

---

RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

FARZANEH BADII: Okay, so here the [INAUDIBLE] Accountability subgroup [INAUDIBLE] that we have. And our agenda today is the review of the previous call that we had last week. And the other things that we are going to discuss is the inquiries from the survey, or the questionnaire, that we sent to SO and AC.

And then a discussion on the current draft of [INAUDIBLE] and reviews. Here is the Google Doc version, but we have also sent the PDF file. And we are going to just have a brief overview of the status of track one, about the review and discuss the timeline and process, and how we are going to actually do the documentation, and discuss our methodology.

And then track two is about evaluate the [SKIP IN AUDIO] we are. And we—just preliminary conclusion that is on our document, on page 4. And there's track three, which is about accessing whether the independent review process should be applied.

And then we are going to discuss the next meeting, and the future meeting schedule. I have noticed that Kavouss is requesting to move the 5:00 am meeting of 19 January to 19:00 hours. So, with that, just because I did not make it to the last call, I can [INAUDIBLE] discuss briefly what we did during the last call, if you were there. Okay. Attention—

[CROSSTALK]

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

FARZANEH BADII: Okay, I can hear you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Farzaneh, it was just a very—it was challenging to understand you. Your connection is not very clear, at least to me. Can you just repeat the last thing that you asked us to do next?

FARZANEH BADII: Yes, Steve. If you can just brief me first as to what you did during the last call, just adding the item one, and then we can go through like number two together. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alright. With respect to the last call, we actually devoted nearly all of the time—and this is Steve DelBianco speaking. We devoted all the time to discussing tracks two and three, and the preliminary conclusions on a first, or perhaps even a second reading for the one on MAR, or mutual accountability roundtable.

And it is the last item in our agenda today to get back to that current draft document and cover it again. But what we did on the call was to expand the rationale for why we were going to recommend against implementing the IRP to be used against an SO and AC for violations of ICANN bylaws or procedures.

---

And again, that was track three. So, that language was updated, Farzaneh, at the end of the last call, and we circulated a new version of the document on Monday. So, some members of this group have perhaps reviewed that document, and I did receive one comment so far from Jordan Carter, which we can discuss at that part of the agenda. Thanks, Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADII:

Okay, thank you very much, Steve. So, with that, we can go to agenda number two. And so, Cheryl, do you have any comments? Okay, so I don't hear Cheryl having any comments. So, I'm just going to go through the questionnaires and the response to the SO-AC.

We are still waiting for—we have received the questionnaires from the [INAUDIBLE] constituency of GNSO and the GAC, as far as I know. And what we have done is that we have tabulated them based on each question and categorized each stakeholder group, or SO-AC, and have put their answers in a table. And there, you can find them in the Google Doc. We have also sent a PDF. I'm going to send another updated PDF. As to the—yes, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. Sorry to jump in, and I apologize for not being in the AC room. I'm still driving. I've just pulled over to respond. We received the responses from the ccNSO. That was the very first of the responses we received. So, ccNSO, GAC and the BC from the GNSO, with expectations of other SOs—sorry, other organization components of the GNSO getting their responses in fairly soon. So, we can already put the ccNSO

---

responses in as well. Thank you. I'll go back on mute and continue to drive now.

FARZANEH BADII:

Okay, great. I'm so sorry, I have not—I did not—I missed the ccNSO, actually. I'm so sorry. I have been moving around a lot and missed it. So, I'm just going to put that in the Google Doc, and we are waiting for other constituencies and stakeholder groups of the GNSO, and other advisory committees. So, as to the—do we want to discuss the methodology today, what we are going to do with the questionnaires, or shall we do that another call?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Farzaneh, this is Steve DelBianco. Before jumping to a methodology, I put into the chat that this morning, Michael informed us on a plenary call that the ASO would get us their response this week. We also discussed on this morning's plenary call the idea, I think it was Kavouss who had mentioned it, to send a reminder, I believe, to the ACs, SOs, and other stakeholder groups, that we had respectfully requested the responses to our questionnaire by the beginning of this month.

So, now that we have been two weeks after that date, I do think it would be appropriate to send a reminder, perhaps, to resend the questions, a reminder and a request for when we may expect those responses. I'd like to put that on the table. If other members of this group think it's appropriate for us to ping the—I guess the majority who have not yet replied.

---

FAZRANEH BADI: Okay, thank you, Steve. I can see the comment to change that [INAUDIBLE]

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, good time to everybody. Yes, we could send a reminder, and attach the questionnaire again. However, one thing that when we expect to receive these. You had mentioned that beyond some date it would be difficult to analyze that because of the time constraint.

So, we should not just ask when we receive it, we should say that we expect to the maximum, at the latest date, the date we establish. Beyond that, it will be extremely difficult for this subgroup to go through the analysis of the results. So, we should mention, add this small part to that paragraph. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADI: Okay, thank you, Kavouss. We'll do that. So, yes, that's—Avri is pointing out that they're under no obligation to actually fill these questionnaires in. And well, I was actually wondering that, if we should wait for the other ACs to respond, or can we just go ahead and start our work without some of them having filled in the questionnaire?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Farzaneh? Farzaneh?

---

STEVE DELBIANCO: Please go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Steve. I didn't want to intrude if you had a queue. Two things, and I was either fortunate to step away from the confusion while the plenary was on the dais. I should have addressed these things as well, in terms of sending the reminder.

The questionnaire was sent out by the chairs, or the co-chairs, of the BCWG. So, I'm probably thinking that either staff on behalf of the chairs or the chairs send such a reminder. So, I think that would be the best way through it. And yes, we have to recognize that there is no obligation.

But the best thing would be if they responded to a reminder from the chairs. We have had a number of component parts of GNSO constituencies and certainly as these refresh minds an ability to drive and remember everything that happened 12 hours ago, now, the ASO has already mentioned that they will be [INAUDIBLE] ALAC.

So, we're not going to be too low in the numbers that are coming in. But Farzaneh, to answer your question, once—as this sub team is starting to at least do the tabulation, there's at least a start. The analysis, of course, will be coming into our plan a little later anyway. And now I really do have to get back on mute because I'm probably going to lose [INAUDIBLE].

---

FARZANEH BADI: Okay, thank you, Cheryl. So, I think we are clear. So, Avri's suggesting that we give them another week. Does everyone agree with that? Should we give them another week? Because we might want to analyze the questions, responses, well I would say until 19<sup>th</sup> January. I don't know. Steve, what do we have planned for analyzing the questionnaires and the answers? 12 or 19?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Hello, Farzaneh. This is Steve DelBianco. Sub team 1 is the team we need to fill, the volunteers that will begin to catalog written review the responses that we receive. I think developing of recommendations can take some time later. And to organize and document the responses is something that sub team 1 of our group should begin to do as soon as possible.

And we shouldn't wait to do that on our phone calls, or frankly, I don't know how we would ever complete it within the year if we tried to do it only on the phone calls. As with our other documents, a lot of that work has to be done by sub team members and rapporteurs so that we can then circulate that for discussion on the calls.

And I really—I believe that at some point on today's call, you're going to show at least a first step at cataloging the replies that we've gotten so far from at least two of the groups, I believe the GAC and the BC, and I know you'll add the ccNSO after today's call.

But I don't believe we need to look at our schedule of future meetings to determine when we'll analyze. We should analyze as they come in.

---

And of course, that means we need to, I think, fill the sub team 1 so that we have an adequate number of volunteers that are there.

I believe that Olga Cavalli had volunteered for sub team 1 and told us that she was unable to join tonight's call, but she could also help in that regard. That's responsive, Farzaneh, but it's very difficult to understand you on the call for me.

FARZANEH BADII:

Sorry, Steve. Maybe you can take the floor, because no one can understand me and my connection's bad, and my phone number doesn't work at the moment. You can just take the floor and I'm just going to chat. I'm just going to put my comments in chat.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Alright, Farzaneh. Did I have it right that we have a table to present with at least two of the three responses loaded? Fantastic. So, I will just ask staff to load the table that Farzaneh created today. And with respect to giving them another week, it sounds as if we can do so.

Our next meeting isn't in another week, so if we were to ask the co-chairs and staff to send a reminder, we'll have to do that in between our meetings and do it with just emails that we circulate. With the year-end holidays coming up, on second thought, it may not be constructive to wait a week to send a reminder.

I would suggest that if we didn't send a reminder immediately, there's really no point in sending it until the end of the year, until the first of the year. I'd like to hear other's thoughts on if and when we send a



---

reminder. Avri is agreeing, send it as soon as possible. Are there any other comments on that? Kavouss is agreeing, now or after the first of the year.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Hi Steve, this is Yvette. I'm sorry to interrupt. Which document did you want loaded? I have a draft. I have some responses. I have an agenda. Which one were you looking for? Was it the draft Google Doc item that you were looking to have displayed?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yvette, we have two Google Docs. One is the draft report, which will come up later in the agenda. Thank you for having that ready. Farzaneh and I created one this morning that just summarizes a couple of responses. If you look in the chat, Yvette, you'll see that link to the Google Doc. And I do believe you have to—I do think you have to convert it to a PDF first. Is that correct?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: That's correct.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, well take your time and do that, and we'll continue the discussion of timing. So, we only have three opinions on timing, from Avri Doria, Kavouss and myself, which is the asking the co-chairs to send a reminder as soon as possible so that it goes out before the holidays begin, as opposed to waiting a week to begin that process. So, hearing

---

no other thoughts on that, it sounds as if that's the opinion. Kavouss, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, my question or comment is not about the timing. It's about why in GNSO we have to go through so many [INAUDIBLE], ratification, so on and so forth. Why not GNSO would be responsible to put the thing together, comments on GNSO? We sent to GNSO and we should receive from GNSO. But not receiving from all of these subgroups, constituencies, and so on and so forth. It is very divergent group causing problems. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Kavouss. This is Steve DelBianco. When we put the questionnaire out, we explicitly said in the questionnaire that any applicable subgroups within the ACs and SOs, were invited to respond as well.

So, we anticipated a response from the stakeholder groups and constituencies in GNSO, and that was with full knowledge of the fact that the constituencies in GNSO have their own charters, their own accountability procedures, and in fact, the ICANN bylaws designate separate communities that these constituencies and stakeholder groups were designed to serve.

So, GNSO is a collection, as you say. A collection of very diverse stakeholder groups. So, it was fully anticipated that we would receive separate responses from each of the GNSO constituencies and

---

stakeholder groups. And I do know—I know the BC is in, and we are also aware that the Intellectual Property constituency and the Non-Commercial User constituency are very close to submitting their replies.

I should say that in addition, it would be great for someone to mute the phone. There's quite a bit of background noise. Kavouss, I wanted to say that the GNSO, as an entity, has its own procedures, and we fully expect the GNSO, as an organizing SO, to also submit its accountability documentation.

We'll have quite a few by the time they get all—they all come in. Sebastian, we have asked all—when we sent the questionnaire out, we asked every recipient to include any applicable subgroups within their AC and SO. So, that was an invitation to all of the ACs and SOs, including ASO and ALAC, to the extent that they have applicable subgroups.

And I don't know whether we'll see a separate one from within ALAC and ASO. So, Kavouss, I hope that's answering your question. Our charter for track one, the bylaws set us up to review and develop recommendations, and that's what we have requested them to do. Kavouss, I'll put it back to you or turn it over to Cheryl next. Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much, and I'm on an Edinburgh landline, and at least looking at the Adobe Connect room on the tiny screen of my mobile phone. But at least that's better than me actually driving. Thank you for your indolence in all of that. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, for the record.

---

Yes, we also left it up to the ACs and the SOs as to how they wanted to deal with that [INAUDIBLE]. For example, within the ALAC, we are very aware that the accountability is the question for the ALAC, not for any of the component parts, original organizations.

That said, the response, I believe, is that they are put together by a group that is balanced regionally. And so, the particulars of any regional organization accountability would be referenced and taken into account. So, it just depends on how each of the ACs and the SOs want to do this.

And of course, going back to what Avri said earlier, we can't force them to do so. That said, I wouldn't mind if one of the outcomes of this current deliberation was to make sure that we do have a few more people joining this sub team, this analysis and data capturing sub team. I heard Steve outlining who we had already set foot forward as volunteers. We also have Giovanni, who's concerned himself, and possibly even [INAUDIBLE].

So, we do have a reasonable spread, but it would be good if more people could commit to assist in that—the going through the responses and making sure that they're not only tabulated correctly, but that we start to draw some inference in terms of the base analysis. That's really what I wanted to say, in terms of catch-up, and I'll turn it back to you now. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Cheryl. Any other discussion in the queue? Thank you. On the screen now is displayed the very simplest of tables, which is to

---

compare the responses that have come in so far, with apologies to ccNSO since we're not loaded here yet. But as Farzaneh indicated, we'll do that right after this call.

I'm not sure that this method of display will end up being very useful for us, having created the table, because with such narrow columns and such long responses, this is already 40 pages long. It's very difficult to be able to read a comment that has come in, in this way.

So, I don't think this will be a constructive way for us to compare it on the call today. Rather, we'll have to summarize in a table like this. Whether you can scroll or not, it doesn't make it that much easier to read.

I would ask Yvette, Yvette, since you're able to access all of the correspondence that we received, you should have from me a PDF of the BC's response, and you ought to be able to retrieve not only that, but the ccNSO's response and the GAC's response from the correspondence list for this subgroup. So, if it were possible to load, for instance, you can load the BC response if you wish, if you have it handy, since I just sent it a day or two ago.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Hi, Steve. I have ccNSO and I have the GAC.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Well, the one—okay, it would be great to load ccNSO or GAC. Why don't you load GAC, since we have GAC members on the call? So, you could load the GAC if you don't mind.

---

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:                   Okay, I'll do that right now. There you go. On screen.

STEVE DELBIANCO:                   Wonderful. Thank you. The table format will end up being useful for us to analyze and summarize the responses, as opposed to paste the entirety of the responses. It will just be too long. Yvette, if you don't mind to put scrolling on for us, we'd appreciate that.

This is a six-page response. The BC's is only slightly longer. And it looks as if this is going to be very useful for us to dive into. It includes references to the ICANN bylaws and it includes references to the GAC operating principles, allowing us to examine the way in which the GAC perceives its designated community and their own accountability to the GAC members that they are designated to serve.

So, as Kavouss mentioned on this morning's plenary call, it was a question more than a request, that Kavouss asked. "What methodology will we use in this subgroup to review and develop recommendations?" That is the charter we have, to review and develop recommendations regarding the accountability of each of the ACs and SOs.

So, the first step is to review, and I do believe that review will end up partly being done in the table, where we would be able to summarize, not explicitly include all of this, but at least summarize what it is we have back. We should open a queue about the methodology we will use to review and compare the responses that we have received.

---

And again, this is something that subgroup would do between calls. We don't have to do the analysis on this call. But let's discuss a methodology. So, we'll take a queue on that, starting with Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, thank you very much. No problem the way you mentioned, but we should look into the end results. What would be in the recommendation for the first question? Another role, reply from all or most of the SO and ACs. We should be quite precise, concise and short in the recommendations.

Because at the end, if that recommendation is approved by the CCWG and the ICANN board, it will be converted, at least like the first thing converted into some legal text. So, we should be quite clear on looking to the end results.

When we summarize all of this, trying to pick up all of the contradictions and put them in the data, it could be seen as a draft recommendation. Otherwise, picking some contradictory statement from SO-AC and so on so forth, would not help CCWG to come up in [INAUDIBLE]. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Yes, Kavouss. This is Steve DelBianco. The end result is for us to review and develop recommendations. For my part, it's far too early to know what those recommendations, if any, will be certainly our charge with review and develop recommendations.

We may not have any recommendations. The first step was to review what came back, and we've carefully designed our questions that we

---

put out so that we would understand. For instance, the very first question tried to figure out whether each SO and AC interpreted the designated community that was defined in the bylaws.

And in the case of the GAC, there was no extra interpretation. The GAC's response indicate that it believes that it's target community is national governments, distinct economies as recognized in international fora, multinational governmental organizations and treaty organizations who can participate as observers.

So, I think the GAC was very clear about who it believes its designated community is. And so, that will be an easy one. Kavouss, your hand is up again. Please go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, just I want to say a concern about this. We look to see whether we could have some recommendations, but not necessarily recommendation on all of these questions. You might have in one or two, but not all. It depends. So, what I'm saying is that we should not put a contradictory statement into the draft recommendation, for instance [INAUDIBLE]. That was my point on this. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Kavouss. Christopher, you've asked a question I thought we had dealt with earlier. Yes, we do expect a reply from the GNSO, which has its own policies and procedures. They particularly apply to council and the operation of GNSO working groups.



---

We are also expecting responses from stakeholder groups and constituencies that are inside of the GNSO, and there are seven in total. We may get all seven, plus the GNSO because we have a separate charter, for instance, in the business constituency, even though the business constituency is also a member of the commercial stakeholders group that has its own charter, and we are therefore part of the GNSO which has its own policies and procedures.

Yeah, there's going to be quite a bit to analyze, and that is not an accident, but is the intent of creating GNSO as the collection of contract parties and non-contract parties, and the splits between registrars and registries on the contract side, and then on the non-contract side we have commercial and non-commercial, with further breakdowns below that.

The GNSO is a large and complex animal, so we should fully expect separately designated communities and separate accountability mechanisms to come back and reply.

That will certainly make it a challenge to catalog what we got back, but it will definitely be interesting to the plenary when we are able to compare. For instance, you might find that the business constituency has an explicit procedure to challenge an election result or eligibility of membership, and we may or may not find the same thing in other constituent parts of the GNSO.

We will add value to this process if we simply reveal to our colleges in the CCWG that not all have a membership eligibility that's clearly defined and a mechanism to challenge membership eligibility. That may

---

lead to a recommendation that each AC and SO, and stakeholder group, develop clear language on how to challenge a potential member who was rejected for membership.

This is just an example. I have no idea if it will be the case, but that would be an example of the kind of membership. Thank you, CW. Kavouss, you're right. We are going to have a bunch from our GNSO. The Russian soup, Farzaneh, is asking it.

Alright, we have a lot of experienced ICANN people on this call, so please, let's have some suggestion about the method we can use to analyze responses, like the response that you have on the screen from the GAC. Cheryl, are you at a position to help us?

I'll call on CW in a moment, but when CW, Christopher's finished, we should also review who has volunteered to be on sub team one and continue to press for additional volunteers to begin to read these responses. Christopher Wilkinson, please go ahead.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Yeah, it's Christopher Wilkinson. Good morning, everybody. Thank you, Steve. I just asked for the floor to keep conversation going, because as you said, [INAUDIBLE]. But indeed, I think the first two or three replies will reveal some basic themes.

And the analysis of all the replies should follow the dominant themes. Of course, you can't rely entirely on the first two or three replies to reveal the dominant themes, but sooner rather than later, we'll see what the main lines are.

---

So, the document would have a chapter describing what is common ground, a second chapter describing what is typical in certain communities and SO-ACs, but not necessarily all of them. And then that's the most interesting chapter, the third chapter, the exceptions, who does things differently and [INAUDIBLE].

That way, for the outside reveal, they'll never read the whole bulk of the what has been introduced of the submissions, we create some intellectual order [INAUDIBLE] in what is done. And from that, I [INAUDIBLE] be careful not to introduce judgements too early.

But from that document/categorization of the dominant themes, and among the communities, it should be possible to begin to identify best practice, and of course, hopefully some interchange between the communities you notice, notably in the third chapter, that are unusual. That would be my approach to this kind of problem.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Christopher. This is Steve DelBianco. The notes reflect that Christopher Wilkinson suggested that in our analysis, we could document in one part, we could document dominant or common themes and then describe commonality, the common grounds, as well as exceptions to that, exceptions like suggested.

Here's one AC and SO that goes further than the rest. Here are two ACs and SOs who don't have anything, for instance, on election procedures. And that might suggest that the end of that exercise, that we would look to one or more of the ACs and SOs to say that there are best practices to be observed.

---

So, Christopher, I would agree that a natural outgrowth of comparing, cataloging and comparing the replies, a natural outgrowth of that will be that one or more ACs and SOs have done extensive work describing, for instance, their election and member eligibility procedures, or their transparency mechanisms for the deliberations of the AC and SO.

And each of them will differ in the degree to which everything is in writing and is transparent to anyone who wants to see it. So, it's natural to expect we could emerge with best practices without even taking them to the form of recommendations. Christopher, your hand is still up. Go ahead.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Well, it's an old hand, but you've just summarized what I said in a very clear way, and I think if the staff can take this elaboration as well, [INAUDIBLE]. You prepare to give some time to this issue, but not necessarily the leader of the pen. I also notice in the chapter, we discovered what [INAUDIBLE]. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Christopher, this is Steve DelBianco. I wanted to ask, are there members on this call as well who have volunteered, and if you have, this would be a great time to talk about your ideas for sub team one. And first up is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Hopefully my audio's okay. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, for the record. Yeah look, I think what [INAUDIBLE] and Christopher put

---

forward, I think it will become self-evident after the initial data capture is done and the tabulations are sort of put together, where patterns do or don't exist.

And of course, there may be times, for example, the unique method of policy development within the ASOs might put it in a very particular category. So, they're the sort of things that will shape out as we go through the process. Because we have now a lack of time without our weekly meetings, it strikes me that this is actually a very good time for our sub team one to do its work intersessionally.

Now if it needs to have teleconferences, we can of course facilitate and assist that. If it wants work purely within our own interchanging and using the Google Doc and other similar methods of collaboration, that's equally fine. I would suggest, and I am deliberately pushing into methodology here.

Steve, I hope you'll forgive me. I would suggest that anything that they would term as list-tropic goes to our full list, that it's clearly on the subject line as a sub team thread. That way we have some transparency that we can maintain in the process and none of us will be surprised with outcomes when we come back together in January.

I also mean that if there's any comments or interventions that the rest of us may feel could be helpful, that that can be put during the earlier parts of the process.

So, going back to where we're starting, right now we are simply collecting the data in a form where it can afford some form of side-by-side or parallel analysis, and at the very beginning might be as simple as

---

“Were all the questions answered? Yes or no. Which ones were and which ones weren’t, and why not? What sort of, in a yay or nay, or minor observation extracts can be made out of the answers that we’re given?”

So, there’s a bunch of stuff for the sub team to do. Obviously, [INAUDIBLE] is getting herself deeply into this, so I would see her, and of course Steve and myself, as being closely engaged with this sub team as well. But we do have, and have requested that we have, wherever possible, people that are from all of the other ACs and SOs, and certainly those that do put in a response.

So, let’s put—we’re making a call here that we need more volunteers. Christopher, I would very much appreciate if you could input some time. I think your input would be extremely valuable, and hopefully it’s time that everyone on this sub team can put in between our close of meeting today.

The final time of getting things in from the ACs and SOs, which will be, we assume, somewhere around the end of next week, if not the end of the calendar year. And then allow a bit of inter-sessional time for some of the collaborative work to come together before we meet back on the 12<sup>th</sup> of January.

We’re still way away from trying to make any sort of analysis, or opinion pieces. And I think what we’ll do on the 12<sup>th</sup> of January meeting is take a significant amount of our agenda time to find out from this sub team and be briefed where they’re up to and where they would like to see us

---

going next, and then we can make some suggestions and course corrections then.

So, that's how I see it. That means we do need to put a call back out to the list again, as a result of our meeting today, to get additional volunteers in. We know we've got people from ALAC. We know we've got people from GNSO. We know we have people from the GAC.

We know we have people from [INAUDIBLE], and we know we have people from—I had another mental break—ccNSO. Sorry, Giovanni. He will be most irritated with me. So yeah, we already have a reasonable team, but it's a team that could be expanded, especially because they can work asynchronously using collaborative tools.

So, Steve, that's pretty much where I would see it, and I would like to suggest that we perhaps should move to the other agenda items, because time is against us in today's call, and I do need to let you know I have another call at the top of this hour, so I will have to leave on time. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Cheryl. I will note it in this chat that Farzaneh was suggesting that instead of focusing on what an SO and AC does, focus on the answers to the questions. Farzaneh, it might have been the connection, but neither Christopher Wilkinson nor I were going to look at anything other than the responses to the questions to do our review, and those responses are our guide.

---

That is what we're reviewing. But at least in the case of the BC and the GAC, those responses did include references to documents and procedures that we use. And the responses don't repeat them verbatim, they just often include a link to them.

So, we may find ourselves in a position of following those links to the appropriate underlying document, to perform our analysis. But I think in all cases, we are relying on what we were told by the ACs and SOs more than trying to observe what they do.

I'm pretty sure that that's what you were intending as well. I would—I just asked Yvette to put up the BC response for one reason, and that is because I would recommend we number the questions. We did not number the questions in the questionnaire that we sent out, and I will note that numbering them will make it a lot easier to follow as we compare the replies that came in.

And I offer as a suggestion the numbering that you see before you on the screen. I simply took our questions, they are numbered 1-4, but it was question 2 that has four subparts in it as well. So, is there any objection? Cheryl's giving me a check mark there.

But if there's any objection or commentary on the use of these numbers, this doesn't need to go back to the underlying ACs and SOs. We're simply numbering it for the purposes of our own analysis and comparison. I see no objection. Let's do that, and Cheryl, convey that to our list from now on, so that the sub team one will at least try to be consistent in how they're analyzed.



---

Farzaneh is asking in the chat, “Do we need one person from each stakeholder group that submitted?” Farzaneh, I think that would be ideal to have at least one from each. It will make it so much more efficient to analyze the responses. I would add that if somebody’s on there from the GAC, for instance. I know Olga Kavalli is on this sub team one, for instance.

If there are questions about how sub team one is analyzing and comparing GAC’s responses, Olga can quickly obtain additional information from either the GAC’s operating principles or other documents that it uses and can assist us interpreting what it was that was said.

I’ll give you an example. One of the questions had to do with outreach. It’s question 2A. We asked about outreach. And I observed that the BC desperately pursued outreach, and we included the budget that we have every year, on trying to do outreach, because the BC is trying to spread its membership to more members of the business community in other parts of the world.

I will compare that to the GAC, where the membership is extremely limited. The potential membership of the GAC is only that list of countries, and the GAC noted with a full paragraph, and I believe Tom put this together, the GAC noted at appropriate fora, it encourages other non-members, other governments who are not yet members of the GAC, to join the GAC.

But one would not expect the GAC to have an outreach budget to try to recruit countries that have not joined the GAC. It can be done in

---

appropriate fora where those countries are together. The BC, on the other hand, doesn't have any gatherings where every single business on the planet is together, so we have to have a very different targeted outreach.

But differences like that can be noted in the analysis so that it doesn't appear as if we are suggesting that every group has to have an outreach budget. That's just not appropriate. Any reaction to that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: My checkmark's left up deliberately.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, Cheryl. Kavouss, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, Steve. What do you want to get out of this budget associated with outreach? This is the result of this question, that is [INAUDIBLE] this budget? What do you mean by this? What is the frame of issue there? I don't think that—if this is in regards to socialized activities, calling on another certified country that is not GAC member.

There are 193 countries, plus some territorial, up to 206. 164 they are members of the GAC. What does the budget mean for that? What do you want to get out of this associating these budgets? We have talked of accountability but not budget. Thank you.

---

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Kavouss. Whenever I use examples, there's always a risk that someone will misinterpret the example. And there is no objective in my mind about budget. I was simply noting that the BC in its response to question 2A, goes so far as describe that it has a budget for doing outreach, because the BC is attempting to recruit businesses that are not even aware that the BC exists.

Then I was suggesting that in our comparison, it's not appropriate for the GAC to require such a thing since the GAC has a very fixed and small group of potential members who are not yet members of the GAC. So, I think what I was describing is the way in which we compare the responses to question 2A would not imply that there's a best practice or a deficiency on the part of an AC and SO until one analyzes the outreach challenge that confronts that AC and SO.

And an outreach challenge in the GAC is not significant. The GAC doesn't need to do a lot of outreach. So, I hope that clarifies what I said. There is no attempt to require or recommend that everyone have an outreach budget. Tom, you're also a GAC member. Was my example clear to you?

TOM DALE:

Yes, it's Tom Dale here, Steve. That is basically correct, I think. The GAC was trying, in its response to be as clear as possible about the limits on the potential membership of the GAC, which now those limits are being reached in some ways.

But we tried to explain some of the specific rules around that, such as basically outreach, but for the GAC is obviously going to be different from other groups, although ICANN is another issue. ICANN, of course,

---

has government engagement work, which is not paid for or responsive by the GAC, but that's a separate issue, which is not a matter for the GAC to comment on. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Tom, this is Steve DelBianco. Thank you very much for that, and I think that that table that Farzaneh and I worked on this morning, that table, for instance, in question 2A on outreach might have a very brief summary for the GAC with respect to outreach.

And the summary of it might be that awareness at all government forums and no formal outreach program is necessary. That would be an example of the way that sub team one might analyze the GAC's response. And on the BC, it would have a different summary.

And if that purpose of summarizing and then comparing that we think would be done in a table form, that would allow us to focus on, as Christopher said earlier, common themes that begin to emerge. And that is to say that a fixed designated community is not going to do as much on outreach as a group whose designated community is across the planet and numbers into the hundreds of millions.

The BC is such an animal. So, outreach is a very challenging task for us. APAC has literally billions of potential members. It's a huge challenge there. But for the ccNSO and for the GAC, for the ASO, not such a concern. They have a very limited set of potential members in your designated community, and outreach there is not as much of a challenge. And I was using that as an example of comparison. Thank you, Tom. Go ahead.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Steve, it's Cheryl. Sorry to jump in. I just wanted to give you a time check. It's perilously close to the top of the hour, and I certainly will have to leave in a moment.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Cheryl. Alright, the agenda for this call had---the agenda had also indicated a desire to—I do think the meat of this agenda was to begin our method of analyzing responses, to decide whether we would ask for a reminder to the groups who have not yet responded. And on that, we had no objection to the idea of asking the chairs to send a reminder. So, we'll have to work on that in the next several days. And Kavouss, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, because at the top of the hour, I have something. I have to leave and go to the airport for another mission. So, I asked at the beginning that it would be possible that on 19<sup>th</sup> of January it moves the 5:00 UTC to 19:00 hours. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Kavouss. Cheryl, you have been our reliable and thankless agenda manager. Would you like to comment on Kavouss' request for a change in the time? I'm not hearing a reply there. Kavouss, we will note it and I guess circulate that for the full group.

---

We have a very limited group of participants that are on right now today. I personally have no problem at all with changing that time. Kavouss, would it be difficult for you to do so, I'd appreciate if you would send an email to our group with that request, and therefore as long as there are no objections, we can go ahead and make that change.

And that would be better since everyone would receive it. Cheryl is suggesting something as well, Kavouss. We have to check against the master schedule, since that's the schedule that the staff has to stick with. So, if we moved it, we can't move it to a time where they've already got another group on the master schedule.

So, Cheryl is going to check the master schedule and when we get that back, Kavouss, then we can send the request. With that, I believe we've reached the end of the call. Please, sub team one, we need to increase the volunteers on that.

And please remember that I did circulate the updated draft document. So, we are interested in feedback on the proposed replies on tracks two and three. We have received one so far. It was from Jordan Carter, and it came in on yesterday, on Tuesday, the 13<sup>th</sup> of December.

It was a thoughtful point on mutual accountability roundtable. So, I think with that we've reached the top of the hour. I thank everybody for your participation. And I look forward to our next call, which is currently scheduled for the 12<sup>th</sup> of January, and we're looking at a potential change in that time. Thanks, everyone. The call is ending.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**