RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen, and thank you all for joining. Today is the, I believe, eleventh meeting of our SO/AC Accountability Work Stream 2 Activities, and we have a reasonably busy agenda today, so I would ask everyone to take a small look at the suggested timing that we have on each of our items. It will be a primarily administrative as opposed to deliberative sort of discussion today. So today is one where we've got a number of how-to-go-forward decisions to make, and so if we can keep our interventions as short as practical, and try a minute to one intervention per person, unless there is a particularly urgent need for a wide reply.

With that, I'm going to do the usual call administration and ask that when you speak, you identify yourselves for the record, and that you speak as clearly and as slowly as possible, that you check your audio and if we have audio issues, staff will be able to assist you and even do a dial-out to you, if that is going to be a more stable line. I would also ask if anybody has any update to their statements of interest to be made at this time.

Not hearing anybody or seeing anyone in the Adobe Connect room raising their hands. I will just note, for the record, that since our last meeting, I will be updating my statement of interest to reflect the fact that the At-Large Advisory Committee has given me the honor of appointing me as their liaison to the GNSO Council. So my statements

of interest to both the GNSO and the At-Large Advisory Committee work will be updated accordingly; I've just been a tad too busy to do that.

With that, let's move on to our next item on the agenda, which is a review of Action Items from our October 20th meeting, which is our meeting number ten. There was a single Action Item – and I want to thank you all for the excellent and very, very useful input that was received – it was a short-order request; the Action Item was to give us feedback on the questions that we were reporting we were going to be doing in Hyderabad. That last-minute set of interactions on the list and on the Google Doc were very valuable, and I know the document originally penned by Farzaneh was far better for your input, so thank you, one and all. And our only Action Item from that meeting is completed.

With that, I am going to take a much-needed sip of my coffee and hand it over to Steve DelBianco. He's going to do a brief recap on the Hyderabad meeting. Over to you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Cheryl. It's Steve DelBianco. Cheryl and I both took turns giving an update to the CCWG Plenary, when we met on the day before Hyderabad began. I'll give you four quick updates on four areas. One is Mutual Accountability Roundtable, the IRP, the notion of effectiveness in the structural reviews, and then finally, the questions we distriubted to all of the SO/ACs. I can sense that walking through what we have on our multi-track work plan, the Mutual Accountability Roundtable continues to generate fear, uncertainty, and doubt in the minds of many

– not only within our own group, but within the large group – if it implies that an AC/SO is actually accountable to all of the other AC/SOs. There is widespread acceptance that an SO/AC is accountable to the members that it serves in its bylaws. There's even a belief that AC/SOs answer to the global Internet community when it comes to getting public comment on their proposals, and that the Board considers public interest before it approves something that, say, CCNSO or GNSO came up with. But I have found only one or two people that are comfortable holding one AC/SO accountable to another AC/SO.

Now, some of this fear is really unfounded; because if you read the Mutual Accountability Roundtable paper that was submitted – and this is all part of our progress report; this was covered a long time ago, but Willy Curry, back in May of 2015, described the Mutual Accountability Roundtable, and it's proof that the title doesn't match the concept. What Willy described – and all of this is in our progress report document – what he described is really just a roundtable of discussion, of best practices, what worked and didn't work, that would occur once a year amongst the AC/SOs. There's really nothing in his original description that would hold, say, GAC accountable to GNSO, which I know is Kavouss's singular fear. I don't find a lot of appetite for extending the Mutual Accountability Roundtable to that extent. So that presents us with a dilemma: to we put that to bed, or do we try to examine whether once a year, there should be a discussion of that nature, without accountability?

That's one track. The second track is the IRP. If you recall, the bylaws charged us to look at whether the IRP was applicable to activities within an AC/SO. I briefly surfaced this when we were together in Hyderabad,

and there was very little interest, but some concern. I would say that Becky Burr, who is now serving on ICANN's Board and as the Rapporteur for all of the IRP implementation, felt like it was too heavyweight and too expensive of a mechanism to determine whether, let's say, GNSO was being accountable to the GNSO constituencies the bylaws created it to serve. So it seems to me, the sentiment is, let's explore more lightweight, fast-moving, less expensive mechanisms, such as Ombudsman and other areas. And Sébastien Bachollet discussed at that meeting in Hyderabad where he was going with Ombudsman; and it may be that – I asked him whether the Ombudsman could serve us in this way, and his answer was probably, but we should talk about it. So, I realize we are going to probably have some help from the IRP team – David McAuley, for instance, who's taken over for Becky Burr – and I think Cheryl has noticed that for one of our upcoming meetings. But we're also going to want to consider whether, if we say no, the IRP doesn't apply, should we also go a step further to say perhaps Ombudsman could apply?

So, that's two down. Let me give you the third item, which is the notion of the word "effectiveness." This is part of Track 1. It got there because the SO/AC Accountability, in the bylaws, was supposed to look at the structural reviews that are required every three years. These are the structural reviews that are described in detail, right from the bylaws, in our progress report. And all of the AC/SOs, except for the GAC, undergo a review. We've been through this with all of you many times, but that review looks at whether any change in structure or process is necessary to improve the effectiveness of an AC or an SO. And so far, when you've done these reviews, it's the Board that hires an outside consulting firm

– an outside reviewer – and it's the Board who really tells them what the word "effectiveness" really means in that context, if they tell them at all. So I will be the one who's to blame for this, but I had teed up a track whereby our group could answer the question, "What does 'effectiveness' mean in SO/ACs?" so that we can guide the Board as it hires its consultants. I don't sense as much of an appetite for that. So it may be that the effectiveness track also falls off.

Finally, there was the question: we realized that to do what the bylaws told us we have to do, that we have some understanding of the accountability mechanisms each of the AC/SOs have today, because we are supposed to review those mechanisms and make recommendations for improvement. And there's no question of whether that's in scope or not, because it's exactly what the bylaws gave us to do. I would say that on those questions, we've got a good set of questions, and they should serve as enough information for us to do the review; but I fear that we may have to nudge the respective AC/SO Chairs and Secretariats to respond – and particularly in the GNSO, we have to drill down to seven underlying Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies. Each of them – I should say each of us, because I'm one of them – we have our own charter. We have our own processes for challenging accountability problems that occur at our level. So I'm going to attempt to lead by example and get the Business Constituency's answers in by the middle of next week. But I would encourage each of you, to the extent that you're working within your AC/SOs, that it's more than just sending a reminder. We may actually have to dive in and start the work. It's rather easy to start the work when you turn to the website that each of you have, but there are a lot of holes – missing pieces, procedures that

are sort of customary, but not documented anywhere. So, Cheryl, that's my recap of the conversation that occurred in Hyderabad, and I'm happy to take questions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Steve. Any questions?

You've obviously been very clear, and thank you for being very concise. It's Cheryl Langdon-Orr again, for the record, who is caffeine-deprived at what is an early hour on this call for me. I forgot to ask if there was anyone only on the audio channel, noting that we do take our attendance records from the Adobe Connect room. If you are only on the phone line, please make yourself known now.

Not hearing anyone. My [inaudible] seems to [inaudible] not [CROSSTALK]

SEUN OJEDEJI: Cheryl, this is Seun.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Seun, thank you; we will note your attendance. Thank you very much, and you know how to make yourself heard for an intervention. Thanks for that. Anyone else?

Okay. Now, thank you for that excellent recap, Steve; and I'll note a number of very good interactions and opportunities coming along in the chat space as well on that topic, which is actually a perfect segue to our

next section, which is looking in a number of [inaudible] of subsections at the next steps in our Work Plan. The first thing we're going to discuss is, in fact, what sort of methodology for review to the replies that we are expecting to come in to us with their questions – which, for anyone who was not in Hyderabad or who has not been watching any leadership lists within their respective AC/SOs – and I believe that [inaudible] if not all of the mail lists for Leadership Teams are usually archived and public – but if not, that's one of the lists that we might need to be looking at in the near future. We have under the pen of the Co-Chairs – during Hyderabad, had the questions that this group discussed and created regarding individual AC/SO accountability aspects sent us during Hyderabad. We've given a – need to send a date for the reply; and as you heard from Steve and Seun in the chat from Farzaneh, we do need to prompt and encourage the component parts of the SO/ACs – indeed, the SO/ACs themselves, to reply. But now let's look at methodology. How are we going to manage the review of these questions? What are we going to do with them? How are we going to move forward on an analysis and a set of observations? Note I'm saying "observations" on these. And for this, I'm going to hand that to Steve DelBianco. Over to you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Cheryl, I quickly answered a quick email. You want me to speak to number three under methodology of reviewing replies; is that correct?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That is correct, yes.

STEVE DELBIANCO:	That's great. To the extent that we can delegate tasks within this group, we really need to identify who in this group is most familiar with ALAC. I'm pretty sure it's you. Who in this group is most familiar with the different components of GNSO? We have several on this call. CCNSO is an area where I believe we really need to generate some participation and interest. We have several GAC members. SSAC, RSSAC, that's another matter. We had spotty participation from them. Thankfully, ASO is on this call. And I think we're going to need from the people who understand those groups not only to generate those answers, but to help interpret those answers. And it's possible that we will benchmark each of the AC/SOs, maybe against the standard that's set by on AC/SO with respect to whether there are specific accountability mechanisms in place.

I don't think it's any secret that there won't be a lot in writing from the AC/SOs about how they're accountable to the communities that the bylaws say that they serve. So the question that I have for all of you is, are we benchmarking the AC/SOs against each other in terms of their accountability, or are we holding them to some undefined standard, some normative standard of how much accountability should be in writing – how many mechanisms should be in writing for the AC/SOs? And until we answer that question, that's the primary methodology discussion. Is it relative comparison, or are they all being compared to some absolute standard? It would be good to take a queue on that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Steve, and I see Alan in the queue. Over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I've mentioned this before. The AC/SOs are all so very different in terms of who their potential membership is, what subset of it are actually members or active participants, and the mechanisms that they would use to rectify things. So I don't think we can have an absolute set of standards and then tick off boxes, because I think different things apply. So I think we're going to have to judge each on relative merits, because I just don't believe they're close enough to each other either to use a single set of standards or to compare them to each other. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. Cheryl, for the record, and I'm waiting to see if anyone else is likely to put their hand up. Alan, is that a continuing hand, or an old hand? Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Cheryl, it's Steve. I want to completely agree with Alan on that assessment, and so it may be that there's an area called, say, eligibility to run for an officer. I'm just picking one item – eligibility to run for an officer. We would look to see, do each of the AC/SOs have a written criteria for eligibility to run for an officer? It may just be that we would indicate "yes," and here's what the eligibility criteria is. And for some, we might not have any at all; nothing's in writing. So we would report that and review it. But it doesn't mean that we automatically assume

that there's a large gap that needs to be filled, because as Alan just indicated, for some AC/SOs, the way they do officers may not require eligibility criteria. It may not require term limits, or anything like that. So perhaps we can be nonjudgmental in our review and simply catalog the extent to which eligibility, accountability, challenge and review mechanisms, and an entire list of criteria and mechanisms are available. And we can do that without saying that there are obviously big gaps in the GNSO, and here's what they're going to need to do to close them. Now, that might fall short of what the bylaws said we are supposed to do, but we can only do what it is that fits. We cannot take a simple one-sentence bylaw mandate for us and assume that we sit in judgment of all the AC/SOs.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Steve. Cheryl, for the record. What I've heard so far is that two issues need to be resolved. That the proposal – sorry – is animal hour here with the bird life getting very raucous. My apologies. Welcome to Australia, for the audio channel. The suggestion that a small sub-group of our team be formed, with at least one person with demonstrable expertise and knowledge from each of the SO/ACs – at least one, can be more – coming forward to do an initial review of the material that is presented to us in response to our surveys. From that, there is a certain data capture exercise that is also required. So let's first of all put it to the group – do you think a small subcommittee that is balanced across knowledgeable people from the AC/SOs should take a first run at the data we get in, and then help us, as the wider Work Team, understand that data and any variabilities in it? Can I have anybody who wishes to speak to that? I see some positives in the chat.

Perhaps I'll ask the opposite question. Is there anyone who doesn't think that's a good idea.

Okay, I'm not seeing any objection; therefore, I would ask, in the chat please, if you list yourselves now as someone who wishes to become a contributor, a pen-holder for want of a better word, on that small sub-team – if you could put your names and the AC or SO you will be specifically bringing your expertise from into the chat. I saw some names mentioned earlier, but if you can do it again this time, check now. I see Olga from GAC, for example. Thank you, Olga. Let's make sure we get the rest of the names listed. Then the next thing, of course, is in the methodology –

SEUN OJEDEJI: [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Seun; noted that. Seun from the ALAC.

Next thing is, of course, a methodology of what we do with the data that's captured. And perhaps what we should do to begin with is, as I think Steve was alluding to, find a way – probably in some form of matrix – which is just very simple, yes or no, data capture point. In other words, for example, "Are requirements and rules of procedure in existence, yes or no?" "Are they published, yes or no?" Just based on the information that comes back to us. No discussion, no value judgment; simply a graphical representation for comparison of the data capture points. Is that a way forward that you think might be useful for

this subcommittee to start working on? Quick queue on that, if anyone wishes to speak to that. Seun, did you wish to speak to that, as well?

SEUN OJEDEJI: This is Seun. Can you hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can, indeed. Go ahead, Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay.   Thank you, Cheryl.   [inaudible] I just wanted to indicate [inaudible] not in touch right now, so [inaudible]. But [inaudible] and so [inaudible] for the [inaudible] to [inaudible] in view of this [inaudible] response. So what you're suggesting about what to do, I think that [inaudible] I think [inaudible] I don't know how we're going to try to [inaudible] people [inaudible]. It may be subjective [inaudible] would [inaudible] providing [inaudible] for someone to judge –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Seun. Seun. Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: – SO/ACs. Yes?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Seun? Sorry. I'm getting a lot of feedback from people in the chat. Your audio is really very distorted. It's virtually inaudible. It's loud

enough, but it's an extremely bad line. If I can paraphrase what I believe I heard you say, is that you wish to make contributions to the Work Team sub-group regarding expertise from the ASO? Can you tell me yes or no for that?

Not hearing anything now.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Can you hear me? Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Seun. I also heard you start going into some detail on analysis points, and I would strongly encourage you, because of the audio, to actually take that up at the first gathering with the sub-team, because it is impossible to understand. Due apologies. Perhaps, staff, you could contact Seun and see whether dialing out to him might give us a better audio channel. I'll leave you and the staff to sort that out. Staff could dial out to you, and perhaps you might get a stable channel. Okay. Sorry about that. I don't know about anyone else, but I'm finding it almost impossible to understand. Steve, I see your hand up.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. Steve Delbianco. I would say two things. The first is, we did get volunteers from four of our AC/SOs, but we still need CCNSO, SSAC, and RSSAC. None of them are on the call for us to – I don't think anyone is on the call from those groups – so, Thomas Rickert is one of the CCWG Co-Chairs who's been assigned to work with our group. That's one of the first things that we'll want to ask Thomas to do, is to help us

to recruit an individual from SSAC, RSSAC, and CCNSO. And as far as I'm concerned, it could be the same individual that fills out the questionnaire for that AC/SO and then follows those answers into this Work Team to help us to understand, to interrogate, and compare and contrast. So we're going to need some help in getting those three groups. I don't believe we've had any participation, even from the beginning, from SSAC, RSSAC, or CCNSO.

My second [inaudible] –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'll caution you against that, Steve. I'm sorry. I can't leave CCNSO being maligned in that way. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record, of course. Giovanni from CCNSO has been a key contributor to even these survey questions. Giovanni has offered his apologies for today's call, and I have worked long enough with him in the CCNSO – remembering that I did serve on that council for many years – that we can probably propose that he at least take up the mantle for CCNSO and see if he can get some others to join, if need be. But I will take an Action Item from this to reach out to Giovanni to see if he can serve in this sub-team. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Cheryl. Apologies to Giovanni, in absentia. I didn't realize he was CCNSO; that's fantastic. We still need SSAC and RSSAC.

The second observation is, is when we categorize the answers we get to our questionnaire, we'll want to follow what the bylaws told us to do,

and put it into three categories: accountability, transparency, and participation. And what was added was the phrase "to prevent capture." That arose from the stress test that the [inaudible] had given us. So the notion of capture can be addressed to all three: accountability, transparency, and then participation. It's that participation angle, where we take a look at, to what extent does an AC/SO do outreach? They try to attract more participation from the target community the bylaws indicate they are to serve.

So we do have some organizing principles, organizing framework, by which to look at the answers that come back, and this made its way through our questionnaire, as well, but we didn't lay it out in those three tracks. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much, Steve. It looks like if we take your Action Item, then, in addition to the one of me reaching out to Giovanni, that we talk with Thomas to see if we can formally reach out for RSSAC and SSAC, and I'm sure that we should be able to do something there. For example, I know Julie Hammer is running a watching booth across all of our activities, and I'm sure I can prevail upon her to see if we can get somebody if Thomas fails.

With that, can I ask – is there anyone who objects to us now going forward with this creation of a small sub-team, who we then will encourage to meet in the next week or so; before, in fact, the materials have all come back in from all the AC/SOs, so that they can get that to us at next week's call with a rough plan of how they will be managing

this data capture exercise? And I think we should think of it as a data capture exercise. If no one is objecting to that, we'll take that as a way forward, and I'll just note on our Action Item there if staff can assist us in facilitation of a – doesn't need to be a supported call, but it would be good to have the ability for this group to have a call, or they may choose to do it on Skype chat. I don't mind. But they do need to have the opportunity before our next call next week, so they can get some feedback to us. Thank you very much for your support on that, Christopher; I noticed that in the chat.

I'd like to move us now, if I can, on to our next Agenda Item, which does have a reasonable allocation of time, most of which we've bitten into with our discussion point, but it was an important discussion point, so I don't mourn the loss of time, there. The next thing I'm going to hand over to Farzaneh and Steve to take a relatively brief discussion and queue on the matter of one of our major tracks of work, which is the use of IRP. We need to start this discussion, and the first thing that we as Rapporteurs are proposing to you as the Work Team is that we will invite David McAuley, who is taking over as Chair from the IRP Work Team from Becky Burr, as Steve said who is now serving on the ICANN Board, to join us on the next meeting or somewhere after that, depending on his calendar, to make sure we all have a proper, shared, mutual understanding of what the IRP is, and what, therefore, we may be able to look at whether we feel at ease or it's not an appropriate use. So, who wants to take the lead on that, Farzaneh or Steve?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Cheryl, it's Steve DelBianco –

FARZANEH BADII: I could just ask a couple –

STEVE DELBIANCO: Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, Steve, how about we go to Farzaneh? [inaudible] categories, and then hand off when you want to.

FARZANEH BADII: I cannot hear you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADII: Alright. I just wanted to raise a couple of points about IRP. So I looked at what has been done in Work Stream 1, and why they came up with this suggestion of looking at IRP in Work Stream 2. The rationale behind it, which I have also put in the document, was that this group should look into this because the question of who watches the watchers is important, but also they want to avoid an infinite loop, which means that they wanted us to look at this IRP as some kind of a mechanism that can put an end to the kind of conflict that can hold SO/ACs accountable. I also have certain relevant sections of the bylaws on IRP,

which is about the scope of IRP and which disputes can be filed. Just for your information, we can take it up after David talks. That's about it. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Steve?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Cheryl, it's Steve DelBianco. The bylaws require us to do the following: to "assess whether the IRP would also be applicable to SO/AC activities." And therefore, if we bring David McAuley as someone in to present, we wouldn't want them to present the way the IRP is used to challenge ICANN's actions and inactions, but rather to directly present to us whether there are aspects to the IRP that either fit or don't fit to activities within an AC/SO. And secondarily, and I believe that David McAuley, if we give him a few days of lead time, we can brief him so that his presentation is on-point, as opposed to a broad tutorial on the way IRP is to be used. Because that won't be relevant to us. I also recommend that we invite the new Ombudsman to join the very same call, with an intent to be able to react to things that come up. So, for instance, if David McAuley presents a way an IRP could be used by a potential participant to challenge the Business Constituency because we said they were not eligible to run for office, then the Ombudsman may weigh in to say, "Well, you don't need an IRP to do that; the Ombudsman can respond to that complaint, and here's what we would do." So that would be an ability to compare and contrast when an IRP might not be the right tool to come up with accountability and

transparency, [inaudible] participation challenged within an AC or an SO. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Steve. I open the floor for any discussion on that. I see Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'd like to understand what it means to have the IRP apply in this case. The IRP right now can make judgments on whether ICANN has violated its bylaws. I think what we're talking about here is to increase the scope of the IRP to use the charters or other rules of procedure or whatever of AC/SOs, Constituency Stakeholder Groups, to see whether they have violated their rules or not applied them consistently. Is that what we're talking about? Because otherwise, I'm not quite sure how the IRP can rule.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alan, if I could reply, I pasted into chat what the bylaws have asked us to do, and they say to assess whether the IRP would be applicable to AC/SO activities. That's not very clear. But the way in which you just described it is pretty much what I assumed is meant. And so, the entity who would bring an IRP would be, let's say, a Business Constituency member who felt that a decision made by the Business Constituency was in violation of the BC's charter, or it wasn't transparent, the BC's not being accountable, or we excluded them from participation in a debate, or we excluded them from the ability to run for office. So it's

my guess – like you – that it's a mechanism by which an entity, like an AC/SO or a Stakeholder Group Constituency could be challenged on its decisions or lack of action. I think that means we agree.

ALAN GREENBERG: My follow-up question is, is there an intermediate step? I believe, for instance, for the ALAC – and I can't speak to the other Advisory Committees – but I believe that there are clauses in the current bylaws which says the Board can intervene, or certain things can be appealed to the Board. Certainly, the admission of an ALS as a member, or the certification or decertification of an ALS within At-Large is something that is appealable to the Board. So we're almost adding either a replacement step for that, or an additional step for that afterwards. I think we're going to need really a lot of clarity about what we're talking about before we can decide if we want it or not. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alan, it's Steve DelBianco. I do think that that probably falls to us, and before we come up with what our preference is in interpreting that, you probably ought to dive into the CCWG's final report and to see whether there is any other detail offered. Farzaneh and I did as good a job as we could scraping from the report and bylaws everything that was relevant to us, but it's possible that we missed one paragraph of explanation in the report that everyone had confirmed, that might have given us some clarity. I suspect, however, that [CROSSTALK] properly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Or it may not [CROSSTALK].

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alan, let me agree with you. I believe it'll probably help us to figure this out. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, gentlemen. I see Christopher Wilkinson. Over to you, Christopher.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you. Can you hear me?

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

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Can you hear me? Yes, you can. [inaudible] the [inaudible] addressing IRP questions. My personal view is [inaudible] essential to [inaudible] jurisdiction for IRP from the jurisdiction of ICANN, without wishing to [inaudible] ICANN's jurisdiction. It's quite clear to me that [inaudible] jurisdiction for all IRPs is [inaudible] structural solution. [inaudible], I recently read cover-to-cover [inaudible] judgment [inaudible] type of costs [inaudible] costs [inaudible] dollars. [inaudible] participation. If it was decided that IRP should apply to the decisions of AC/SOs, [inaudible] that question.   [inaudible], it is quite clear that every [inaudible] costs of [inaudible] makes [inaudible] potential users of IRP.

So our decisions [inaudible] questions [inaudible] different [inaudible], different arrangements – for example, the Ombudsman – or it must be very, very clear that the IRP can be conducted under any jurisdiction that is relevant [inaudible] and certainly the costs to [inaudible] or to [inaudible] to the AC/SOs themselves, the costs [inaudible] and very reasonable. The idea [inaudible] dollar bill. No.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Thank you, Christopher. It's Cheryl, for the record. It sounded somewhat like your microphone may have been very loud. There was an awful lot of distortion, and I'm not sure if everyone – and in fact, I can tell by the chat as you can – that a number of people had difficulty understanding exactly what you're saying. However, as I understood it, I believe – and I'd like you to just do a synopsis in the chat, if you don't mind – you were raising two particular issues, which go to a substantive discussion that we will undoubtedly have later, as well, and that was on jurisdiction and cost. The questions, of course, that we can delve into in greater detail – but if you could just give us a synopsis into the chat, please, and then we'll make sure that we pick up those threads when we have a substantive discussion on this matter. Is there anyone else who wishes to go on the queue on this topic? If not, I would like to move us on to our next thread, which is, in fact, how we're going to look at the preparation of our next report to the CCWG; and for this, is it possible – I don't know if staff have it – but if we do have the current timeline for Track 1 and Track 2 work, that I would strongly suggest we need to look at to remind ourselves of where we are and where we should be, if that can be displayed. If not – oh, looks like it is; excellent. And I just want to take a small amount of time

now – and I'm going to hand over to Farzaneh and Steve – to look at how we may go towards preparing a report that we do owe the CCWG in short order. Obviously, not the final report, but an advancement on our update in Hyderabad, even though it can be based upon it. Those of you who are in the Adobe Connect room will see that we are already bumping up against timeline issues, and there may be several ways for us to deal with that, which I'm sure Farzaneh and Steve can explore. But one thing that the Rapporteurs do want to propose to you as a group is that this is another situation where it would be, we believe, wise for a small sub-team of our group to gather and start framing how the next report, making some high-level notes, etcetera. So a small drafting team should be formed on this, and if those of you who are interested in contributing to that drafting team will note that in the chat, we'll come back to that a little later on in this discussion. Who's going to lead off on this, Farzaneh or Steve?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Cheryl, hey, it's Steve DelBianco. The report that we prepared was really a summary, a travel log of where we have been. If we can – if first, if we were to discard the track called "effectiveness." If we could pull that out and put it to the appendix as something we looked at and discarded. So, rearranging our report might be the first step we do, and rearranging in such a way that we completely narrow the focus of Mutual Accountability Roundtable, so unlike its title, it matches the very limited exchange of ideas that it was originally written up to be. So if it's possible that Farzaneh and I could rearrange the report we have without adding anything new to it, in an effort to see how much work

remains to be done at actually getting the report completely. And I don't mean to volunteer Farzaneh for that in advance. Farzaneh?

FARZANEH BADII: Yes, sure. Yeah, I think we can do that. I'm not very sure about the timeline, here. What are we supposed to do at the beginning of December?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Farzaneh, according to this timeline, the Track 2 groups in Work Stream 2 – the Track 2 groups of which we were one – we would actually need to produce in early December a report that could be presented to the rest of our CCWG Plenary, for the purpose of a first reading and perhaps even a second reading, so that the Plenary would say, "Yes, this is ready to put out for public comment." And staff, by the end of December, would add all of the other [AUDIO ECHO] that public comment [inaudible]. I think that's what implied by the timeline in front of you, the Work Stream 1 – Work Stream 2 timeline. I'll confess that I don't see how we could meet the Track 2 timeline, given where we are today, and I would ask us all to consider whether we ought to move to Track 1, which adds significantly more time to get this finished.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Steve. I must say, Farzaneh and I have also independently suggested to each other that a move to Track 1 would be a smart way forward. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record; I should have said that, first of all. Can I then put that to the assembly here today? Is a way

forward for our timeline management to formally request that our topic be shifted to a Track 1 timeline? Is there anyone who objects to us proposing that our topic shift to a Track 1 timeline, as shown in front of you on the Adobe Connect room?

Not hearing any objections, and not seeing any objections. That will make a great deal of difference to the pressure we have upon ourselves, and of course that includes other commitments such as we were noting in the chat – activities of the Internet governance forum in Mexico – indeed, other national and regional initiatives that are running all the time, as well. That doesn't mean that we shouldn't also now consider [inaudible] shift to Track 1. We should also now consider the collection of names who would like to offer themselves to be part of the small drafting team. Farzaneh, I would suggest you were "volun-told" by Steve to be part of this. Perhaps you'd like to take the lead on this one, and the first thing would be a reorganizing and restructuring of our initial draft report. Kavouss, I notice you are not connected. I'm certain that staff also know that you are not connected, and that they will be doing their very best to dial out to you. If staff can double-check on that, please. So, if you'd like to be part of this drafting team now, please put your name in the chat, noting that; and obviously, we will make another call for people on the list to do so, as well. But I think, unless anyone objects, we'll ask Farzaneh to lead this particular part of the work. I'll just leave the chat to run, and come back to it. Kavouss, we hear you are not connected, and staff undoubtedly will be working to get you connected. But we can't do anything about that; only staff can, unless you have another ability to dial in.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Looks like we have a second small sub-team to be created, then. And I would like now to move us, if I may, to our very next item; and that is the one that Steve did start to talk about in his review from Hyderabad, and that is when and how to approach the matter of our mandate to discuss the Mutual Accountability Framework, etcetera. I'm going to try taking the lead on this one, and I'm going to try and gain us back some of our time so we have a little bit more time for the rest – and I suspect that might have been Kavouss joining us. If it is, welcome to the audio back again, Kavouss.

With moving to Track 1, we have the small luxury of a little longer time. So we are not discussing the topic; we are discussing how and when we will approach the topic. Can I suggest that on this matter, which we know is hotly contested and has a lot of divided and deeply held views, can I suggest that we reestablish a timeline within the constraints of now Track 1 for Work Stream 2 timelines, and that we position, in a clear point in time, early in 2017, a dedicated conversation – in other words, a single-purpose call – to explore this particular track of our work? Prior to that, I would like to suggest we form some sort of brief opinion survey – whether it's a Doodle poll, or a Survey Monkey, or whatever – and we distribute it to all of the members and the participants on our Work Team. So, rather than just hear one or two voices, we give the opportunity between now and that discussion point in early 2017, for everyone – hopefully, over the Christmas break and holiday season, remembering that Asia Pacific has a number of very important ritual and holiday times in the January and early February period – so, over that period of time, where each and every one of our members and participants can have a think and give us some feedback

on this matter. Is that a way forward that you would feel comfortable with? That's the question I'm putting to the table. Can we pick an early 2017 now point in time, where we have a single-purpose call and we have a discussion on this track of work? And secondly, that we poll all of our members and participants in advance of that? I see Kavouss and then Steve. Please limit yourselves to the questions posed. Over to you, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Excuse me. Do you hear me, please?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We hear you perfectly well. Go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I think announcement of the time is misleading. It is 900 GNT or UTC, which is 2000 Central European.   But sometimes in the announcements it says 2000 to 2100.   That means a one hour difference. I did not know that you had started a full fifty minutes ago, because it was not clear. Please put one single time UTC and for everybody UTC [inaudible]. But do not announce to 2000 to 2100. 2000 to 2100, perhaps it means UTC 2000, UTC 2100 means 2200 to 2300 Central European.   One time announcement, please kindly.   This is misleading. This is question one, and I request you kindly to consider.

Second, why are you [inaudible] into the business of CCWG relating to Track 1 and Track 2? This is a CCWG decision to decide about all of this, whether we should [inaudible], unless you have been given a task by the

CCWG to start with this issue to facilitate the load. I am just asking, I am not opposing. Please tell me why this little group discussed the Track 1 and Track 2, which is dealing with issues outside the group. Just explain why. And who has given us this mission? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, before I go to Steve who hopefully will have input on the question raised – this is Cheryl for the record – our discussion regarding the timeline regarding Track 1 and Track 2 is only limited, Kavouss, to our work and our ability to meet the timeline. At the moment, when we started our work, our work – SO/AC accountability – was allocated to a Track 2 timeline, as shown on the screen. The times and deadlines in that timeline are not going to be reached, because of how far we've progressed in our work. So the group has just proposed that we request that we are shifted our topic, and only our topic, to the Track 1 timeline, which allows us to work longer and later in the program. That is the only thing that has anything to do with timelines.

Regarding UTC and European time, I'm sure staff noted your comments. I only ever work in UTC, and I would strongly encourage others to do so, so these sorts of confusions do not occur. All I can say is, I do apologize; but please, everybody, try and use the UTC times and UTC times only, both in your own scheduling, and in the calendar. Over to you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Cheryl. I believe the question we're supposed to respond to was your proposal of a sub-team meeting to discuss how to proceed on Mutual Accountability Framework. Do I have that right?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, Steve, you don't. If I can be clearer. What I was suggesting is, we need to decide when and how we deal with that piece of work. My "when" suggestion was, we find and advertise a date in early January – sorry, in early 2017 that will work for us to have a single-purpose call to start a detailed discussion on this topic. Prior to that, Steve, I suggested we poll all of our members and participants to get their opinions on the matter, and that can be shared in advance of that call. Back to you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. Then I'd like to register a somewhat different approach. It's my belief that people are simply confused about Mutual Accountability Roundtable, because the title implies something that the author never did. And I believe that if we were to write up a very limited scope of mutual accountability that matches what Willy Curry described, where people just share best practices once a year – and I put it in the chat – where people share what worked and what didn't, and that's all. There is no mandate of GNSO holding GAC accountable and vice-versa, there is no mandate to prescribe changes, and if we wrote it up that way in the space of about two paragraphs [inaudible] put it out [inaudible] first reading – someone's talking over us, here – we could put it out for first reading, Cheryl. And if in fact, this group embraced that limited scope, original intent, we'll have solved this, as opposed to doing the same amount of communication to have a separate group get together and end up coming to the same conclusion. So it's just me being an engineer here and trying to say, I think we know what we want; we just

have to write it up differently and avoid all of the confusion that was generated when people read into this that it was about accountability, as opposed to sharing of best practices. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Steve. Does anyone have an issue with a fresh write-up of the matters – I'll come back to you, Kavouss; don't worry – the proposal from Steve that we have a fresh write-up? And I would suggest that even in today's chat, there have been some excellent other opportunities to look at this general topic that could perhaps be included in that, Steve; I'm assuming that you would take that as a friendly amendment. Is there any objection to that? Kavouss, I'm assuming that that is a fresh hand, not an objection, and as I said, I will come back to you on that. In which case, it may be that that will be an interim point. I would still very much like to get the whole of our Work Team's input on that fresh approach and not just a small subset of us that turn up to the meetings. Okay, Steve, I'm going to come back to you before I go to Kavouss. Over to you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I appreciate that, and friendly amendment accepted. I'm just trying to cut to the quick in the sense of what we think we need, what we know. To Kavouss's question – and perhaps this will relieve him of needing to go into this – I've put into the chat, Kavouss, I've put in the exact text that Willy Curry used to describe Mutual Accountability Roundtable. And you'll see from his text, which is in quotations, that there's really nothing in there about

accountability. It's about sharing best practices of how each of us are running our AC/SOs in terms of accountability, transparency, and participation. And there's nothing wrong with conversations like that. If we write it up that way – and what I anticipate is something very close to what Willy wrote up – and that would be in the first draft of this revised document that Farzaneh and I and others would work on. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, Steve, so let me see if I can be clear so everyone is understanding. We're proposing that in the already agreed-upon reporting sub-team, that the rewrite you're all doing of the existing preliminary report, that a specific section is dedicated to a rewrite or a refresh of the concepts that we can discuss, and that should include some of the additional concepts based on the bilateral [inaudible] that Jorge was mentioning, etcetera. And that's as far as it goes for now. Is that correct?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes, Cheryl. That is what I was thinking.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Is there anyone who objects – and Kavouss, I'm coming to you next, so if you have an objection to that way forward, then I'm sure you'll raise it then – is there anyone who objects to that other way forward now, noting that we do still need to come back to this matter at some other point in time. If so, you could make yourself known by putting it in the chat, perhaps. Now, Kavouss, I noticed you asked for

something to be put – a proposal in writing – hopefully, I articulated the proposal suitably then. But I will ask Steve to write it up now again in the chat.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, thank you very much, indicating one single timeline of the meeting, but not two. 1900 and 2000 is misleading, so next time I would like to be on time. So if it is 1900 UTC, I know at what time I have to come to the meeting.

Second, I understood that you said that you want to extend the timeline of your group because you are of the view that you may not finish within the initial timeline. No problem. Explain that how much extension you want, and what are the reasons, and what are the issues before you that you cannot finish. I believe that you are waiting to receive answers from the charting organizations. I don't know whether you have sent a message to them or not. GAC, during the last meeting, said that they have not received anything from the CCWG. So they have to reply to you, you have to wait one month till they send a reply to you, then you analyze that, and please on the reply you organize [inaudible]. However, in the meantime, you might have other subjects. I don't know what other subjects you want to discuss. Therefore, I suggest that your timeline for extension is good to discuss, but put it in writing, how much time of an extension you want; two, what are the reasons; and three, in the meantime between receiving answers from the charter organization to your question, if and only if they have been sent, then why [inaudible] –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Kavouss. In fact, we are not asking for any particular extensions; we are shifting – there are two choices of timeline – we are simply going to shift from our Track 2 existing timeline to the already established Track 1 timeline. So we don't need to justify it; we just need to do it.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are four minutes after the top of the hour and we are not completely through our agenda. So what I will do now is put a line across the agenda now, and we will start at next week's meeting with looking at the next section. We will have an update from our Action Items at next week's meeting. I will send a copy of our Action Items to the list, and that will include a call for anyone else on the list to join the sub-teams that we've established today. But our agenda for next week's call will include matters from the basic foundations of the enhanced SO/AC Accountability Work Plan. Apologies for running longer, but we did have a perhaps overenthusiastic number of things to do in a short amount of time.

If there's no other urgent "any other business," I would note that our next call will, in fact, be on a different day and a different time. Staff, if you could just put into the chat – and obviously we will send out to the

list – but due to the Thanksgiving holiday of the Americas next week, we cannot meet on our normal Thursday. So we are going to be moving, only for next week's call, to a Wednesday call. And that will be Wednesday at 0500 UTC. Kavouss, can you make a note of that?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The call next week is Wednesday, 0500 UTC. With that, thank you one and all, and thank you for the extra six minutes of your lives taken on these matters. Bye for now. Wrap the call up, thank you, staff.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]