
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much for that. My name's Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and I'll remind you all in terms of general form for these calls, if you are on the audio bridge by telephone and not in the Adobe Connect Room, if you'd care to make yourself known now. Otherwise, we will take our attendance from the Adobe Connect Room list of participants.

Not hearing anybody. I will assume that the list of participants will be as was in the Adobe Connect Room, and any additional people joining will also of course be noted and captured by staff for the record. At this stage, I am unaware of any apologies, but if staff or anyone is aware of any apologies, if you could just leave a notice in the notes section if you're staff, or put it into chat if you are aware of someone who has sent their apologies, just in case Farzaneh and I and Steve have missed an email, because things have been rather busy, lately.

With that, I'd also like to remind you all that as these calls are recorded, if you could take the time to speak relatively slowly and as clearly as you possibly can. If you have audio problems, it would be wise for you to request a dial-out, using the machine automated system that the Adobe Connect Rooms have. If you have ask it to connect your phone, it will ask you what number you would like the mechanics to call you, and that, of course, is a simple and quick way of assuring higher audio quality. If you're unable to do that for whatever reason, of course staff

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.

will of course be able to assist you. At this point, I would like to ask if anybody needs to make an update to their statements of interest.

It appears not. However, I will make a brief update to my current statement of interest, which I've not updated online yet, simply to note – whilst there is no conflict, I have been appointed to a new committee and a new role in that committee within ICANN. I am now going to also serve in the upcoming Nominating Committee Independent Review Process, by serving on its committee. And I'm serving along with another person as one of the Co-Deputy Chairs. So that's it for my update; has anyone else got any update to give us?

If not, let's begin. Let's – I'll start off with running through a brief overview of our last call, which was call number nine. And at call number nine, you'll note that we had a couple of documents that we reviewed, one of which of course was [inaudible] the Google Doc, which is in development, and we hope almost ultimate development after today's call of the questions for community. And we also started to discuss the reviewing of the staff paper on SO/AC Accountability. And in addition, we looked at the standard form of reporting, whereby we were to be giving our interim progress report from our Work Teams' activities at Hyderabad, and also obviously the same standard form of reporting would be used for our final report, as well. Both the questions for SO/AC feedback, and the form of reporting and matters to be discussed from our Work Team in Hyderabad are points from today's agenda. So unless anybody has anything they want to raise about last call, I would suggest we simply move on to those as agenda items.

Not hearing anybody. This is going to be an extraordinarily fast meeting. Excellent. Although I must say, I had the world's quickest – well, certainly, my knowledge of record formal meeting for ICANN today – where we had one of the Work Tracks in another GNSO call that actually lasted less than five minutes, and it was actually a formal discussion and close. I don't think we'll beat that record; that one can stand for [inaudible] for quite some time.

Let's move now, and I shall give my voice a break and ask Farzaneh to step up into the breach for leading this next discussion topic, which is our final review and discussion of the draft [inaudible] questions. There are one or two matters in the Google Doc that in the interim editing and polishing still need to be discussed, and some of the minor definitional terms. If you can, please, do click on the link in your agenda, and you can follow live on the Google Doc, and we will be making our final edits to this and hopefully having this as a sign-off and final set of test questions, perhaps not format, but the test questions – test [inaudible] questions at the close of today's meeting. Over to you, Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADI:

Thank you, Cheryl. Farzaneh Badii speaking. Hi, everyone. So we – based on our discussion last week and also the week before that, we have – Steve has drafted – the text of the Google Doc, which clarifies the designated community, in accordance to the bylaws. And also, the questions are now framed in a way that the SO/AC leaders are – they can provide a definition of their designated community if they print that it is broader than what is predicted in the bylaw.

What we also did was that because Giovanni's reframing of the question got support from the group, we replaced the original question that we had with Giovanni's question, and then he also reframed a little bit and came up with three questions, which I think are in the document. And I was hoping that we can also talk about the questions, but I think – yeah. So, basically, the questions here are now – yes. So the questions that we have here at the moment are based on our discussions with the group and we are going to finalize our – we are going to work on these questions, based on the past two sessions and also based on Giovanni's questions. If the group is okay with that, we will send a finalized question to the mailing list. I would say, Cheryl, would that be possible to do that by tomorrow?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I would think so, yes.

FARZANEH BADII: Yes. So what we will do, we will send the questions tomorrow to the mailing list and give the group members a couple of – some time to look at this and see if there are any points of discussion that we need to finalize [AUDIO BREAK] and send them out to the SO/AC leaders. Kavouss –

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Excuse me. Excuse me. Before sending, please I am waiting for to be given the floor. I have asked for the floor, please. Hello?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Kavouss, Cheryl here. You are in the list; yes, I [CROSSTALK]

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: [inaudible] the questions. We have a problem with the questions. What you sent in the list still doesn't discuss it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can Farzaneh finish her presentation, and then we'll go to questions?

FARZANEH BADI: Yes, [inaudible] Kavouss.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go on, Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADI: Yes. So as I said, we are – sorry, Cheryl. So as I said, we are not going to just send the questions. We are going to send the questions to the group members on the mailing list by tomorrow, and then we can discuss and finalize them, and then we can send them to the leaders. Now, Kavouss, please come in.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I think you [inaudible] mix up the Transparency Group with SO/AC Accountability Group. The type of the question we put has nothing to do with the SO/AC Accountability. For instance, election. Election has nothing to do with the accountability; election is a transparency – how

the election is made, how free or liberal election is made, how transparent election is made. Discussion of decision-making; how decision-making is made, is not accountability. The accountability is the first type of the question that you had in your list, but not what it has been amended by Giovanni. We are mixing up the two groups of Transparency Group and SO/AC Group, so I am not in full agreement to send this type of the group your deliberation, what deliberation you will ask. What you deliberation you will ask from other group is not accountability; it is transparency. Election – what you want [inaudible] one SO, ask another SO how you make the election. This is not accountability. This is the transparency. Do you make election in a very transparent manner? Is the candidate announced [inaudible] the Board? Do they send their CV? Does the CV get checked by somebody? Would be the [inaudible] distribution? Or [inaudible] rules of procedure for elections? This is not accountability. If it is, what about the Transparency Group? We are mixing up the situation. So I don't agree with Giovanni's questions. It may be relevant, but for transparency. All the questions that you read are still, to some extent, valid. To some extent. Although difficult to answer, but [inaudible] question is valid. But not the extended part by Giovanni. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII:

Thank you, Kavouss. So as to whether elections or any other elements in the questions are related to accountability or not, I think this is something that we might have to discuss within the group. When tomorrow we send the questions, then we can have a discussion on that. I do personally believe that elections are a sort of accountable [inaudible] mechanism [inaudible] employee [CROSSTALK]

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: But that does not [inaudible]

FARZANEH BADI: [inaudible] it is my personal view, and we can have a discussion on this, and of course, when we send the questions to the mailing list with the group members, we will have a discussion and we will decide on that. Sebastien, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much. I hope that you hear me well. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. I understand what Kavouss is trying to tell us, but Kavouss, we split the work in nine items. Of course, there are interrelations in some issues, and regarding the election – yes, of course, part is a question of transparency. But I do feel that the other part is also how we are really accountable, and that may be who are the voters, how we get the candidate, and how many candidates we get, and so on and so forth. And there are both subgroups can talk about elections, and I can tell you that there's another group where we are talking about elections [inaudible] there is a single place to do it. But I think it's important to raise the issue within the question to the SO/ACs, to know what is their view about this. And at the end, for the moment, I will say just questions and what is our fear to receive an answer, not receive them – we will see. But I think we need to be open, and we will see what they give us as an answer. And really, we need to find the best way to ask questions, and we'll see how we will use the answer. Thank you very much.

FARZANEH BADII: Thank you, Sebastien. Okay, Kavouss. Your hand is up.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I know the issue, but I just don't agree. I'm sorry, Sebastien.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Noted, [inaudible].

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you very much. Hello?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go on.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Sebastien, thank you very much; but I don't agree with you. Election has nothing to do with accountability. Election is a procedure that is done in every SO/AC. The only thing we have to talk about is rules and procedures of election, and its transparency and its freedom of the candidates and non-discriminating actions. This is not accountability. Accountability is not this. The whole accountability was mistakenly put in the Work Stream 1 in the wrong context. First, you said [inaudible] accountability your designated group. That is maybe valid in some cases, but we are not talking about elections. What do you want to talk about the elections? Do you want to [inaudible] accountability

[inaudible] object to the elections carried out in GNSO? Or vice-versa? I heard that. I heard that on the statement of the Internet governance. One of the speakers said that they want to know how the Chair of the GNSO Council is elected, if there are problems, will another SO object to this? This has nothing to do with this SO or other AC. This is the internal issue of that, and that is of that group to decide. I don't think that is this one. Yes, everything is valid. The whole nine issues are valid. But we have divided them, in order not to mix up the situations. Unless there is an area that we have difficulty, then we send it to that group [inaudible] might have difficult legal questions in the accountability, present it to the Jurisdiction Group, if it relates to jurisdiction. If there is anything relating to the accountability of the election, we'll send it to the Transparency Group, but we don't discuss that. So why we should be in the hands of one person? I think we should be quite clear why we should spend the time to discuss it, if not valid? Many of them are not valid. This decision – what decision do you want to know about accountability? What is the relation of decision-making and accountability? We should be convinced. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, I was on mute. It's Cheryl.

FARZANEH BADII: Thank you, Kavouss. [CROSSTALK]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Farzaneh. Thanks, Kavouss, and remember the questions we are asking the AC/SOs are to ask them to self-report, to report on their own activities. Eh? We're not asking for any form of mutual accountability discussion at this point in time, at all. So some of your examples have drifted us into the mutual accountability issues, which we are yet to discuss further. But right now, we'd like to try and manage and finalize questions to go out to each of the AC/SOs, and it might be just the Chair of each of those that answers, or it might go to – in the case of the GNSO – the constituencies. That's up to each AC/SO, as to how they manage that. So I think let's just see what we get in response; and if an AC or an SO has deeply held beliefs and concerns that things like even asking a question about an electoral process in an accountability review is a problem, then they can tell us. Let's not get stuck on our own personal opinions. Let's try and move forward in our project planning; and part of our requirement is to inquire from each of the AC/SOs about their accountability, and the mechanisms they use. Kavouss, is that a new hand, or is that an old hand still up?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, a new hand. We should be [inaudible] whether deliberation is accountability. What is the relation, dear madam, between deliberation, discussion in an SO/AC and accountability? Discussion is the conducting of the meeting, and discussion is [inaudible] there is a point on the table, the Chair conducting the meeting – like you conducting the meeting – you allow the people to discuss, and you make a final sum-up of the situation, and try to conduct the group to [inaudible]. What is the use [inaudible] this discussion that I have with

you. It is the accountability of you – of this group – these discussions [CROSSTALK].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Kavouss. Kavouss, may I answer –

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: [inaudible] in which –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Kavouss. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: It is not accountability.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: May I answer, or are you going to continue with your diatribe?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: [CROSSTALK]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl Langdon-Orr, for the record. Kavouss, my opinion – and the response to your question in seeking my opinion – is not important. What is important is, if there are mechanisms and methods of accountability that each AC or SO wishes to report to us, these

questions – whatever questions we send out to them – should be an opportunity for them to make us aware of them. Other than that, we don't need to discuss this any further.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

But you didn't – this isn't a reply to me. The discussion [CROSSTALK]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

My reply to you is, [CROSSTALK] my view is not important. We don't need to discuss accountability in terms of theoretical value and individual belief sets. We do need to settle on some questions to send out to the SO/ACs.

So, at a previous meeting, the general group agreed – and perhaps you weren't at that meeting, but I thought your attendance record had been excellent for our meetings – the general group did agree that we would follow the general format that Giovanni had proposed. If you have a counter-proposal – and we are now two, if not three meetings on from that decision, could you please write the counter-proposal very specifically, and in a very short order, we will see what we can do in terms of making some changes. But that [CROSSTALK] proposal will need to go to the list, because [CROSSTALK].

The list is confirmed. We have agreed to reframe our questions as previously discussed based on Giovanni's proposal. Thank you for your input. Let us move on. Is there anyone else who'd like to bring any points forward on the questions proposed to be sent out to the AC/SOs?

Not hearing anybody.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, I've been on the queue. This is Seun.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Wait a second, Seun; I just wanted to make sure there's nobody else.
Okay, over to you, Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, thank you. This is Seun, for the record. Thank you very much. Two concerns. The first one is how soon are we looking at sending these questions to the AC/SOs? How much time do we have? I'm not – I'm audio only, so I'm not looking at the questions now; but are these the same questions that were initially discussed some time ago? When would they be shared, and if there is enough time – I mean, my own personal opinion is that the questions should not be too long. They should be quite straightforward. Whether it's an accountability question or a transparency question, I think the SO/AC should be the one to respond to that [inaudible], simply just [inaudible] question blank. But if we think we have not provided enough questions specific to accountability, then we can probably have those, and then substitute just to avoid the questions being too long. Important that we don't ask too many questions that do not actually achieve our goal. If what we have is not too long, then we can just give it to [inaudible] the SO/ACs like that. Any one of them that thinks one of them does not actually talk about – ask about accountability, they can leave it out. And then we will continue. I understand what Kavouss is saying in terms of us repeating what [inaudible] may also be repeating. I think [inaudible] the

only part that I think I also agree with Kavouss about [inaudible]. There's a lot of repetition [inaudible] community, anyway. So let's give it up to them and let's let them respond. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Seun; and it's Cheryl, for the record. And indeed, the whole aim of trying to settle this as a final reading is to get it out, and hopefully before too many people leave for Hyderabad. Let me, as you are not in the Adobe Connect Room, so you won't note my apology that it was taking a while to get to you in the queue; so take it as read, please, that I am sorry that you were so long in the queue.

It is a less than three page, in terms of typed [inaudible], including comments at the moment, Google Doc, so it probably hasn't changed since the last time you looked at the Google Doc a great deal. One – almost half of that page is a preamble, so that's not a question. And then, the questions follow – in general, so you know to refresh in your memory – it asks about the designated community, that it should be AC/SOs that it is involved with; and here we refer to the ICANN bylaws, where it's been specifically defined, and we then ask about any published policies or procedures by which their SO or AC is accountable to that community. And if possible, to include links. There is a little bit of additional questions, such as were the policies and procedures updated over the last decade, do they have mechanisms by which members of their community can challenge or appeal decisions, are there unwritten policies that the AC or the SO maintains? Those sorts of questions. So that should resonate a little bit. One of the questions

also is simply asking, "Please describe any mechanisms to do with resolving challenges."

So we've asked in our draft at the moment, if the responses could be back by the 1st of November. So I think that responds to all of your questions. But it is, in fact, a very short survey, in terms of number of questions; and of course, how detailed the answers may be is totally up to the respondents.

Kavouss, is this a new hand?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, new hand.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: For the questions, I suggest that the third line after comma and "transparency about your," put it in a square bracket if it is transparency, it is not accountability. The first part is accountability [inaudible] of the community. Third line, you have a comma, and then add "transparency about your," and so on, and so forth. That all put it in a square bracket. I am a member of the group, a formal member, and I disagree with this one; but keep it, put in a square bracket. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, for the record. Kavouss, in terms of square bracket, I'm not sure when we're going to decide to edit that out. So if you're proposing that we remove all references to the word "transparency" other than when good grammar requires of us – and I can't imagine there would be such an occasion – to this document, why don't we put that to the rest of the group, here? For example, you've proposed – and I'll put it to the group for you. You have proposed to remove reference to transparency from our questions.

Avri, in chat, has just said, "Keep transparency." So it looks like we'd better have a straw poll, and we will also – when we send our final questions to the list – we will also ask this question again. So just from the straw poll point of view, if you could indicate a tick if you agree with removing the word "transparency," as suggested by Kavouss, from our document. I have a red X from Avri. So, if anyone agrees with Kavouss' proposal, please make yourself known with a green tick. I am noting some red Xes. Kavouss, I'm assuming you can see the red Xes coming up, and I would note for the record that, obviously, you would support – yes, you're right; it is a white X on a red background; love dealing with pedants, Avri, thank you, dear – your input would be that you would like it removed. We are not a complete group here today, so we will also ask this question when we send the list –

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: [inaudible] there is no consensus. I know the attitude of some of the people with respect to me. Some of them [CROSSTALK]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Of course, Kavouss, we don't need to operate with complete consensus, Kavouss. [CROSSTALK] A hundred percent is not required for this team. [CROSSTALK] So a hundred percent consensus is not required for this team, but we will ask the rest of the list. [CROSSTALK]

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: On my behalf, [inaudible] one member said put it in square brackets, that's all. If everybody agrees with that, okay. I propose [CROSSTALK]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I've just said we will test that in the list.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. But perhaps now we may be able to – Farzaneh, I saw your hand up. Did you want to take the floor again?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: No.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Your name's not Farzaneh, Kavouss. Thank you. Farzaneh, over to you.

FARZANEH BADI:

It was actually before you were discussing the transparency issue, in Giovanni's [inaudible]. Steve has also put a reformulation on page two, of the questions. Perhaps we can also put that forward to the group, and maybe that would be acceptable. There are three questions, if I'm not mistaken – yes, on page two. Sorry, you don't have page numbers. It's on page two, and you can see that after he describes how the bylaws define the designated community for each group, he says, "Please comment and/or provide links to your interpretation of your quality and efforts in outreach, and also your policies and procedures to be [inaudible] an individual organization." So these are [inaudible] his reformulation. We could also discuss them on the mailing list; maybe this would be acceptable. That's about it, Cheryl. That's what I wanted to say, and I think we should move to our preliminary progress report.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Farzaneh. Cheryl, for the record. Indeed, we should. My only concern is, we can't just send the Google Doc to the list, because for example, Kavouss does not operate in Google Docs, and so he would not be privy to the reformulation of the questions, which I believe you're right, could very well solve some of his problems. So we will need to articulate those to the list, as well. Obviously, anybody who can operate in Google Docs is more than welcome to put their comments and make their opinions known on the Doc before we actually send it out to the list. Thank you very much.

Okay, let us now move to our next agenda item. And our next agenda item is something that is also time-critical. We would like to be able to send our very brief interim report, that we'd like to present in

Hyderabad, to our staff by the end of this week. And you will see on the shared screen in front of you, and we will – it’s very brief, so we will read it to the record, for those of you who are only on audio. It follows the standard form of reporting, which is something we’ve looked at at previous meetings. In other words, it has an executive summary description of the issue, a current state of play, and any sort of recommendations. And obviously, at this stage, for our group, we are not making any recommendations or any rationale for our recommendations.

Farzaneh has put in the [inaudible] on this, so I don’t know whether she would like to take you all through; perhaps that’s going to be the easiest, Farzaneh, but just if you could very briefly review it for those who are only on audio.

FARZANEH BADI:

Yes, thank you, Cheryl. So this is preliminary; there’s nothing finalized here, but what I have done is that I’ve gone through what we have done during the past month. As you remember, we came up with four tracks of work that we need to carry out.

So in the executive summary, I have drafted that we have four tracks, and what we’ve worked on until now. [inaudible] specifically [inaudible] accountable to SO/AC works on four tracks of issues. So Track 1 is effectiveness, Track 2 is assessing the mutual accountability roundtable, Track 3 – proposition of the detailed working plan for enhancing SO/AC, and Track 4 – assessing whether the independent review panel would also be applicable to SO/AC activities.

Some preliminary discussion is taking place on effectiveness, and the topic was divided into effectiveness of outreach and effectiveness of community representation. The mutual accountability roundtable has also been discussed; we have not come to a conclusion yet on that track. In order to provide the working plan on enhancing SO/AC accountability, we have worked out some questions to be forwarded to the head of SO/AC. The group has not yet – actually, not the head, but we should say leader. The group has not yet discussed whether SO/AC should be subject to independent review panel. We’ll probably do that after we – this is not in the text; I’m just adding that – just for the group to know that our next step after we finalize this question is to go to that track.

So the description of the issue is that – so we discuss the issues as to whom SO/ACs are accountable, and what they are accountable for. The group discussed various scenarios. The most discussed scenario was that the SO/ACs are accountable to their stakeholder groups. This includes internal stakeholders who are members, or participate in the SO/AC, and external, who do not assert their views and are not members. So this is as defined by the bylaws. We are still in the process of asking SO/ACs to define their designated community, and if their designated community is broader than what is indicated in the bylaw. The accountability is of SO/ACs to each other, and to the global Internet users were discussed, as well, but has not received strong support and needs to be discussed further.

We addressed the question of what SO/ACs are accountable for in Track 1, effectiveness, which includes efforts for outreach, entry barriers, and representation in decision-making. It will be combined with the efforts

of asking several questions from the SO/ACs about their accountability mechanisms as we get into Track 3, working on enhancing SO/AC accountability working plan.

So the current state of the [inaudible], the accountability group has worked on some questions to be forwarded to the leaders of SO/ACs, as part of carrying out Track 3. The next step is to work on Track 4, assessing whether the hierarchy would also be acceptable to the SO/AC activities. As for a supplemental report, we could put the link to our – if you remember, we initially had a Google Doc that captured all sorts of discussions that we had – we can put the link there, to the supplemental report, or we can – I’m not sure if we can actually meet the deadline and make a new report, but we will see. But I suggest that we actually put a Google Doc link that we had initially as the supplemental report. [inaudible] recommendations; we don’t have any recommendations at the moment, I think. And of course when we don’t have recommendations, we don’t have any rationale for the recommendations, either.

So that was about it. This document might change. Cheryl and Steve and I, we will discuss that until tomorrow, and we will send it to the group and to the staff. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks very much for that, Farzaneh. Kavouss, is that a new hand or an old hand?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: No, yes, new hand. I have told in this group and other groups, I have stated difficulty to access the Google document. I would like to finally have this document as a Word document or a PDF attached to the mailing list, but not the Google document. I have serious difficulty. You might not have, but I have that, so I cannot follow this Track 1, Track 2, Track 3, Track 4. This is the first time that I'm hearing that, so I don't understand totally. I don't object to that; that might be right. As far as I have heard, that seems to have some logic, but I don't know what is the exact wording. Please, can you provide normal Word or PDF document attached to the list; and in addition, if you want to continue [inaudible] Google, your [inaudible] Google, go ahead with the Google. But I have difficulty with the Google, so I request [inaudible] to provide me a copy of these four tracks in an email [inaudible] in order that I will be able to read that, because I have to report to my SO – my AC as soon as possible within about [inaudible] or ten days. I don't have any idea about these four tracks, because I am not able to read the Google document. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Kavouss. [CROSSTALK] Go on, Farzaneh. I was just going to tell him what you said.

FARZANEH BADI: Sure.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, no, go ahead, please.

FARZANEH BADII: Hi, Farzaneh Badii here. Yes, [inaudible], for sure. We will provide PDFs of everything we have done so far [inaudible] we have on the Google Doc, and we will send it to the list, and if you want individual, to you as well. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that, Farzaneh. Cheryl, for the record. Of course, I should point out, with this particular progress report, it was in fact – it is a very new piece of work. It is a review piece that we are discussing for the first time at today’s meeting. We have it as a PDF displayed on screen. I believe, in fact, it is already a Google Doc – sorry, it is already a Word doc, and I don’t think it is a Google Doc yet. So your request is very easy to comply with, and of course, we would be using – for such a small piece of work – it’s easy enough to use comments from the list. But we don’t want to run with “track changes” from commenters on a Word doc. We would rather, when we are getting edits in, have them either just go to the list, or the “comment only,” rather than an actual edit onto a Word doc. So, happy to provide PDFs and Word docs, although most of us are able to and are comfortable working in Google Docs these days, although many of us have been forced into it. But it is important, if you are operating in the Word doc environment, that we don’t want to “track changes,” and that things come in by comment. So that would make life a lot easier. Putting your comments to the list is simple enough, and we will make sure it gets interpreted. Kavouss, another new hand, I’m assuming. Go ahead, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yeah. I think we have [inaudible] with eighty-two meetings, [inaudible] and I already have [inaudible]. Who are we that we don't want [inaudible]? I am part of those [inaudible]. We want [inaudible] "track changes" is good; I know what has been changed, I know [inaudible] Word document [inaudible] not to type it. I take whatever there is and I then try to change it and put it in the list. I don't understand any problem with that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Thank you, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: What is the [inaudible] that the whole work in all of the [inaudible] ICANN or some people decide that [inaudible] Google Docs and that is that; [inaudible] somebody like you [inaudible] put in Google Docs, so we want to have Word docs on the mailing list? You [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: [inaudible] if we are members of this group [inaudible] I'm sorry [inaudible] possibility to [inaudible], unless we are excluded. I am excluded from the discussion, because you want Google documents. You don't want [inaudible], distinguished madam.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Kavouss. Please don't assume that any one individual has moved in the direction of Google Docs. A number of ICANN Work Groups are moving in that direction; some of us are simply going that way sooner than others. Let me make it also very clear that not everyone can read tracked changes. For example, if you don't run a Microsoft or Office environment, which many people in open-source software environments don't run. Therefore, what suits one, doesn't suit everyone. What we do do is try and make sure that, as much as possible, the majority is satisfied with how we can operate in collaboration. And most importantly, anything someone like you who doesn't want to run or cannot work in Google Docs, anything you put into list discussion, or in another form of text, we make sure is imported into and reflected in a Google Doc as well, just as we would in a Wiki. So [CROSSTALK] accounted for.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I had sent the two documents. In the Word document, you had not taken [inaudible]. That is not true. Even I put in –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: – one-and-a-half-page full text. Nothing has been put in. It is not true.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not going to ask Brenda to pull up the eighteen-page document she had displayed earlier, but on page eight of the eighteen-page document she had displayed earlier, there are a number of references specifically, Kavouss, to your comments, your agreements, or your disagreements on particular matters and in particular, on the roundtable concept, which your earlier documents were focused on, and that we recognized you have considerable problem with. All of that, as far as we can tell, has been accurately and reasonably reflected – at least, in that major report.

Can I move to – do you mind if I go to Sebastien before you, Farzaneh? Sebastien, over to you, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, it's very short, and I agree with you. Go ahead with the work we have to do. If we spend time in just talking about Google Docs, I don't think – we need to create a Working Group for that; but not here, please. It's not very [inaudible]. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Over to you, Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADII: Thank you, Cheryl. Just to add – Kavouss, [inaudible]. I will try to send you an updated version of the documents we have in PDF, and I promise to do that; but I do not promise that I will do that regularly so that you can get updates. So there might be some changes that you don't see. But I promise that I will send you the PDFs of whatever documents we have so far.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Now, if we've finished looking at the particular choice of collaborative tools, could we actually look at – if anyone can still remember it now – at some of the content on what is being presented here and is visible for anyone in the Adobe Connect Room to read and look at? Seun, I know you're not able to read at the moment – you're not fully in the Adobe Connect or something – do you need a refresher, or are you comfortable on giving your opinion on what you heard Farzaneh read to the record?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, this is Seun, for the record. You can just go ahead. Maybe follow up on it, if necessary. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much, Seun. I'm well aware it's very difficult if you're not fully involved in the Adobe Connect Room, and that's what we're displaying. For those of you who are able to see the PDF copy of the draft progress report in the Adobe Connect Room – and you'll have

heard it read to the record by Farzaneh – are there issues which you believe need to be added, are there matters that you’d like to highlight, are there comments that you’d like to make on this text? Floor’s open.

Not hearing anyone.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello. Yeah, this is Seun [inaudible].

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

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, please go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, sorry. Sorry for coming back. Is it possible – what is being displayed right now, will it be shared on the mailing list, as well? Or I think you shared. Maybe I missed it. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Seun, it hasn’t been shared as yet. This is very much an early draft first reading. It will be going out on the mailing list, as Farzaneh indicated a

little bit earlier, in response to Kavouss' request. It's going to be going out as a PDF and probably a Word doc, as well.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. Alright, just to recap, we're looking at a brief executive summary, which is talking in great generalities about what preliminary discussions have taken place, and what particular topics, such as the neutral accountability roundtable matter, which are being held over for later discussion, we have a brief description of our issue, and that's, of course, relatively easy to draw out from our mandate. There is a current state of play which is very, very brief, talking about the questions we're working on, and will hopefully be distributed by the time we get to Hyderabad. And the references to the tracks of work come from our original work plan, so don't get too concerned about Track 1, Track 2, Track 3; that's simply a link into our original work plan, and describes that the next bit is to work on assessing with an IRT would also be applicable to SO/AC activities, remembering that those work tracks are drawn directly from our mandate.

So, hopefully, we've whet your appetite on this matter, and with the very few minutes we have left on the call, I'm looking forward to having fairly short turnaround on responses on the list, though, if possible, because we really do need to put this to completion so it can be included in the Hyderabad paperwork as soon as possible. So forgive us for the shortness of the response time that we will be requesting.

With that, I'd like to move now to "any other business." Does anyone have any other business to bring forward?

Not hearing anyone or –

SEUN OJEDEJI: Cheryl, this is Seun.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, Seun. Go ahead, please, Seun. Go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, just a [inaudible] is there going to be a face-to-face in Hyderabad for this group?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Seun, you must be psychic, because the very next matter on the agenda is our next meeting and any Action Items.

SEUN OJEDEJI: [CROSSTALK] thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Our next meeting, albeit as part of a plenary meeting in Hyderabad on the day before the main Hyderabad meeting starts, will, in fact, be a Hyderabad face-to-face meeting. Our meetings as we go forward on return from Hyderabad, we will discuss on list in greater detail. I know

ICANN – our support staff from ICANN – wanted us to review our frequency and timing of the calls if need be, but we can discuss that on lists rather than take the time now, in the last five minutes that we have of this call. I certainly would be wanting to propose that we may as well keep on with the frequency and timings and rotation of timings of the call we currently have. Yes, our group has had – along with a few of the other topics – a fair number of calls, compared to some of the other topics. But I think our work is fairly detailed and is taking a reasonable amount of discussion for a number of the matters, and so I would not want to be reducing our frequency of calls. So I’m certainly proposing that we keep with our regular weekly schedule, and that we rotate to share the pain as best we can, throughout the times that staff have made available for their support. So, that we can finalize on.

Now, the timing of our call – our meeting at Hyderabad, and the location of it, I’m unaware of. I just asked the staff for that. And I’m also not going to tell you now what the date and time of our next teleconference is; I’m going to ask if staff can do that, as well. [inaudible], Brenda.

BRENDA BREWER: Yes, this is Brenda, and we posted over on the notes that the next meeting is October 27th at 13:00 UTC.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Ah, thank you. Now, with October 27th, I’m hoping that that is before most of you are getting on planes and flying to Hyderabad. If you’re unable to attend that meeting, obviously, your apologies, you can either

send them to the list – we’ll note them – but hopefully most of you won’t be traveling quite that early, and that we’ll be able to have another meeting before we all meet up in Hyderabad. So Seun, our next meeting – 13:00 UTC, 27th of October. And then, yes, we’re having a meeting as part of the Hyderabad plenary and face-to-face, but not a separate work track meeting, as such.

Are there any other questions? In terms of Action Items from today’s call, then, we are going to ask for a fairly quick turnaround for comments, and lack of comment will be no doubt taken as support for text, in terms of our final reporting and some of the specific questions we outlined that we’d be putting to the list regarding our questions for the ACs. So, two pieces of homework.

Out of the finalizing of the preliminary report, we will then put together a couple of PowerPoint slides, and between now and Hyderabad, we will distribute those slides for your review, as well. But those of you who attend the meeting on the 27th of October will be focusing very much on Hyderabad, what we’ll be reporting and looking at that slide deck as our Agenda Items for that call.

With that, I’d like to thank our staff, thank each and every one of you for attending today’s call at an unfriendly time for many of you, I recognize, and ask staff to finalize the recording now. And thank you, one and all. Bye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]