RECORDED VOICE:	This meeting is now being recorded.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Bernie, appreciate for you to push the button on that. This is Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And this the 12th support organization and advisory committee accountability meeting of the work stream two cross community working group on accountability.

It seems like the name is getting longer, perhaps I'm just getting older. I'd like to start off today's meeting by noting that we will have an apology list from [inaudible]. She had intended to join Steve and I today, but she was over stretched a little in terms of time and organizing herself for impeding move. So, we suggested that she would probably be better off taking the time gathering herself and her paperwork more efficient than joining us, but if she does join us, she's more than welcome.

We have a number of other apologies that have been sent to the list, one of which I want to make a note of is Giovanni. Giovanni [inaudible] is going to be mentioned in one of the action items, and he did reach out to me and mention that he's unlikely to make today's call. And I also suggest that we double check with our list if there is anyone else who has said to the list that they won't be able to attend today, recognizing that today is change of date and indeed, time, due to the normal Thursday meeting clashing with the American Thanksgiving.

With that, let's get onto other call administration. The first thing I'd like to do is ask if there is anybody who is only on the audio. In other words, if you are not in the Adobe Connect room, and you are only on the audio, if you'd let us know now.

Not hearing anyone identify themselves at this stage, we will take our attendance, excuse me, from the Adobe Connect listing, and hopefully a few more people will join us as time ticks past the hour in the five minute past the hour zone. I'd also like to now ask if there is anybody who needs to make an update to their statement of interest?

Not seeing any note come up in the Adobe Connect room, if you do have a change or an update to the statement of interest, please let staff know and they can pop it into the notes, or you can obviously can put it into the chat record here. With that, I would like to now ask if anyone has any other business that, at this stage, they would like to notify the group, that needs to be added to the last agenda item of our meeting today.

Not hearing anybody. We will, of course, call for any other business at the close of the call, but at this stage, nobody is flagging that they have a piece of any other business that we need to calculate for. And then the final point would be, is there anybody who wishes to make a change to the agenda, or add anything to the agenda, noting that today's agenda is, in fact, a continuation in the main of our last week's meeting.

Having met again with silence, I'm going to move on to the next point in our agenda, which is the review of the action item's from last week's call, and there is a couple of items from last week's call that we did

EN

distribute as action items to the list, with an update on our call, rather than take the time in our call last week to review. Just to recap for you, one of the first of those related to our call for volunteers, for the first of our two small [inaudible] sub-teams for drafting, the first of these were the team that was being put together to look at the methodology for reviewing the responses to our survey questions, which will be work coming on from mid-December when we expect those survey questions to be returned to us.

We specifically wanted to make sure that there was a, at least a balance in this small drafting team, so that all of the ACs and SOs were represented, and this is where we took Giovani's name in vein, and put an action item on me to see whether he would be willing to assist, and indeed, perhaps get someone else from the ccNSO to assist. The answer is yes, indeed, he is able to be now listed as a member of this small drafting team, and he will also reach out to Katrina to see if there is someone else on the Council who may wish to contribute as well.

We have another action item on this particular matter, which is also to ask Thomas [Rickett?] to help to identify volunteers from the RSSAC and the SSAC. I have no feedback on this, and I also note that Thomas, even though he is our allocated co-chair, is not on today's call. So, we will leave that one as an open action item, and Steve and I will follow-up with Thomas on that after today's call.

Following up on that, is for this subgroup to take a meeting between now and mid-December to start to organize how they want to approach the data capture and the reporting back to us, and we will schedule that

as a piece of agenda item at one of our December meetings, if not more than one of our December meetings.

The second… And obviously staff will take an action to support that subgroup as necessary. The second of the action items that came out of last week's meeting was very important one, and that is to move our particular topic from a track two timeline to a track one timeline, whilst Thomas has been informed of that, as he was copied in on our meeting notes from last week, we haven't had a formal approach to the co-chairs, but we will do that within the plenary session that's coming up.

So, that is still open, but we are following up on that as a formal request. We can't see that there would be any problems with it, but we do need to make a formal request, and we'll take it through the plenary to do so. Then there was a second drafting team, just going back to the first drafting team, I just wanted to remind you that we did have Steve come in from the GNSO, Olga for the GAC, Seun for the ALAC, and Michael for the ASO.

And Steve has a follow-up that he will share with us on some of the drafting he has put together on that action already. With that, let's move to the other action item, which is our second drafting team, with the second drafting team, and that is, in fact, what Steve has done some drafting, not the first, my apologies. We have the drafting team that's going to look at a reframing of our existing report material, and to work on our ongoing reporting requirements.

At the moment, we have far too few people volunteering for that, although we do appreciate Matthew Shears, who did volunteer for that,

and he also is to be noted as an apology for today's call, but we would put out a feeler that Steve did when he sent his draft to the list earlier today, for more volunteers.

So, if you can't step up today, please consider doing so in the near future. And then we have, I think, covered all of our action items from last week. Took slightly longer than normal, but let's now move on to our next item, which is, in fact, me handing over to Steve, because there is an update on some of the sub-team activities, because as those of you who read the list today will know, he has done a small redrafting, and that's an exercise that's going to be putting the second drafting team into good steed.

I'm going to ask Steve to speak to that document now, and I'll also note that [inaudible] has offered to take the lead now, Steve has done that, that strawman, I guess is the best way to describe it, of the redrafting, and take the lead with Matthew and the other volunteers, as they come in to do a next cut on this. Steve, over to you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you Cheryl. I'll ask staff to load the first draft of our reframed report, and I sent it around five hours ago to everyone on the list, although it did not come back to me as received in my inbox. So, let me ask, is there anyone on the phone who needs for me to send it? Or needs staff to send it to you individually?

Indicate in the chat, and I think that staff can forward it on. Thank you. It's a re-draft, or sort of a re-packaging of the progress report, which is one of the three documents that we shared with the full CCWG prior to

Hyderabad. I condensed it in a couple of important ways, and it's meant to be a draft, it starts to frame the way we would present our conclusions and recommendations. Because of that, any conclusions or recommendations that I've put into this draft, are completely preliminary. I probably erred on the side of drawing conclusions early, in an effort to get everybody to focus on where, I believe, personally we are heading with our recommendations.

So this is a great opportunity to say, hold on, we're really not that far yet, and I'll happily revise or pull it back a little bit, but I did think it would help us to move forward, if I put into writing where it is I believe we're heading, so that you can all either validate or revise. The first page is familiar, it's a recapture of where our mandate comes from, and you all realize that it starts with the bylaws of work stream two, and that's at the top.

But since those bylaws referenced specifically the CCWG accountability final report, I had to include from recommendations 12, recommendation nine, and recommendation 10. And those are all on page one with footnotes. And then if you look at page two, at the very top, I tried to redraft the work, the tracks that we have. And you'll notice that there are three tracks here, whereas, for the last several weeks, we had a fourth track as well.

The track that I have brought, was something that I discussed in our last call as well as in Hyderabad. The track called effectiveness, no longer in the description of work that came before us. The link to effectiveness had come because one of the recommendations in the working group before said that for us to look at the Board initiated organizational

EN

reviews that are done every three years. And include whether they have something to say, [inaudible] the accountability. So they do, and the most effectively asked every AC and SO, except the GAC, to access its effectiveness.

And that was an invitation, I believe, for us to decide whether we asked them to define effectiveness for the purpose of those reviews. It was my conclusion that there was not significant support in this group, to take on that task of effectiveness. So, in order to focus on what we can complete, I have, and Bernie and staff, to the extent that anyone in the chat will [inaudible] if they don't have it, could you please forward the email that I sent five hours ago? I appreciate that.

So, we dropped effectiveness for that purpose. It was no longer in the mandate for us. There is a vestige in the sense that our mandate on accountability recommendation 10 still includes a reference to the organizational reviews, but we're not going to try to redefine effectiveness.

But we are going to take care of the three that you have in the screen in front of you. So, declarations for each track are described next, and then we please go to page three, if you're scrolling along by yourselves, just go to page three.   At the very top, I indicated the first recommendation that I believe we have already concluded, but I'm happy to be corrected on that.

It is that we recommend accountability of each SO and AC is to the designated community for each AC and SO as defined in the bylaws, and then I've repeated the text we've taken from the bylaws. I believe that

EN

it survived several readings in this group, there is exactly the basis that we used for the questionnaire that we sent out to the ACs and SOs in Hyderabad.

So, the implication of that is covered in the next paragraph, which said, this does not imply that each SO and AC make its decisions without regard to the broader internet community, outside of the designated community. Rather the global public interest is a fundamental consideration of the Board, and approves or implements advice and policy recommendations from the ACs and SOs.

So, it's not as if we are taking global or outsiders to the curb, but we are recognizing that the notion of SO and AC accountability is to the designated community. The bylaws say that that SO and AC is created to serve. So Cheryl, it's up to you, but I only have a few items in this document to cover. This would be where I stop and see whether people have a reaction to that first conclusion of the recommendation.

And I see Alan's hand is up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, maybe I should have picked up on this before, we have an interesting statement there. It says this does not imply that each SO and AC makes its decisions without regard to the broader internet community outside of its designated community, rather the global

public interest is a fundamental consideration of the ICANN Board and so on and so forth.

Elsewhere in the CCWG report, and I think in the bylaws now, it says the Board cannot determine what the global public interest is without chartering a bottom-up multistakeholder group.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alan, would you be happier if the word said, the interest of the global public community? I did not use global public interest as [defined?] term, I meant to say the difference between internal accountability and the notion of broader accountability outside of the designated…

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm actually delighted with the words that are there, but I think we have a paradox if we use them. So yes, I think changing those words avoids the paradox. Doesn't avoid the problem, but it avoids the paradox in words. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: It's a good point, Alan. I'll change it to the broader public interest, and until we can work on that harder. Thank you, Alan, I appreciate that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We've got Kavouss, yeah. Go ahead, Kavouss.

Kavouss, we heard you for a moment.

Yes, we can hear you now, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Do you hear me, please?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, we do. Yes, we do.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Okay. Thank you. Several issues, discuss at the same time. I don't know which one I have to reply. I have a question on the first four bullets, the bullet number four, assess whether the IRP would also be applicable SO and AC. This is a conceptual idea. I would like to know where we say applicability of IRP to any SO or AC [inaudible]. Is it for the entire SO, or is for individual from that SO, or is the designated representative of that SO?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Kavouss, may I answer?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: This is one question that I have.

STEVE DELBIANCO: If I answer that first, you can go on afterwards.

EN

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Please go ahead and kindly give a reply to that question. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you Kavouss. Those words have been part of our mandate, or part of our charter, since day one, since they're part of the accountability final report. And I simply repeated the words that are in the report. So, nobody on this telephone can tell you what the word applicable means until we get to the track that is going to define whether the IRP should be applied to our activities, and that is the third track.

It appears on page five of the document that I sent you. And you'll notice that I said this awaits work, because this team, Kavouss, has not even begun the assessment of track three on the IRP. I believe Cheryl has invited the IRP implementation oversight team chair to address this group on our very next call, about the likelihood of being able to apply it.

I will say there was some discussion in Hyderabad, and this is where Sebastien Bachollet was somewhat helpful, in that the IRP is a very heavy laden and expensive process, and it may be that we turn to the ombudsman to look at accountability concerns that occur within AC and SO, as opposed to turning to an external arbitrator process like the IRP. So, I hope that answers your first question. I realize that you have more, so perhaps you want to go on.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: So, this is what you said you will discuss in [inaudible] or sub [inaudible], if that is the case, I have no difficulty. My second question is that, as I've mentioned in my previous [inaudible] because of the mutual accountability, it just conceptual. And we have to try to see whether we can translate that into practical way.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That will be the next [CROSSTALK]…

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: You have not come to that, yes, right? [Inaudible] discuss?

STEVE DELBIANCO: That is on the very next page, we'll get there in a moment. Let's just stay on track one, if you don't mind, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Okay. Thank you very much for the first answer. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Hi. Avri speaking. The question I have has to do with the internal accountability [notion?] and maintaining it as completely internal. While [inaudible] I find, I kind of agree, and yet, I'm concerned into how that internal responsibility includes the outreach and bringing in

responsibilities of every one of the groups. So yes, the accountability is indeed to those that are internal, and yet, that group does maintain a responsibility to do outreach, and to even outreach for ideas and thoughts to their larger communities.

And I don't know how we stick with just internal and not therefore exclude accountability for that. And so that was the thought I had in mind, thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you Avri. If you're able to scroll to the third question on page three. The third question that we all drafted and sent to each and every SO and AC. The third question is about, what are your policies and efforts in outreach to individuals, organizations in your designated community, who do not yet participate in your AC slash SO?

And it was also an echo from the stress test 32 through 34, given to us by NTIA, and I cited that on page one, where he raised concerns regarding internal capture, but also concerns about incumbent members might exclude new entrants. I guess I should say, new entrants and new ideas through an AC and SO.

But we're all waiting on each AC and SO to answer us about this policy of outreach through parts of the designated community that do not participate. I do hope that those answers will lead us to assess whether or not they're adequate, and then to make recommendations. How does that sound?

AVRI DORIA: The question sounds good. I saw the question. But, in a sense, if they're not accountable to that external community in any way, it's just a question. And the question of how they do it or how they don't do it, doesn't really answer the question of, and how are you accountable for doing it? So, that's the only thing that I guess I just don't understand. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. The final two questions get to the notion of mechanisms for accountability. For instance, they ask, does your AC and SO have mechanisms by which your members can challenge or field decisions? And one wonders whether that would extend to parts of the designated community, and not to be participants or, in the case of say, ccNSO, happen not to be members of your AC and SO.

So Avri, I have to believe this will end up being highly specific to each AC and SO. That is to say the extent to which they listen to, are open to outreach and are accountable to, with the bylaws, this is who the bylaws say they are to serve. If those individuals, after trying, determine they have not been admitted as a participant, or they cannot access the decision making processes, and then what accountability do they get?

I mean, that's going to be a very important question for us, about which we perhaps make recommendations to some of the AC and SOs, or even to all of them.

Sebastien. I'm sorry, go ahead Avri.

AVRI DORIA: No, sorry. I mean, I had put my hand down. But I guess, I wonder whether we can just side note or asterisk, that because I see [inaudible] accountable for that, or the review could hold them accountable for those things. So, I guess it's still a pending question there, that maybe needs to be resolved once we know more. But I do think that there may be some wider accountability to the outreach and onboarding process, then just internal there. But thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I'll mark it with an asterisk to say that, as we get the questions back, and that's all I've sad at the bottom of the page, we're going to await replies to the questions. I'll asterisk that can suggest that non-participants in the designated community may meet accountability mechanisms as well. Thank you Avri. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Hello. Thank you very much Steve. I hope that you can hear me okay. First, an answer to Cheryl's comment in the chat, yeah, I will do my best to be in the discussion next week about the IRP and possibly the ombudsman.

The second thing, thank you Steve for this document. Unfortunately, I just got it now, and [inaudible] five hours ago, I wouldn't have waited at all, as I am just waking up. [CROSSTALK]

I would like very much that we balance the question of mutual accountability. I know that there are people that I understand why

EN

they're pushed again, but my point is just, we have done the work stream one to have involved accountable the community, and the community is composed by SO and AC.

And I don't see how we can avoid to be at least a little bit accountable to our [inaudible]. We can't just be accountable to the member of our SO or AC. We need… We live in the same ICANN [inaudible] in the same building, if one group decide, I don't know, to read the weather through the windows, the other doesn't like that. We need to do something to [inaudible] together.

Is the work accountable to strong? Maybe, but maybe not, because it's the one we used on the Board. And I would like that we have this specific discussion. I read the comment of Christopher Wilkinson, it's very interesting. I know the point of view of Kavouss. Really, I think it can be so easily defined, and we need to discuss it.

And my last point, regarding the question of Kavouss of the outside of this, when they see just one [inaudible] mind, I think it's quite easy to say it, ccNSO. In fact, the cc manager world, you have member of the ccNSO, and you have new member of the ccNSO. And in one way or another, the ccNSO is accountability of all the cc, not just the cc members.

I guess it's a little bit more complicated with At-Large, because if we say that we are accountable to our work, 200 and something ALS, and we are therefore accountable to the 3 billion users, it's more difficult to imagine. But it's a way, at least, we need to take into account that in our [inaudible].

Hope it's clear, and thank you very much.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you Kavouss. With regard to ccNSO, in particular, the bylaws say ccTLD managers that have agreed to be members. And I certainly hope that the questionnaire we sent to ccNSO will come back with a broader interpretation of who they think their designated community is.

I could well imagine the ccNSO finds itself serving the community of ccTLD managers, even those who have not yet sort of joined as members of the ccNSO. I do hope that's the case. And I'll agree with you that the way the GNSO is structured…

Go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just to be sure, you say thank you Kavouss, but it was Sebastien speaking.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Sorry. And then I did note, Sebastien, that the ccNSO and the GNSO are very different in their designated community in the ICANN bylaws, and they have been that way for well over a decade. The GNSO is open to registries, registrars, and they list commercial and non-commercial stakeholders, which is far broader than just the managers of the registries that are gTLDs.

The ccNSO, on the other hand, has a very tight set of designated community, which is just ccTLD managers. It doesn't include the registrants, users of ccTLDs. That could be [inaudible] of how ICANN got started, I don't know what, but when we get the answers back from the ccNSO, I hope that all of us on this call will, that's part of sub-team number one, analyze those answers and try to make some determination of who is the true community that they serve.

Sebastien, in answer to your first question, that's coming up on the next page in a discussion of preliminary conclusions on the mutual accountability roundtable, the point is well noted. And I notice that Christopher is on the phone. So, we'll cover that when we turn to the next page.

Kavouss, your hand is up. If it's on the first track of accountability, do it now, otherwise I can save it for mutual accountability. Go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: No, I have another suggestion. This difficult task even to us, to be taken properly. I think… Thank you very much for all efforts you have made [inaudible] really reference to the parallel, but I think we should go a little bit further, and try to take it down in each SO and AC, to see who is accountable to what, internal of any SO or AC.

Go to the ALAC, RALOs, or [inaudible], RALO to any management team, going through [inaudible] to see all who is [inaudible], who is accountable to what, to whom, and how is the accountability of all of those [inaudible]… So we need to go to have a little bit, do some

breakdown, and think that with respect to the GNSO and put these [inaudible] who will believe could be accountable to whom, and if [inaudible] could be accountable, you have to find ways and means and [inaudible] to have or to ensure or to control that accountability, and is not what is the next step.

Whether some action remains inside that SO and AC, or going outside. To reply to the accountability that you mentioned in the final report or in the bylaw. In other words, whether sometimes the internal issue of particular AC and SO, need to be resolved first, at the level of that SO and AC, and then [inaudible] to go one step higher.

So, we need [inaudible] or whether you want to [inaudible] or whether someone else, you need to go to that breakdown. Yes, I have many people really looking at one SO to be accountable to another SO, AC, but how and with what breakdown and what internal. So it's all one [inaudible] is not [inaudible]. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you Kavouss. Kavouss, I did want to point you to the questions that all of us developed and sent to all of the ACs and SOs. In the very first question, it's right there on the page in front of you says, what is your interpretation of the designated community defined in the bylaws?

And all of those questions are about internal accountability mechanisms, within the GNSO, or within the ccNSO, or within the GAC. So, I believe that everything you just advised is exactly what we have asked and implied in the questions that we sent to the ACs and SOs.

EN

[Give it a read?] and see that if you believe that we failed to honor any of the advice that you just gave, because I believe that is all in there. All right team, Cheryl is hustling us along, so please move to page four. This is the mutual accountability roundtable. This is all I really have for you today, because the IRP is a blank page.

But on this mutual accountability roundtable, on page four, what I did was summarize this track, what was noted in the final proposal, and [inaudible] 2015 email where he described what he means by mutual accountability roundtable. There is no denying that's what the words say, even though the words, mutual accountability roundtable, seem to inspire dramatically different views in the part of everyone who reads it.

And in order to focus everyone on the task at hand, I've taken a risk and put a preliminary conclusion in here. And that preliminary conclusion is at the bottom of page four, so I'm happy to have this debated however long Cheryl wants to do it on the call today, but I say that we've concluded that the mutual accountability roundtable, as originally described, is more of a transparency exercise where best practices may be shared.

And while this exercise is viable, we do not recommend it for formal implementation. So keep in mind that the charter to us was to determine if a mutual accountability roundtable was viable, number one, and if viable, what are the actions we would recommend to implement it?

So, I spoke to the implementation, and viability in that one sentence, and then I go on to say that the SO and AC chairs convene regularly for

EN

calls and meetings with the ICANN CEO, and I believe that creates an appropriate and adequate forum for the sharing of experiences and best practices on accountability to the respective stakeholders.

So I realize this picks up a bit on Christopher Wilkinson's most recent email, but with all respect, Christopher, we had drawn the conclusion that [inaudible] was describing a transparency exercise eight or 10 weeks ago, so I'm glad that you also agree that that's what it is. But I guess our job is not to retitle what Willy [inaudible] called a mutual accountability roundtable.

Our job was to say, did what he described, was it viable and should it be implemented? So, I throw open the floor on whether the people on this call support this conclusion? Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, I think you put something about [inaudible] that you perhaps need to look at the [inaudible] of [inaudible] between Christopher Wilkinson, with respect to this issue and include that also in the [inaudible] whether his views on the matter.

But my question is that, please don't interpret it differently. I'm not against [inaudible] how to implement that. When we say roundtable on accountability, you want to do it in public comments, meetings, that means SO and ACs [heads?] and so on and so forth, the composition would be getting together, and ask [inaudible] question of accountability of other totally publicly, or only limited to other SO and AC.

If it is totally publicly [inaudible] would not give [inaudible] because question may create some misunderstanding to the public, for myself and the chairs, or if there is a big problem among themselves.

So we have no more trust in them anymore. Or, you want to [inaudible] only and only among those SO and AC, and if there is [inaudible] to make it totally public, we can always in favor of open and public, then it is different. But, it's still about the term, I think, that it would not be more than some sort of review process, and some sort of addition to each other by the way it needs to improve the situation.

I think we need to a little bit [inaudible] explanation about what we understand of the mutual. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah Kavouss, I was attempting, being the engineer that I am, to cut through all of that and reflect what, I believe, this group has said for almost 12 weeks. The description from Willy [inaudible] is there because Willy [inaudible] was the advisor to the CCWG, and he introduced the words mutual accountability roundtable. So, I took him at his word.

That is why his [inaudible] is on the page. He introduced the concept. It was somehow deemed interesting enough that we preserved it in all of our reports and drafts, and it made its way into our final report, and that's why we are looking at it. So, I do not attempt to redefine his words, instead I'm selecting the comment that says, we do not believe that it's, we recommend it for formal implementation, as he describes it.

If you agreed with that conclusion, then it wouldn't be necessary to go back and reinterpret Willy's words, or come up with a different name for it. There is nothing in what Willy described that should generate the fears that you've just expressed. That is to say, there is nothing in his words that would hold anyone in the GAC accountable to anyone in the GNSO.

There is no accountability in the mutual accountability roundtable. As Christopher and others have noted, it's mislabeled concept, and perhaps that was the intent of the author. I don't know, but as described, however you label it, as described, I'm recommending we not recommend it for implementation. Christopher.

Cannot hear you.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I've got to unmute. Yes, I think that's working now. Thank you. Very briefly, first of all, [inaudible] a certain amount of latency, particularly since I wasn't in Hyderabad, so [inaudible] questions in which most of you seem to [inaudible] thoroughly discussed. Secondly, I could certainly live with Steve's preliminary conclusion.

[Inaudible] I am [inaudible] Sebastien's argument, but I feel that [inaudible] more a matter of common sense and [inaudible] leadership, but it would be very difficult since it's already proving to be the case. It would be very difficult to institutionalize and codify on a [inaudible] basis, the sentiments that [inaudible] that Sebastien described.

And finally, I think we want to keep these things a little more simple, a little bit simpler. We are [inaudible] supposed to be quite familiar [inaudible] with the issues, and if we found it complicated, I think when this comes to implementation in a broader context among people who have not necessarily benefitted from this detailed negotiation, would find it even more complicated.

So, we should try to keep it simple. So, in conclusion I could live [inaudible] thoughts of Steve, [inaudible] preliminary conclusion. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you Christopher. Ironically, the mutual accountability roundtable that's described by the inventor of the concept isn't very complex at all. It's the three paragraphs on the page above [AUDIO INTERFERENCE]

I think many people suffer from perhaps, English is not their first language, or if there is nothing complex, or concerning about what Willy [inaudible] described. I'm drawing the conclusion that it doesn't seem valuable enough for us to bother to implement it. And I realize that Sebastien gave us an extensive description of what he believes he should implement some form of it.

Avri has just put into the chat that giving up the MAR would be a loss. And I put in the chat as well, to the extent that you disagree with this conclusion, I would advise you please, draft an alternative conclusion that might well require adding some detail about how we would recommend this limitation.

Folks, and I'm finished now, there is nothing more on my docket here, but I'm trying to move us toward making recommendations that we could all support on two readings, so we can put them to the full CCWG, because it doesn't seem constructive for us to continue to debate what words Willy [inaudible] wrote.

And all we really need to do is focus on our recommendation, and if our recommendation is to implement, well then yes, we do need to put some details on paper. If our recommendation is not to implement, we don't need to go there. Thanks everyone. I look forward to getting more volunteers on team two. Back to you Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much Steve. Cheryl for the record. I do appreciate, and I'm sure everyone on this call, and indeed the list, does on you getting such a good head start on that reframing of the existing materials into new ways of looking towards some of our issues. Let me make a suggestion now, as we finalize the last little part of the general item three, and I do want to spend just a few minutes looking at the next meetings and the future meetings after that.

And that is, because we have not… It may seem, to some of us, that we have discussed the mutually accountability roundtable ad nauseam, and I understand that view, but we really haven't had a full frank and fearless discussion on the merits of the concepts as written by Willy, and indeed, as the transparency exercise has been brought forward by others of our workgroup.

So, let's leave it with that current recommendation, in the text, at the moment, call upon, and certainly, Avri and Sebastien and I are likely, but anyone else as well, who would like to join this team, because this is not to be, as Steve DelBianco authored document, this is to be a small drafting team created piece of work, and then it comes back to all of us as a committee as a whole, and eventually, of course, to the plenary.

But put in alternates, put in an option B, and option C, and maybe an option D, and let's leave that tab open for edits until at least early 2017. We will busy with December, accumulating what we can out of our data acquisition from our survey, and we will then have a number of meetings which won't be held, we'll get to in a minute.

So, let's not kill us, but let's be prepared to have the do not resuscitate order exercised, and I would encourage all of those of you who believe that resuscitation or indeed, nurturance and development are a good idea, that you help draft into this document an option B, C, and how many other we want.

I would like to use that as a segue to another piece of work that we should start thinking about now, and this is setting up the foundations for, not our report, which is what this document is all about. Our reporting to the CCWG and then we assume, inclusion in public documentation later. This is what this documenting, this reporting, and these recommendations associated with units of the reporting is all about.

But we do need to ask ourselves, and this is only in asking, so this is something we all need to think about, and interact on the list, between

now and the end of the year. Is there a place for a standalone document, or set of recommendations with clear implementable options, which would be our plan for enhancing SO AC accountability?

We can't say what they may be yet, because we're not that far along, but you do need to start thinking about, should such a set of enhancement recommendations be an integral part of this reporting, this type of reporting that you've just spent the last 35 minutes looking at? Or, should it be an annex to this sort of reporting? Or, should it be referred to this sort of reporting and be a standalone document?

So that's third support. We don't need to discuss this now, but I certainly would like you to think about that. And I do see two hands up. I'd very much like it to be 60 to 90 second interventions, please. First of all Kavouss, very briefly.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, the idea is very good. We need to have recommendations that will by this group, and the report will be supporting the material of that recommendation. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Kavouss. Steve, I saw your hand up earlier.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I took it down, Cheryl, just to say that I agree with your third option. Track one is where most of our work lies. We can say in our main recommendations that receive an annex, or receive a separate

document, the SO and AC specific assessments and recommendations, because they will be different for each AC and SO. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So, this is just something that I would like you all to start thinking about, because it is something that we will have to get very much involved in, in fairly short order, during our early part of 2017 work. So, now, assuming that we're going to be in track one timeline, we do need to continue working towards our part in public comment documentation.

I'm going to hold a detailed discussion over until our next call on that, but I do want you to start looking at the timelines for, and proposed milestone dates, for track one timelines. And I would like to discuss that in greater detail as a part two of next week's call.

Taking next week's call now, let's look at our next meeting, and indeed, the future meeting dates, which staff has very kindly put into the notes pod in the Adobe Connect room, but I would like to just remind you that next week, our 1st of December call, we will be back on Thursday. So this Wednesday meeting is an exception, but we will be back on Thursday the 1st of December, and it will be a 13:00 timeslot.

With this, I'm going to ask Bernie if he can just briefly take you all through, just in case you aren't able to see the note pod, our future calls and call rotations, so you're all clear between now through to Copenhagen. Over to you Bernie.

EN

BERNARD TURCOTTE:	Thank you ma'am. All right, as Cheryl has mentioned, we booked meetings of this group until Copenhagen, which is the next ICANN meeting in March. So, 23 November was today, 1 December is 13:00, and will be back to the standard Thursday rotation.
	8 December 19:00, 15 December 05:00, and then we'll be taking a break. So, there will be no meetings on 22, 29 of December, nor will there be a meeting on the 5th of January. Meetings will start again in the New Year on January 12 with a 13:00 timeslot on Thursday. All the rest of these are all on Thursdays, so I'm just not going to mention the day of the week.
	19 January 05:00, and the regular rotation kicks in after that. 26 January 13:00, 2 February 19:00, 9 February 05:00, 15 February 13:00, 23 February 19:00, March 5:00, 9 March 13:00, 16 March 19:00, 23 March 05:00, and March 30th 13:00. I hope that covers it, and I'll be glad to take questions. Thank you.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thanks very much Bernie. Chery Langdon-Orr for the record. I'm assuming there aren't going to be questions on that, that everyone will have a note, at least in their mental calendars if not their actual calendars. Two things. Of course, there is the master schedule, that if those of you who wish to avail yourselves of these dates and any changes, cancelations, or anything else, on these dates, there is a master schedule, and that's a Google Doc.
	And I know staff has distributed that in the past, and I'm sure someone will pop it into chat now so you'll all have access to it again. So, I just

wanted to remind you now, that with the exception of our three December meetings, which will be the 1st, the 8th, and the 15th, which of course, will be the 16th of December for my part of the world, and I will except a rousing chorus of Happy Birthday to me on that particular call, there really will only be 12 calls before Copenhagen, when we start back in January.

That is an incredibly short amount of time to do a significantly large amount of work, including drafting. That is why we have created these small drafting teams. It is why more of you need to volunteer to be engaged in this small drafting teams. And if you're not directly engaged in the small drafting teams, please take the time, including if you can, over the December period, notice we do meet in February, January and February, which of course, is the holiday season for Asia Pacific.

So, we're continuing on despite the holiday season in December being noted, we really do need you to take the time to make comments to work on the list. So with that, please if you know of anyone who you would think would be a good contributor, reach out to them, even suggest on the list that they might want to volunteer.

We have a relatively low turnout today, that is understandable, but this work is important, and there is little time to get onto it. By Copenhagen, we need to be well and truly advanced with all of our major work pieces. So let's not leave all of our work until 2017, and a rush towards the end.

I would like to now just make sure that we all have our personal action item of thinking about exactly how we want to have our enhancing SO

AC accountability documentation integrated. And at the moment, I'm seeing some support for an option three.

And I also want to note that we have an action item to get more people involved in the drafting team, that's upon us all, and to use more of our time on the list, especially over the break time. I'm going to follow up with Thomas regarding the action item from last week's call, and make sure, because [Herb?] is an apology from today's call, that he is aware that the IRP discussion, led by David, will be going on next week, and that obviously, he and Sebastien's input would be valuable.

With that, I'm not going to ask for any other business. I see Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I think we established or set one month for SO AC to [answer?] our questionnaire. There are two ways to do that. One perhaps [inaudible] representative, or the one that's [inaudible] perhaps [brief?] others whether something is going to be received by us. And if not, we have to launch some reminders, because I personally have not heard anything in that.

[Inaudible] one month [inaudible]. And the things that I don't know whether the letter has been sent [inaudible] copy of letter of CCWG. Thank you all SO AC, asking this question, or just [inaudible]… Nothing has been sent.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Kavouss, thank you. It's Cheryl for the record. Let me assure you, it has been sent, it has been received. You have Tom on the call here today, so he will follow-up I'm sure, but I see Bernie because I know he's going to say when it was sent out and when it was distributed. Over to you Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Actually I was going to comment on the fact that not only has it been sent, but I know that the co-chairs yesterday, sent a number of reminders to various SOs and ACs that this group is expecting answers. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. That's certainly my understanding as well. So, if we look at our schedule just in response to your point, Kavouss, we wouldn't expect everybody to have their feedback on our 8th of December meeting, but we certainly would expect them to have either feedback to us or a damned good reason for an extension by the 15th of December.

So that's on the 15th of December is the time that we'll be looking specifically at all of that. Obviously that means that our initial, our drafting team for that data capture exercise is going to have to get their act together during this next two to three weeks before that data starts coming in.

So, with that, ladies and gentlemen, it is the top of the hour, and I would like to thank everybody who was able to make the time to join us

today. I certainly want to thank Steve for the enormous amount of effort he has put into getting this new drafting going.

And appeal once more to you all, to continue to make the useful contributions you've done so far, and to take a note of how little time we have to do very much work. With that, I want to thank staff for their support, and mention that if there is anybody who has a problem getting a Google Doc, or interacting with the Google Doc, we will always find alternates to make sure your contributions to our drafting are properly incorporated.

And with that, we can end this call, and thank you one and all. Bye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]