
FARZANEH BADII: Hi, everyone, this is the monthly meeting of the WS2 Subgroup on SO/AC Accountability. Rinalia Abdul Rahim and [inaudible] have sent their apologies. If there's anyone on the phone bridge, please, can you identify yourself? I don't see any intervention.

Today, we're going to discuss our second review of the questions that we're going to send to SO and ACs, and also we're going to discuss the staff background paper on SO and AC, which was sent to the mailing list by Karen.

Steve, would you like to make any remarks? Okay.

STEVE DELBIANCO: No, Farzaneh. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII: Okay. So I'm going to just give a brief overview of what we've been doing the last call, and then we're going to discuss the second review and the other items of the agenda. During the last call, we discussed the first draft of the questions. I made some minor modification to the Google Doc based on the discussion [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

FARZANEH BADI: Excellent, okay. I made some modification based on the discussion to the draft, and we discussed the designated community and its [meeting]. Rosalia on the Google Doc had suggested that we actually ask the SO and AC Chairs to specify their designated community.

And so there were a couple of remarks on this that the designated community has been defined in ICANN Bylaws, so as [inaudible] just did, we added this sentence to the question that as the designated community has been specified in ICANN Bylaws, please comment on whether you validate or expand on the Bylaw's definition.

I have also looked at the Bylaws and extracted the articles in which mentioned the structural components and the community that each SO and AC serves. Please, if you have any comments on this, let me know.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Right, Farzaneh, I wanted to mention that everybody that we did this work over a month ago, when we extracted from the ICANN Bylaws, the community just represented each of the ACs and SOs. It's on pages three and four of the Google Doc that we did over a month ago. I'll put that into the chat as well. You recall the document we used, that kept track of our discussion.

FARZANEH BADI: Okay, [inaudible].

STEVE DELBIANCO:

And if I could go on a tiny bit, there's a varying amount of specificity with regard to this. Let me give you an example: With ALAC, it says, "The primary organizational home within ICANN for individual Internet users." For the ccNSO, it says, "ccTLD managers that have agreed to be members of the ccNSO."

So in that sense, the ccNSO, its target community only targeted managers who became members, not ccTLD managers who didn't become members. So that distinction is captured in the Bylaws. With GNSO, it's a little bit more explicit. It says, "GNSO I open to registries, registrars, commercial stakeholders, and non-commercial stakeholders." So it's very broad, and it doesn't include just those who became members. So the word "members" is used for ccNSO and for the SSAC and the RSSAC. Those, in fact, had listed members with regard to the Bylaws.

The rest just identify a target community, a designated community, on the assumption that that community either will or won't participate in the AC and SO. So it is a little bit of a mixed bag, and that may argue for us to customize these seven inquiries, so that each one makes sense to the recipients.

That's a couple of hours of work, probably, but the alternative is to try to come up with generic phrases in this letter that are going to work for everyone without confusing them. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII:

Thank you, Steve. Kavouss, I see your hand is up. Please, come in.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Good time to everybody. Since long time, I have read discussions many, many times, and while I do not find anything wrong with the wording, I don't see anything which could be resulted of publishing or sending discussions. I do think that the ASO, the question [inaudible] ASO – and we are an ASO – that the published policies of ASO, published policies of [RALO], our regional registry, regional Internet, and then according to the [inaudible] please comment on real participation.

What we expect [inaudible] ASOs to talk about past encouraging participation? What participation in ASO you are expecting? And then what aspect from ASO [inaudible] talk about the staff policy? What you expect the ASO talk about the [deliberation?] What type of [deliberation]? What do you expect the [inaudible]? And then what does it mean eligibility? Eligibility of what? And then election, what do you expect that ASO talk about election?

The third question to write [inaudible]. What we expect that we talk about the policy?

FARZANEH BADII: Sorry, Kavouss, if I may interrupt, I do not hear you very well. Would it be possible for you to speak louder or –

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: [inaudible].

FARZANEH BADI: No, I cannot hear you very bell.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Can you hear me now? Hello? Can you hear me now, please?

FARZANEH BADI: If you can, speak a bit louder. Thank you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, I am speaking louder. Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Now I can hear nothing.

FARZANEH BADI: Sorry, Kavouss. Yes, we cannot hear anything, Kavouss. Can you please try again? Okay, so Brenda is calling Kavouss back, and until he's back on the line, maybe Alan, you would like to intervene?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. And I could hear Kavouss quite well. He was basically asking what some of these questions mean in relation to a group like the ASO, which is very atypical from the others. And that's exactly what I wanted to speak to.

Each of the groups is very different. Some of them, like the ASO, by their very nature, are accountable to their own groups. Otherwise, the

people on the ASO would be replaced by those groups and it's an internal matter within those groups. Those groups each have their own accountability mechanisms within them, each of the regional registries.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Hello, do you hear me? Do you hear me, please?

FARZANEH BADI: Yes, we can hear you, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, I I'm sorry. I said about the question that I see some difficulty about the questions, difficulty to answer those questions. I wanted just a word on the point that we raised, question that asking ASO for instance. You're asking it to talk about published policy and procedures by which ASO – as just as an example – is accountable.

If they have something, they already made it available, so what do you want? You want to make available [inaudible] part of the question, we're talking about encouraging the participation. Participation in ASO, what does it mean? What does it mean participation [inaudible]. What does it mean participating transparency in ASO? What transparency you expect to talk about?

[Deliberation,] what do you expect that they will tell you about the [deliberation] in ASO? What do you expect they'll talk about decision making of the ASO? What do you mean by eligibility of the ASO? Eligibility to what? To election? That they elect [inaudible]? The elected

group, the community, the management? And what? And about the election.

So all of these things, I don't think that it gets [off any of that]. Then [inaudible] not in [line] with the questions that is difficult to answer and would not take up any [inaudible] account. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII:

Thank you, Kavouss. As Alan has also brought this up and we also discussed this during last session. As Steve also suggested during the last session, we can customize the questions. If that would be acceptable, then we can just customize the question based on each SO and AC, and continue. Alan, your hand –

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, my hand is up, because I didn't get a chance to finish speaking. I disagree. I believe each of the ACs and SOs are very different, and I think it is a futile effort for us to spend time trying to customize the questions to what we think are the appropriate questions for each AC and SO, which really depends on what the answers are.

I suggest that we prefix the question with a comment saying these are general questions, take the questions and the meanings of the appropriate words – such as members – and apply it to your own context, and let them tell us what they can about their organization and accountability.

I think it's a waste of our time to try to second guess them and hope that we're asking the right questions. As an example, in the case of the

ccNSO, yes, their members are just those who choose to be members, but if you look at the IANA issues, they now have a responsibility of representing the interests of the ccTLDs that are not members.

So at times, it extends to other groups, and it will vary depending on the exact usage. Let each AC and SO tailor/interpret the questions in a way that makes sense to them. Easier for us, and it will be easier for them, and the answers will have more meaning. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADI:

Thank you, Alan. So there are two suggestions here: one is to customize the question lightly, or have generic questions as Alan suggested. If I can get more comments on this – I can see – Alan, was your hand up again, or is it just an older hand? Okay. So if you don't have any intervention, I see Greg's hand is up. Greg, please, take the mic.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. I tend to agree with Alan as well. I think it's both time consuming and largely futile to try to customize the questions. Plus, it also it may even make it harder to collate the data when we get it back. I think what we need to do is just take a look at the questions.

If we can make them a little more high level and generic in the sense that they don't sound like they fit some and not others, that would be good, but I wouldn't waste a lot of time on that. Just making sure it's a little less – that the questions are a little more agnostic, and then add the note that Alan suggested. You should respond with regard to your organization and the way that it works.

So let them do the customizing, because they're in the best position to do so. And if there are some questions that really don't apply, that's okay. We can have a free text question as well: "Anything else that we should know about accountability in your organization that would not have come out based on the questions above?" And leave it at that. Thanks.

FARZANEH BADII: Okay, thank you, Greg. What we are going to do, based on your comments, we will make modifications and you can also make modifications in the Google Doc, and be more clear but more generic.

I can see Alan's hand is up. Alan, would you like to speak your mind?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, that's an old hand. No, that's an old hand, sorry.

FARZANEH BADII: Okay. Kavouss's hand is up. Please take the mic, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: You can make the questions more general, but if your question is finalized by the group, the [inaudible] of the nature of the question... Excuse me, can you hear me? Hello?

FARZANEH BADII: Yes, we can hear you. Yes.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Hello, can you hear me, please?

FARZANEH BADII: Yes, we can hear you, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes? No? Can you hear me, please?

FARZANEH BADII: Yes, we can hear you. I don't think you can hear us. Can you hear us?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: If you succeed to modify the text to make it in view of somebody high level and very general, that everybody look at the question and answer within its mandate and so on and so forth, in that case, the question before going to SO/AC must be submitted to the CCWG. If your question is ready by our next meeting on the 19th, please do that. If not, it's [inaudible] submitted, it should not be agreed.

I don't think that the question – I have some difficulty with the question, but I don't want to retain my disagreement. Go ahead, generalize it, finalize it, and submit it to CCWG next meeting before being sent to SO/AC. [inaudible] against that. Some SO/AC might have serious difficulty to reply.

For instance, the RSSAC, I don't know how he'd reply to this question, but I don't want to speak on their behalf. Generalize it, approve it under CCWG, and send it, but I am sure that the reply you'll receive will be very vague and very general, and you may not get anything out of it. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADI:

Thank you very much, Kavouss. It's a very helpful suggestion. Also, we're discussing that we are going to submit our questions to CCWG. This is a group effort, so if you can comment on the questions as well during this week, that would be great.

Greg, your hand is up, if you'll please take –

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. Responding to something that Steve said in the chat with regard to customizing the term "designated community." I think there's more than just customization issues with that. For instance, for the GNSO itself, putting aside the stakeholder groups and the constituencies, but for the GNSO as a whole, it's not entirely clear that there's a designated community.

And the term designated community is something we just kind of made up. To my mind – and then we talked about potentially to global Internet stakeholders as well, so I think we need to decide whether that is within our remit or not, since we're kind of – we have to either be doing it or not do it, we can't be kind of wishy-washy about it in these questions.

And to my mind, I'll look it in a very parochial paradigm of the intellectual property constituency, with which I'm most familiar: I wouldn't know how to apply the term designated community and global Internet stakeholders either.

The way I view it is that we have actual members, who have joined and who participate, or at least have access to our mailing lists and come to our meetings and are considered our members, and then we have the rest of the intellectual property community, which is anybody who owns a trademark, anybody who creates copyrighted material or distributes any of these things, as well as organizations that are around these things that aren't members of our group. And so to my mind, those are the two silos I think about, neither of which I would call a designated community, nor would I call them the global Internet stakeholders, except the global Internet stakeholders of our community, because we're not responsible – except in a completely wide open sense – to all global Internet stakeholders, whoever they may be.

You could apply the same thing to any other stakeholder group, constituency, SO/AC to a greater or lesser extent. Again, and even then, even if you apply to the ASO, there are the RIRs in them, but then, beyond that, there are their next level communities of people that they deal with.

So I think we need to at least be a little more clear, if we're going to be making up terms, what we mean by designated community and what we mean by global Internet stakeholders, and I think for most, it would be kind of – the actual members, of which I think nearly every group

has, and then the people kind of who are in essence the potential members – some might say, incharitably, the free riders.

Those are, to my mind, the groups that we should be looking at, and we should be clear, because if we don't get that clear, the whole rest of this questionnaire is not going to work. Thanks.

FARZANEH BADI:

Thanks, Greg. I think Steve has an answer, but also, it was suggested that the stakeholder group is the ones that actually take part in the process and assert their views. Steve, please take the mic.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

I think Greg just actually justified my point, is that when you use a generic word like designated community, we invite people to misinterpret that. This would take approximately 15 minutes to make sure our questionnaire, when it references the GNSO, that it simply cites that per ICANN Bylaws, the GNSO is “open to registries, registrars, commercial stakeholders and non-commercial stakeholders.”

And if we want, we can even put the reference to the Bylaws. So we never even have to say the word designated community. We make it very clear that for each of the seven, this is the group that the Bylaws say that they represent, and we ask when members of that target community [inaudible] designated in the Bylaws are interested in participating in the activities of your AC and SO are there eligibility requirements?

And we ask them questions about the procedures to become a participant. For some of them, we might even use the word member. There are only two, Greg, at the AC/SO level where they use the word member in the Bylaws. I realize that at the level below that, the ITC and the BC, we have members, but the vocabulary employed in the Bylaws varies for each of the ACs and SOs, and that is why it does make sense to customize how we ask, to avoid creating confusion.

But I don't feel strongly enough that I would want to force that on anyone here. I'm happy to do the work of wiring seven customized queries, and perhaps even can do so on the call, but if you all believe that there's no ambiguity about eligible member and target community, by all means, proceed with a generic set of questions. Happy with that as well.

And Greg, finally, at the end, you talk about global Internet stakeholders, and that is an important part of what we have to look at when we try to determine if each AC and SO is accountable to stakeholders outside of its designated community. We had extensive discussion on that in the CCWG plenary, because it's not at all clear that that's part of what's being replied here.

However, that's not part of this questionnaire, so I don't think we're going to create confusion on this questionnaire with respect to the global Internet stakeholders. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN:

If I could just reply briefly, I think if we're not going to ask about the global Internet stakeholders, we shouldn't mention them in the

preamble. In terms of the designated community, whether we use members or participants, I think we need to distinguish between two levels: which are those organization's and people who actually show up, who are kind of part of the mailing list, if you will.

So for the IPC, again, we have X number of actual members, and then Y is this entire designated community that we are open to. So I think we need to talk about accountability to those two groups, because we have to be accountable to the people on our membership.

The GAC has to be accountable to the people who show up in the GAC seats, the ccNSO has to be accountable to the managers who have chosen to join, and then the larger group would be all CC managers, whether they choose to join or not. The same thing for registrars. There are registrars that are members of the stakeholder group, and then there are those that are not.

So those are kind of the – I think whatever language we use – and I don't necessarily think we need to customize it, we just need to be clear that we are [actually] – two things: your kind of actual – the actual people that you interact with. I don't know how to term that, to some people are on the list but never really show up.

I'm just going to call it members for the moment, I don't care what the Bylaws say, whether GAC isn't termed as having members, but there's clearly kind of two divides: those who are kind of under the tent, and then there are those who are the larger community that are served, that may not even know they're being served by us here.

So we have to find a way to define those two [inaudible] in a way that gets it across, and certainly, if we're not going to ask whether we're responsible to all 3 billion Internet users or all 7 billion potential Internet users, then let's not even kind of go down that road, because I think we're just going to end up with muddled answers if it's not clear how we're asking.

Another way to look at it is people eligible to vote for the Chair of the organization. Whatever it is, there is a finite list, and a defined and known list of people or organizations. Then there's an undefined list that's only defined by the fact that they're eligible – if they were to show up, that they're eligible to be in that organization.

So whatever way we do it – and I'm sorry I don't have [inaudible].

FARZANEH BADI: Thank you, Greg.

GREG SHATAN: We need to do it. Thanks.

FARZANEH BADI: Okay. So I can see Kavouss's hand is up. Kavouss, please take the mic. Thank you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I'm a little bit disappointed that even two people [inaudible] group is speaking are not agreeing with each other, [inaudible] what is

designated group. I'll take another way to look at this. You send this questionnaire to GNSO. What do you expect that GNSO do or does with this question?

It is the council that reply to that, it is the two houses that reply to that, and it is inside those houses all those sub-[parties] reply to that, and then all of these replies that are going to come, who will take care of that to put them together, or they will send you the reply received from various sub-sub-sub based on the [inaudible] members, from IPC, from ISPs, from others, and so on and so forth. And who will do that? And you will receive a handful of different answers which makes it difficult to put them together, they will not be compatible, so I wonder how we'll do that.

The same thing if you send it to ASO. So I see these practical difficulties, but I am not concerned about designated community or designated [inaudible] how these people will carry forward this question and reply. There are some [days] cannot do it without them to many ratification level, and get the answer from that and put them together. So this [isn't] practical. In some places, it's more easy, in some places, it's very difficult. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADI:

Thank you, Kavouss. Actually, I think Greg raised this point and we discussed it. Also, Steve responded to this, that whether these questions should be forwarded to the constituency and the stakeholder group or this should be just at the organizational level, which I think

Steve responded that it should be forwarded to the constituencies and stakeholder groups, at least at the GNSO level.

If we can have a discussion on this, because this is one of the issues that we might want to look at and resolve before sending the questions – so Alan, I can see your hand is up. Please come in.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. We are discussing AC/SO accountability. I believe we talk to the ACs and SOs. If applicable, they can forward the questions down to a lower level and collate the answers, but I do not believe we should make that decision for them.

With regard to the vagueness of the words that do not necessarily have meaning in one context or another, that's the exact point I was making: we are telling people – we should tell people to interpret the questions and the definitions and the words as applicable in their environment, because I don't think we're going to get them all right regardless of how many 15 minutes we put into it. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADI:

Okay, thank you. Yes, so we will kind of change the final question, which was about forwarding it to the relevant stakeholder groups.

So if there are no comments, there's another thing that we need to resolve before we actually move forward, is that Giovanni's reformulation of the questions got a couple of support from our members. I was wondering if we should work and make changes to Giovanni's draft or our draft or can we just work on our draft? If I can

get feedback on this so that we know which version we can work on.
Okay, so there's Sébastien and then Kavouss.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Farzaneh. I raised my hand before you asked this question, and I wanted to – I don't want to bother and to stop the group, but I really think that two main – I will say issues here with regard to whom we are sending the question.

One is that we need to be clear that it's for the whole organization, and then if constituencies, RALOs, if those type of organizations want to participate and to answer, we need to be sure that they receive the questionnaire and that we allow them to answer. If they don't, they don't, but we can't say that we just talk to the SO and AC. We can decide that we just send to the SO and ACs, but we ask them actually that we want them to send the questionnaire to all the relevant bodies within their organization, and those bodies will decide to answer or not.

And the second point – I know that we already discussed that a few meetings before and I guess we will come back on that – no, we are not just accountable to our members, our participants, whatever is the name we want to give. We are also accountable to the others, because if we want to be accountable to the whole internet user, Internet groups, we need to be accountable with the other.

Okay, it's not the same level, but it's important. Here, we have a questionnaire to the SO and ACs and their bodies, and that's a good first step.

FARZANEH BADII: Okay, thank you very much, Sébastien. Kavouss, please take the mic.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Still, I think there might be something behind the question or questionnaire that would create some difficulty. I had [inaudible] they want to use this process for instance that – for instance – one AC put objections to the ways that one [inaudible] SO is functioning. One SO put a challenge on the way that the Directors or Chairs or Vice Chairs or election of another SO is functioning.

I have heard that. I was sitting at the table with several people and I heard that what is behind this is [different.] One SO will be able to comment on the activities of other SO or other ACs and vice versa to comment on the way that they elect their leaders, to elect on the way that [function] their regions. To allow you to comment on the way that they decide on the issues. That would become very dangerous and put all the SO and ACs in some sort of retaliations and some sort of competition, and so on and so forth. That will result in some unhealthy environment and atmosphere that people acting each other instead of doing their job.

It looks like that in some countries [that I know], people instead of doing something, they all criticize either each other or criticize their predecessors, but not doing the job. So I might be [inaudible] if you send this out and so on. This is a big [inaudible].

And now coming to a particular case, I am just [inaudible]. You receive the questionnaire, what do you? You send it to RALOs, you answer it yourself, you answer it in your review, you send it to the [inaudible] people. What you do, and [inaudible] and what is there [inaudible]? Thank you.

FARZANEH BADI:

Kavouss, just to respond to this last comment that you made, we are charged with the task to provide – and this is a CCWG report, it has charged this subgroup to come up with a working plan for enhancing the accountability of SO and AC. This questionnaire is an effort to feed into this task that we are charged with, because we cannot just come up with a working plan without enhancing the SO and AC accountability, without consulting with them.

And this has been something that we are charged with, and this is what we decided to do within the group, that we are going to send questions to the SO and ACs. I hope that answers your question. Steve, your hand is up. If I may, we might want to also discuss the staff report after this. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Farzaneh. When the staff report comes report, it's fine as far as it goes, but I had somehow hoped that the staff report would include a pretty comprehensive list of the accountability documents of each SO and AC. And it certainly has some, but not all.

For instance, it has a link to the GAC operating principles. And maybe that's all there is in the GAC, who knows. In the GNSO, it has a link to our Westlake report, but it doesn't have links to the GNSO operating procedures, or a link to the section of ICANN Bylaws describing GNSO, or any other document. Because there's quite a bit out there.

One idea is to discuss with the staff at ICANN who is charged with servicing each of the SOs and ACs. It's my belief that there are individuals whose job it is to actually work to support an SO and AC. If we were to contact those individuals – they work for [inaudible] – all of them, pretty sure – and suggest to them, “Could you supplement this staff report by giving us a comprehensive list of all known accountability documents and procedures in response to these questions,” and then we'll catalog all of them, so we'd have a starting point for each SO and AC.

And I realize that, Farzaneh, we're halfway between discussing the questionnaires and the staff report, but remember, we came up with this questionnaire idea because we were waiting on the staff report, and didn't know for sure if the staff report would address the question.

It goes some there, but it doesn't actually answer them all. This might be a golden opportunity to go back to the staff who's assigned to each SO and AC and ask them to dig up the documents. That way, we have something to start on, then we go back and ask the leadership of an SO and AC if they have anything they want to do to supplement what we could find online.

The beauty of that is that we save any of the SO and ACs from doing, well, boring work that they felt we should have been able to find on our own, and maybe they'll add some color that isn't reflected in the Bylaws and procedures. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADI:

Thank you, Steve. Kavouss, please take the mic.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

I'm sorry. I apologize to you, but your explanation did not convince me at all. [inaudible]. What we're doing does not do anything at all. It reminds me that a group of people who are digging the mountain, taking the rocks [inaudible] to have water, and somebody says that, "What you do with this?" "I want to have water for those people." And the person says that this does not bring any water to those people. He replies, "That doesn't matter, it brings [growth] to these people."

So this does not get anything for SO and AC accountability, just creates some job, just spends some time and some money and some effort. I don't think it's there to aid us. The result would be very small. I don't think that the people pushing us by these stress tests and so on and so forth, and they're pushing us to do something, the results of which would be negative, almost negative. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADI:

Thank you, Kavouss. We will note your concern. Okay, so if we can move to the staff report, and actually, staff have also noted a couple of

[inaudible] organizational [leads] that are taking place or have taken place already in the GNSO and ALAC.

Steve, do you want to make some remarks on the staff report?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

I first want to thank staff for doing it. I know they've been stretched lately, and I really appreciate the work that went into it. No surprise, I found everything in the staff report to be very helpful and accurate, and it's very closely matched to the documents that we presented earlier in our Google Doc, which cataloged all of our earlier discussion. That's where we reached into the Bylaws for Work Stream 2, we reached into the CCWG final report and tried to faithfully suggest what it is we were supposed to work on. In our Google Doc, we also dove into the idea that there are Bylaws mandated organizational reviews.

So in my opinion, the staff report closely tracks and supplements the Google Doc this group put together. And for that, I'm grateful. But I do want to indicate that the staff report doesn't do a deep dive into the accountability documents and procedures that are used by each of the SOs and ACs. That's treated in a cursory fashion at the end of the report, and I could understand that with the staff resources available, that's all that could be done, but we may have missed the opportunity to have staff talk to staff.

If, for instance, I believe Brenda and Karen did the work on this, and they could have easily talked to David or his team and asked them, "Who handles GNSO? Who handles the RSSAC and the SSAC, and can you have them put together a list of all of the accountability documents

and procedures that are relevant to how that operation works?” That would make the staff report more valuable and if that can’t be done in short order, we ask open-ended questions of each SO and AC in the hopes that they’ll reply. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII: Thank you, Steve. Alan, please take –

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. If you think that if we ask questions to ACs and SOs, their staff members don’t see it, you’re crazy. I really believe we should ask the ACs and SOs. If I choose, as Chair of the ALAC, to ask my staff to prepare something as a first cut, then that’s my call. If I decide to ask a volunteer to do it, that is my call.

I don’t think we should unilaterally assign staff tasks. They’re busy enough as it is, especially preparing for the Hyderabad meeting and then the follow-on from it. Let’s let our processes work and not try to build new ones. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII: Okay, so if I gathered it correctly, Alan is suggesting that we just ask the Chairs, and the Chairs can decide whether staff should work on the answers [inaudible] the volunteers.

Kavouss, please take the mic.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, thank you very much. I am grateful to the people that [inaudible] but I don't agree with the way it is written. One, transparency means that an actor, ICANN, is answerable to its stakeholder by being open and visible to them. We mix up transparency with accountability. When you say answerability, you talk accountability. You are not transparency.

The second part is, yes, the doctor is open and visible to outside and inside – that [I agree]. But to be answerable is not part of transparency. Answerability is part of accountability. Responsive and answerable is not transparency, so it's [making up]. How [inaudible] answerable? [inaudible].

We have used many times the handbook of [yours], consultation, consult, consultant, consulting, why do you need to define what is consultation? Review, why do you need to define what is review? I don't understand. This is [inaudible] totally to go into all of these things.

We do exactly the same thing in the Human Rights Group. We say, "What does it mean to respect? What does it mean to address?" What does it mean due diligence?" If we take all of these questions, what does it mean, we just get nowhere. I don't think that [inaudible]. This is misleading. This is not the correct way.

I don't agree that we're wasting our time on the nights and so on and so forth, from our families, from our lives, and discussing what does it mean transparency. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADI:

Yes, thank you, Kavouss. Actually, I think at the beginning of the staff report, I think you're talking about the second page, and these are the [recommendations] by Jan Scholte. He says that accountability is comprised of four dimensions: transparency, consultation, review, redress.

We actually met – if I'm not wrong. I'm sorry, if I'm wrong, can you correct me? Okay. So basically, this was also raised in the Google Doc, the initial Google Doc that we had with Matthew Shears. I am also in doubt that whether his kind of dimensions apply to the SO and ACs' accountability or not, and whether we should define accountability considering the four dimensions. My personal view is that, no, we are different, and it should not be defined like this.

So I can see your hand is up, Kavouss. Please, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, I'll go to the first part, [inaudible]. I don't understand why the NTIA statement has now become the guiding for us. That was something for the Work Stream 1, and we have addressed those to the extent possible, and some people, they have provided the stress test, but we are not going to implement those things.

I don't understand the meaning of this, I don't understand this point [inaudible] NTIA one, two, three, four, [inaudible] they are not [holy roads], they are not something that we should spend our time on that, and they are not executable.

I don't understand. I asked in the e-mail that could those people tell me one example that somebody captures that any newcomers come in? Give you an example: would SO and AC prevent or put obstacles that new SO or AC [is prevented/created] or new member comes to SO and AC? Who has done that? We don't have that in the GAC. Anyone who wants to be member of the GAC, will be [inaudible] immediately and welcome. If you need money to come, we try divert [inaudible] to the ICANN to get some fellowship.

I don't understand this capturing from outside. What does it mean, capturing from outside? Who has prevented, up until now? Please, give me one example only that any SO and AC has been captured, not allowing other people coming in –

FARZANEH BADI: Okay, so –

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Not allowing new SO and AC be created. Please, give me an example.

FARZANEH BADI: Yes, okay. Cheryl, would you like to take the microphone?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just briefly. Thank you, Farzaneh. Kavouss, we know of your serious concerns with the definitions on what we need included and what we need to remember is a staff generated compilation of some existing

resources that is material from other sources. This is not a piece of group drafted text here and we are asking for some feedback and your feedback is you have deep and considerable concerns about some of the terminology and relevance in the terminology used in this paper.

I think we can just note that and ask for other opinions as well, but this is a compilation exercise done by staff to give us some reference material to look at. It is supposed to be an assistance tool, not a piece of text we're going to die in the ditch over. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII:

Thank you, Cheryl. I think we're coming to the end of our meeting if there are no comments on anything. What we are going to do, we're going to use Giovanni's version of the questions and consider all the comments that have been made during this call as well as last call. I have made some modification based on the last call's comments, but we are going to draft everything, all the questions, and – I don't know the time line. Cheryl, would that be doable for next meeting next week?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I believe it should be, but we'll keep the group updated through the list if it's not.

FARZANEH BADII:

Okay, great. So if there are no other comments, then have a very good evening and day. Goodbye.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Farzaneh. Thank you, Steve. Thank you, everyone. Bye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]