’re accountable?” Because yes, some questions you will get the answers that are led. If you say, “Are you accountable?” most people would say yes.

Let’s move to – and I’m not sure whether it was Farzaneh, you, or Steve who had their hand up first. I’m assuming that both Christopher’s and Kavouss’s hands are [up and] if they are, please put them down. So let’s take Steve first and then Farzaneh.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you. Christopher, we would be so much more productive on these calls if everyone kept in mind the charter, which was documented exhaustively. It was in the bylaws in the Board resolution, setting up Work Stream 2 and the final accountability report recommendations 12 and 10. We don’t have a lot of discretion to say that we’re only going to look at the accountabilities with respect to instructions in the Empowered Community. We don’t. That is part of, but by no means is that the complete picture of what we are charged to do. We are charged to review and develop an assessment of the adequacy of each and every SO and AC’s accountability, not limited to improved processes for accountability, transparency, participation and prevention of capture. And we have several other items that we have to address.

So I appreciate the wisdom of you suggesting that politically we only have to look at the Empowered Community. That's four of the seven SO/ACs and then we only have to look at how they instruct their representative on Empowered Community powers, but if we were to do so it would significantly miss what the bylaws said we're supposed to look at.

So I refer everyone, please, to just look at the report, the Google Doc that we prepare and all of you can edit. It lays out in detail what it is we're supposed to cover. And if we all kept that in mind, I'll bet these calls would go more quickly because that document has the slides in it that we've presented in previous meetings, and it has the discussion of internal and external accountability. I put the link into the chat in case you can't find it.

But that charge is very clear, Christopher, and we can't just simply ignore three quarters of what we were asked to do over what is, in your opinion, the only part that's politically necessary. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Farzaneh, over to you.

FARZANEH BADI: Thank you, Cheryl. Farzaneh Badii speaking. Actually it's public what I wanted to say. I just wanted to also mentioned that we are charged to propose a detailed working plan on enhancing SO and AC accountability as part of this group. So that was one of the rationales behind coming

up with the question and asking it [inaudible] on AC. And that's [inaudible] thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. And Kavouss, that's in your hand, as you assured me. Over to you. We're not hearing you, Kavouss. Check you're unmuted. Kavouss, we're still not hearing you. Staff, can you check that his line – ah, there you are. We hear you now.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: [CROSSTALK] questions or expression of comments that we ask individually the SO/AC. I don't believe so. We are not interested to receive any answers from any individual in a way that accountability, transparency and so on so forth are implemented. We expect to receive something from the SO and AC in general from the entire group, but not from individuals. And I have some difficulty to understand if you ask just a question, for instance, of GNSO, who would reply that? There are two houses, and there are several sub houses and so on and so forth, each of which discusses the way that they implement. For instance, IPT says that this is the way that I ensure the transparency and the accountability and so on and so forth. And the [history] is saying this is the way [inaudible] way.

Then Steve, group they say, so how do you want to come up to see what is the overall view of the GNSO? And how are you going to have the overall view of the ASO? There are three people. It's three groups of people [inaudible] and so on and so forth. How do you want to come up to the reply from the ALAC? They have [mentioned] any time that they

could not say anything with respect to the four [inaudible] people because they don't have any reaction of those things. They could say this is what they do, but who could examine that what they say really observe and respect that of what they have to do? So I think you are talking too much. Steve is talking too much theory. Theory after theory. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Kavouss. I'd encourage you to look at the chart where alternate views, even from the GNSO Council, are being put forward. Alan, seeing as ALAC is being invoked, would you like to go next followed by Sebastien? We're not hearing you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, the system didn't – decided to mute me on its own. I don't know why. Can you hear me now?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, we can. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. As I've said a number of times, the accountability and the processes associated with accountability will be very different for each of our ACs and SOs. So there certainly is no uniformity, and yes, the answer that's going to come back from the ASO is going to be very different from the one that comes back from the GNSO. And in fact, the GNSO is going to have to be the compass that answers of its various

constituent parts because the GNSO is accountable – the GNSO Council is accountable through its own processes, and after that it's up to the individual stakeholder groups or constituencies.

So the answers are going to be different. Whether the answers are going to be truthful and hold water and be defensible, that's a really interesting question. Will someone be able to bluff us out and give answers which have no meaning and no one will notice? I suppose it's possible. It may even be probable in some cases. But our challenge is to try to put an answer together, which when it's looked at has some level of credibility.

So since we have put the faith in the ACs and SOs to ensure that the Board is accountable, I think we have no choice but to at least attempt to go through the process of verifying that our ACs and SOs are, indeed, accountable to a larger body than just the few people who show up at meetings. So I don't see how we have a choice but to go ahead with it and starting by asking questions may not give us all the answers, but it's a good start. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Alan. I noted that Steve wanted to have a right to reply to Kavouss. Yes, we'll come to that. But noting that we don't want to hear too much of our voice, you don't mind, Steve, if I do take Sebastien first? Over to you, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you Cheryl. Sebastien Bachollet. Sorry, Steve, to take the floor. But I think I agree with what Farzaneh just put in a chat that we don't – we can't predict now what will be the answer, and we can't judge. And one thing [inaudible] is that maybe we will find interesting to cross [inaudible] what is done in one group to be done in other groups. And at the end of the day this will help the whole organization to improve, to and answer this [accountability]. Therefore I think it's very important to ask those questions to get a response, and we are not a tribunal. We will not say, "Oh you are doing bad," or, "Oh you are doing well," but maybe with that we will allow those different groups to themselves decide to improve something because they are seeing what's happening in other groups. And I really think that this is a good way to improve things when you take good experience from others. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sebastien. And I think the point you raised regarding the unexpected consequences of us asking such questions might be very worthwhile watching, indeed. I certainly hope that it may be a situation of when people in each of the AC and SO silos also have the opportunity looking at how some of the others are conducting their internal accountability that may be inspiring, as well. Let's go to Steve and then to Kavouss.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Cheryl. Steve DelBianco. The question that Kavouss posed about being theoretical by asking the ACs and SOs could not be further

from the mark. It is a practical consideration that when one group like us is asked to assess, to review and make implementation recommendations about seven ACs and SOs, we would be criticized roundly for failing to ask the chairs of those ACs and SOs for their direction about where their accountability, prevention of capture, transparency and participation rules live. If we were to just assume we could find them, and then not finding them, criticize those groups for lacking procedures, we would be criticized all day long.

So it is imperative politically to ask each of the groups if they want to point us to where their resources are, and it's perfectly within the capability of the Council, chair and GNSO to tell us with the staff's assistance, here's where it is on the GNSO website. So there's nothing theoretical about asking somebody for some guidance before you assess them and make recommendations about how they should improve. Thank you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Steve. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, first of all, GNSO Council does not represent the entire GNSO in this regard. If we look into the duty of the GNSO Council as it is existing bylaw and the derived bylaw, they are not responsible to seek out what the accountability is being done and so on and so forth. Something that you could try, or we could try, not saying that what you have done – you're saying that bylaw requires us [and end quote] so you are requested to inform ways and means and modalities that you could take

in order to implement this provisions or requirements or you know to ensure that and so on and so forth, and then wait for reply.

And adding to that, if your ACs and SOs or your constituency composed of various other constituencies and sub-constituencies, you are requested to collect information from all of those and send back to this group or whatever [inaudible]. So it is very critical how to draft the question. But still I don't believe that you get a clear answer because when we go to the group, the group could not reply without having a physical meeting and so on and so forth. Otherwise having 10 people on the virtual meeting would not satisfy.

And even in some of the physical meetings are less numerous than the total community. So I don't expect that you have a satisfactory. But if you want to try, try. But raising the question more or less in a way that I have mentioned, rather than saying that what you have been doing. You say that how you are going to implement them, how you are going to ensure this or observe that and so on to see what the reply would be. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Kavouss, and it was certainly my – it would appear now idle hope – that we would actually get to some of the specific drafting of such questions' text in today's call. And I'll come back to how we will need to proceed with that a little later. But right now I wondered because Avri's been putting some excellent inquiry into the chat. If Avri, before I go to Alan, Avri, do you have audio at the moment? Would you like to speak on what you've been putting into the chat?

AVRI DORIA:

I do have audio. This is Avri speaking. I'm not sure that what I was saying was directly in line with the conversation that was being had, but I was basically just talking about the way one views these self-appraisals and that in looking at self-appraisals you get as much from what is included as what might not be included. You get to talk about them. We all have to write self-appraisals that pass the giggle test. For those that don't know the giggle test, it really has two parts. Can the person giving it read it without choking on their words and giggling? And can the listener listen to it without starting to laugh?

Now most of us know enough about the other organizations that if a self-appraisal is far off the mark, we'll know it, and we'll ask questions. I'm a little worried about getting into appraisals of the GNSO before we even figure out what we're going to ask people and, you know, external interpretations of how the GNSO is structured and how it functions. Didn't quite seem to me to be the topic we should be into. So now I've said what I've written, but I don't think I've said anything more than what I had written. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Avri. If you hadn't have had audio I was going to read your comments to the record because I just think that they were highly contributory to the discussions we were having. Alan, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Two very brief comments wearing two different hats. The first is regarding the GNSO. I've spent eight years on the GNSO Council, and I think I have a modest idea of what it is. The chair of the GNSO Council is also, according to the bylaws, the chair of the GNSO. And I think the chair of both those entities is a fine place to start asking the questions, and you have the chair with his or her vice chairs and the Council decide how to pass it down to lower levels if that is indeed necessary. I don't think we need to do their business for them here.

With regard to the ALAC, yes, we may have some things down. The ALAC at-large is an interesting structure in that the ALSs are part of the RALOs, but there is also a relationship directly between the ALAC and the ALSs, and therefore it may or may not be appropriate to ask the RALOs to defend themselves as to how they are accountable. So I think each, as I said before, each organization is different. The chair is the right place to start the question. And as Avri said, we will use the giggle test to decide whether the answer has any merit or not. That's a very start in any case. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Alan. And before we move into further or different directions in our agenda, is there anyone else who wants to contribute at what seems to be the theoretical as opposed to the practical discussion about the questions? Okay, I just want to make sure we've allowed everyone's voice to be heard.

So in the time we have left, which by my clock seems to be a little over or on about the 10 minute mark, I'm relatively confident that we are not

going to get any distance, if at all, into any formal drafting. We do, however, have assurance from our hard-working staff that our staff paper should be in our hands sometime through next week. So in a perfect world we will be able to look at and review that as a sub-team in our next meeting.

But [what I propose] – and I’m proposing this off-the-cuff; I have not discussed it with anyone else – that based on today’s conversations and what was captured in the notes, and based on what we know our mandate is and how it has been specifically articulated in the recommendations 10 and 12 and in the bylaw language, if we start a fresh or new blank page, for want of a better word, in Google Docs and we also replicate that on the wiki for people who can’t access Google Docs or don’t feel comfortable doing so can just put comments on the wiki. And we put a few prepared text questions, and by few, let’s aim for – well, let’s pick a number. Five. Five is a good number. No more than five questions. If at our next meeting we find that there is a desperate need and enormous pressure to have seven questions, that’s okay. If we decide that it needs to be nine, that’s okay. If we get much more than that I’ll start to suggest that we’re probably getting too long-winded.

But let’s see if we can come up with five clearly-articulated and carefully-drafted language questions so that we are drawing out on our self-appraisal appropriate answers, not the – as Christopher warned us of, if we ask when did we stop hitting our dogs or beating our horses, the question of course is moot because the way it’s framed is guarding how the answer can or cannot be reflected as truth.

So let's look at this carefully. Let's do this [our list] and on collaborative space over the next week. If it needs to, we can then [inaudible] modify any of those questions or indeed add to those questions. And once we have had a look at what has been their staff accountability paper.

Now that said, based on what Avri contributed, as well, it may very well be worthwhile to even have questions asked directly in the self-appraisals that are covered from an analysis and reviewed by staff because the comparison between what is assumed and then what is specified might be interesting in its own right.

But I can't see any other effective and efficient way forward. If anyone else has a [charter] proposal, I suggest you speak now. Kavouss, I noticed you say in the chat, "Questions we raise must be relevant to the activities and structures of those SOs and ACs." Thank you, Kavouss. I think if we set our preambles appropriately or indeed if we decide to do personalized preambles, we should be able to cover that off. Not hearing anyone countering or making an alternate proposal, I'm going to now ask whether or not – oh, Avri. Over to you.

AVRI DORIA:

Yes, thank you. And at the risk of disagreeing with something that's been said – this is Avri speaking – at the risk of disagreeing with something that's been said, but perhaps it was more that I didn't understand, and I do this with the greatest amount of respect, I don't know that the questions we ask should be structure-specific. I think we should be asking larger [chapeau]-type of questions about accountability structures and how they work.

But I don't think we should be presupposing because, indeed, they are different in each one. And part of the answer that comes back should be this is the structure we've got, and this is how and why it works. And here are some metrics we perhaps have for showing that. But there is most definitely not a one-size-fits-all set of structural questions that we could come up with. So perhaps that was what people were saying, and in which case I've just been dumb and haven't really understood what was said. But I just wanted to make sure that we weren't trying to be structure-specific in our questions. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Avri. My use of the term "preamble" was very much a concept I wanted to allow rather than to try and do specific questions to AC or SO. But let's take that as we do our further drafting. I'm just going to call for any other business. Kavouss, is this new matters that you have to raise, or are you reiterating another point?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, I was misunderstood by Avri. I did not propose that we draft a specific question for each of the SO and AC. But I said that we should refer in the question having a part of the question taking into account the manner and the structure that you are working because the way that ALAC working is different of the way that [DAG] working and the way that SO, the AoC working and so on and so forth. I was just referring to that. I didn't mean that we have set question for each SO and AC separately. No, I didn't say that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Kavouss. I had hoped that my use of “preamble” may have covered that, but you have made it clear and reiterated the point. Any other business, please, because many of us have another call we need to get to at the top of the hour, and I certainly would like to not have the call waiting bugging in my ear phone, which is what’s happening now.

Not seeing any or hearing anyone raising any other business I want to bring this meeting to a close. If you would like to note that our next meeting is on the 28th of September at 0500 UTC, and in addition to looking at what we will be drafting between now and then with regard to the questions and the work that we did not actually manage to get to today, it is our plan to at the very least look at a review of the staff’s briefing paper. So we’ll have two things, in particular, on our agenda in a perfect world next week at the 28th.

Ladies and gentlemen, staff, thank you all very much for the time and attention you have put to today’s call. As usual, I’d like to encourage you, as would my co-chairs and my co-rapporteurs, to use the list and please do interact with us on the collaborative spaces that we’ll be raising these questions with. Thank you, and bye for now.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. Bye bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]