CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thank you very much. I was just about to say I note Steve DelBianco the other co-rapporteur who is able to join me on today's call has already joined. So I was about to ask staff to get everything started, and they've done so. Thank you very much for getting the recording started, we'll get underway.

What we're getting underway with is the, let's count them, I think this will be our 16th or 17th meeting – Meeting #16, that's right – of the SO/AC (Supporting Organization and Advisory Committee) Accountability subgroup. This is our meeting of 12 January 2017, at 13:00 UTC. So wishing you all the very best for a happy New Year as we gather for our return to 2017 work together.

Relatively short agenda, but not a short amount of time on our agenda. We're going to probably take every bit of our 60 minutes, but if we run early, that is okay as well.

Noting apologies today from Farzaneh. Of course, as one of our co-rapporteurs and someone who has contributed considerably to some of the work we'll be reporting on and discussing this evening – evening my time – but discussing in today's call, sorry to see that she is unable to join but her new work has a commitment that she cannot miss out on at today's time and date. If there are other people who have put their apologies to the list, they will be noted. If you're aware of any apologies, feel free to pop them in the chat.

If there is anybody who is on audio only, please let yourselves be known now. Not hearing anyone identifying themselves, we'll take our roll call from the Adobe Connect room.

Next thing I'm going to do is ask is there anyone who needs to make an update of his Statement of Interest? If so, please let us know now. Not hearing anyone on that, I'm assuming that everyone's Statements of Interest are indeed up-to-date.

The only other "administrivia" for today is the usual request to identify yourself before speaking. This is for the transcript purpose, and it makes a huge difference rather than just having people identified as MAN, WOMAN, WOMAN, MAN, etc., if you remember to identify yourself before each time you take the microphone. Also, if you don't mind, it would be appreciated if you would speak relatively slowly and as clearly as possible.

If you are planning on making many oral interventions today, it would be as always perhaps a good idea if you test your audio and, if we note an issue, if you can arrange to have a dial out to a phone. We often find that there's a fair amount of time taken while we try and establish [some sort] of audio connection with people wishing to make an intervention, but these things happen and we will manage.

With that, I believe all of the administration is over for this call other than for me to ask is anyone aware of any other Any Other Business that they wish to put forward in advance of the agenda. Not hearing anybody or seeing anybody wave and put their hands up in the Adobe

Connect room, I'm going to ask now if there are any urgent changes that anyone wishes to make to today's agenda.

With that, we will now move on to Agenda Item 2, which is a very brief review of action items out of our December 15 meeting. There has been in the relatively long break between now and that meeting during the holiday season when the ICANN office was in fact closed and a number of people had [inaudible] and social commitments elsewhere then thanks to those who have made [inaudible] input into our review of the responses that were received from the Advisory Committees and Supporting Organizations. That's a matter that we will in fact be dealing with in detail later in our agenda items. But thanks to all of you who were able to get onto that particular action item.

There was indeed a call for more of you to join this second sub-team for drafting, and that invitation is still open. Farzaneh particularly requested that we repeat that on today's call. It would be greatly appreciated if anyone who wishes to make the additional commitment to assist with the current work which is looking at the responses that we did get in the end of last year to our questionnaire, the opportunity is there and you would be more than welcomed. Just let us know to the list but of course, as ever, our Google Docs and Word documents are open for input anyway.

That was our major action item, but we did have another action item and that's one that we have completed but not completed in a way that at least some of our members will find successful. Our next meeting, which we will review at the end of today's agenda, is on 19 January. We had a request that its advertised time for 05:00 UTC, Kavouss had

requested at our last meeting if it would be possible to move the time of that call on 19 January to a 19:00 UTC timeslot. That was an action item on us to explore with staff if that is possible. Unfortunately, and we are very sorry for this, unfortunately the 19:00 UTC slot is already taken up by a meeting from another sub-team. So that is unavailable.

So we did complete our action item by inquiring about 19:00 UTC on 19 January, but unfortunately we were unsuccessful. So at this stage, and we will look at this again later, there is no opportunity for us to change from our previously advertised and planned time of our next call. So apologies for that, but I believe that at least means that all of the action items from our call on the 15th were completed.

Is there any other [inaudible] of action items that we need to report on? If not, then I'm going to move now to a very brief update on activities between last meeting and this. We have indeed received [inaudible] input from various of the SOs and ACs in response to our survey, and thank you very much most formally now on behalf of all of us and in particular the rapporteurs Farzaneh and Steve who are working in particular on this aspect of our ongoing work.

The input to that survey is [inaudible] that we're going to discuss in our next agenda item, but we did round up what we could by the end of the calendar year. They have all been as received put into the matrix that you've all received under separate cover along with the invitation and link to that document that went out to the list. That of course is a document that can be updated should we get some additional input to our work from that survey.

All right now, if there have been any particular sub-team activities on anything else since the last call, with that I'm going to ask Steve if he'd like to make some comments on that and then take up onto our next Agenda Item 3. Steve, over to you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: [inaudible], Cheryl. As you say, sub-team activities really dovetails exactly into Agenda Item 3 because the sub-team that we're focusing on today is the sub-team for Track 1. That is the notion of reviewing and developing recommendations with respect to the accountability of the SOs and ACs. We call it Track 1 and I believe, Cheryl, you had named it Sub-Team 1 if I have that right. Maybe I'm confused, but I'll just call it the sub-team for Track 1.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You are absolutely correct.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great. Now in the chat, what I indicated is I worked with Farzi on this yesterday. Farzi's not available today, but she has done the prep work so far. We have seven responses, and Farzi put them all in a Google Doc folder. I put the link to that Google Doc folder into the chat. That is a folder where all seven of the received responses are sitting there. That's not a folder we should be editing. It's just meant to be a repository where you can go there and quickly see what it is that ccNSO or BC said.

I think we'll try to work with staff and, Nathalie, I'm going to ask you to help us with this. It might be easier if you created a folder in the wiki

where the received response documents could live. Currently on the wiki for Work Stream 2, there are general lists of documents. That list of documents is across the entirety of Work Stream 2. I can assure that finding the seven responses to our particular request and questionnaire is next to impossible on that long list of documents. So we want to request that staff give us a folder for the SO/AC Accountability responses. You could call it SO/AC Accountability Responses.

Now Brenda has just replied already in the chat. She's pretty quick. I'm going to click on your link. I'm there right now. Brenda, that's the entirety of our documents. If you scroll down on the link that Brenda has just given us – thank you very much, Brenda – she has already delivered what I asked for, which is a link to the documents that have been received so far. Thank you very much.

So as far as I can tell, and I'm happy to be corrected by anyone on the call, we did not receive a response from two of he SO/ACs: ALAC and the Root Server [System] Advisory Committee – the RSSAC and the ALAC. I'll pause there. Any news from ALAC or RSSAC? Alan Greenberg – thank you – is indicating that ALAC is coming. Alan, give us some sense. Should we wait a few days, a few weeks? What's your idea about when?

ALAN GREENBERG: I would guess something somewhat over two weeks but not a lot more. We've just been overtaken by the At-Large review which is going on, and it has taken infinitely more of my time and other people's than we ever thought it would – a minor little distraction.

STEVE DELBIANCO:	Minor, yeah.
ALAN GREENBERG:	We won't comment on the details but, trust me, it has taken a bit of time.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Alan, I might add, so end of January is probably the earliest we'd see the ALAC, right?
ALAN GREENBERG:	That's correct.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Okay. And what's interesting is that review is the Bylaws mandated review every three years that the Board contracts an outside firm who usually knows next to nothing about ICANN, multi-stakeholder processes, or the particular group they're reviewing. The Board hands them a terms of reference to review the AC or SO, and then they come back with a report. It's often difficult to recognize the SO or AC that they're reviewing when you read the reports.
	I think that we can contrast that outside-driven process with the process we're supposed to do here. This is the community itself trying to review particular aspects of accountability on the SOs and ACs. I think we can do a better job.

ALAN GREENBERG: Aside from anything else, I think the draft we have so far is a demonstration on the dangers of crowdsourcing when you believe the crowds actually know what they're talking about.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alan, I was contrasting our internal community-based review from the third-party clueless consultant review. But I don't know. Which of those is the crowdsourced one in your opinion?

ALAN GREENBERG: The third-party external.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Got it.

ALAN GREENBERG: They interviewed a lot of people and took things as facts.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Oh, I got it. They write it all down, and the last person they talk to becomes the driver for their conclusions and recommendations.

ALAN GREENBERG: Or the sum of the total. Anyway, not a discussion for this group. It has been somewhat distracting, but work is progressing.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right, Sebastien, I see your hand up.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I'm not sure, Alan, that it's not a discussion for here because it's a question of transparency and accountability for our organization. I am from ALAC too, and I am not participating in the review as such. I am not in the group, but I am not sure whether we can get a better review for real crowdsourcing review than the current situation. But nevertheless, it shows that somewhere we may have a discussion about how we want to handle those reviews. Because I would say we are disappointed and I guess within the GNSO you were disappointed by the review coming from outside expert.

They know a little bit of ICANN because [both] reviews were done by organizations who already have done one other at least review in the past. The GNSO experts [are] the ones who made the ALAC review, and the At-Large review is made by part of the group who had already done [ISO] and another review – the ccNSO, I guess. It's not that they don't know about ICANN, but my feeling is that they think themselves as they know they will have the right to say what they think and they're the ones who have the right idea about what to do.

Sorry for that, but I don't trust in God and I don't trust in them either. We have to discuss how we want to handle in the future the question of those reviews. It's maybe not in this group as such, but it's a very important question. Because it's not because it's in the Bylaws that we need to do like it is suggested today, and it could be a good change of the Bylaws for the future. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Sebastien, I want to agree with you that it's true that those consulting firms take turns reviewing. But the part that concerns me as well is the terms of reference that guide that external review. It's entirely up to the Board, and they're the ones who are supposed to look at the effectiveness of the organization.

If you recall many, many weeks ago I had teed that up as something this group could have addressed: what the word "effectiveness" means. This would have guided the terms of reference for the consultants. This group didn't take that up and the Plenary didn't seem to support it either. But that would have been an opportunity for our group to have some effect on what it is these outside consultants look at every three years.

Now in the case of the GNSO, at least half of the GNSO is meeting for our intersessional in two weeks in Iceland. We are going to take on the project of trying to come up with the terms of reference that you would hand to the Board and ask them to use this as the terms of reference for the next review of the GNSO. We may not achieve that and we do have to reconcile what we're doing with the contract party house, but we should not give up on the ability to influence who they pick and what they're supposed to look at.

We're not going to deep dive into that external review. This is the internal review that we're supposed to do. I wanted to ask whether anyone is aware of the Root Server [System] Advisory Committee or the RSSAC. Are they planning to respond to our questions? Is there any

insight on that. If not, perhaps, Cheryl, we should do an outreach to the RSSAC and ask.

Then, Alan, I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. It is on the subject that Sebastien raised and [inaudible] you are correct. I don't agree, by the way, that if we had defined "effectiveness," we would have fixed the problem. I think the overall concept of how we do these things is just wrong.

The number of successes in these external reviews where the reviewers come in, they really grasp what's going on, and make recommendations that we can implement that will really help – not just cause reorganization and work – are very, very few and far between. I think we need to recognize we're throwing huge amounts of money at this process and rethink it. So I agree completely, but it's not this group's job – sadly or thankfully.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alan, it could have been this group's job. It falls within…

ALAN GREENBERG: Well…

STEVE DELBIANCO: We just decided not to. I don't think that we could have fixed the current review. It was already underway by the time we convened. I

wasn't suggesting we could have fixed the current one. The idea is to try to guide it in the future to be more focused.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the methodology is wrong. It's not just the words. But be that as it may, for one reason or another it is not our task this time around. But somebody should think about it soon because we are throwing huge amounts of volunteer and staff time and money at this, and I don't think the results are anywhere near commensurate with the level of effort. That has nothing to specifically with our review. Just observing a lot of other ones over the last decade.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Well, let's get our first three tracks done, and maybe we can reopen the question on how we define that. I had lobbied hard for this to be one of our key tracks, but we didn't have any support for that. Maybe there will be a new appreciation for the fact that we ought to do this.

Cheryl, thank you in the chat. You've indicated that we'll do a follow up with the Root Server [System] Advisory Committee and we'll ask [CCWG] co-chairs to help with that outreach. And it's really just ask. Okay, thank you.

Cheryl, if we were to take a look at the draft document that Farzi was kind enough to pull together where she just summarized under Track 1, would that be an appropriate place to go next or did you have something else in mind?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, I think that's a perfect place to take us next. We will be following a more detailed discussion of this document now with the no doubt slightly shorter but necessary look at the overall reporting. If we can take anywhere around the next 15-20 minutes, maybe 25 minutes if needs be, diving into that, that will help us progress.

Of course, while I have the microphone, I'm going to do my advertisement again. Olga is part of this team and I have been pleased to see her able to join today's call. But we can't leave it all to co-rapporteur input, Olga, and one or two other commenters. Please do indicate formally by letting the list know if you can step up to be part of this drafting team, this Sub-Team 1.

Because if you do that whilst, yes, commenting, etc., is open to us all, the nucleus within our Sub-Team 1 here are the people who will be guiding the way we carve up and analyze. There may be some additional thoughts, for example, on how this current listing of the data can be re-matrixed or new ways of listing it, let alone when we get to reporting and responding to this data capture exercise. It's that group who are going to be leading that. So they will have the ability to have online interactions and assisted telephone meet-ups to facilitate any of that. But please let us know if you can contribute directly as more in a pen-holding than a commentary base for this.

With that advertisement over, Steve, back to you. I've given enough time for the document to be loaded up. I can stop my filibustering, and we can get into the meaty bits. Thanks, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Cheryl. While I am part of this sub-team for Track 1, I by no means have been doing any of the lifting so far. Farzaneh has done that for us, and that's the result of the document you see in front of you.

I thought I would return to understand what the task is in Track 1. As you know from our document, it was to review and develop recommendations on SOs and ACs accountability, particularly with regard to capture. I wanted to remind everyone in the chat where this came from. This came from one of the ICANN Bylaws regarding Work Stream 2 where each of the Work Stream 2 groups was supposed to "review and develop." "Review and develop" – you'll see it right in the center of the Bylaw that I pasted into the chat.

And then one of the Work Stream 2 groups, little iii, is ours, the SOs and ACs Accountability. There we're supposed to "review and develop recommendations on accountability, including but not limited to improved processes for accountability, transparency, and participation that are helpful to prevent capture." So the Bylaws themselves give us the guide for what it is we're supposed to do as we analyze the seven SOs and ACs to the extent that they provide [responses].

If they don't provide responses, technically the Bylaws would still require us to review and develop recommendations for RSSAC, even if they don't provide a response. That's going to be very difficult thing for us to do without any participation from RSSAC. So I guess we'll cross that bridge when we determine whether they're going to provide us a response.

But the responses are supposed to be geared to the questions that we asked, and we asked the questions specifically to learn enough to be able to review and develop along the lines of what the Bylaws gave us as a charter.

Having said that, the document that Farzi prepared has four dimensions. It looked at the scope. The four things that you see on the screen in front of you, there are four points in here. But those four points are only sort of cataloging what we have received. They don't really start down the path of determining whether we've covered accountability, transparency, and participation. They are helpful to prevent capture. So there is indeed quite a bit of work left to do on Track 1 of deciding how it is we dive into the ASO, for example, to determine whether when we review their processes for accountability, transparency, and participation, are they adequately protecting against capture, etc.

So we have a great deal of organizing work to do, and it probably starts with understanding our charter, which I've pasted into the chat. And then the other is to do a deep dive by reading the actual seven responses that we've got back. I found that to be really illuminating, and I think I better do it again since we have to understand what they've told us in order to be able to catalog whether their responses are actually going to protect against capture and increase participation and deliver on accountability.

We really have a mixed bag. The responses that we've received so far – and we have seven responses because while we're missing two of the SOs and ACs, I think a number of you realize that two of the GNSO's subgroups – the Business Constituency and the Non-Commercial

Stakeholders Group – gave us responses and there are still several other subgroups inside of GNSO that I have no idea whether they intend to responds. Groups like the Registry Stakeholder Group, the Registrars, and the Intellectual Property Constituency, and the ISP Constituency. We may or may not get responses from them. But I think all we can analyze is those who have responded.

I really wanted to take a cue from other members here who are part of this Sub-Team 1 or Track 1 and see if we can figure out whether Farzi's summary is actually appropriate and helpful and then move to the next step of organizing our work. Can we at least get a show of hands or ticks from those who have already volunteered to be on Sub-Team 1? I'll just say put a green check so we understand who on the phone today is part of that. Olga, for instance, I realize you are. I'm only seeing one green check at this point. Olga, are you able to just check that box? Okay, great. Cheryl, this would indicate that we actually don't have the people to do the work. I don't know where that leaves us right now, especially as we need to tell the Plenary when we're going to get done.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Steve, I just finished yet another advertisement for people to step forward. I thought there was more than Olga who had done so to date, and I'm assuming that those names have been captured over time. Interestingly enough, we did have someone step forward from RSSAC. So that's someone that Thomas had reached out [to]. I'm just having a mental blank at the moment. Thomas, you might pop her name into the chat. For some reason, it's just not coming to the front of my brain at this stage.

We had, I thought, Seun and perhaps it might have even been Christopher Wilkinson. He's on the call. He would remember. But certainly I thought Seun stepped forward from the ALAC. We were close to having at least one from each of the SOs and ACs. So the lack of response in this call to your question may not be a true indicator of those who have stepped forward.

I'll ask our ever capable staff if they can have a look back over our various meeting notes while we're conducting the rest of this review part and just see if we can pull those names out. But regardless of that, more people need to step forward and the door is more than open for you to do so because this work needs to begin in earnest. Back to you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So our current list is – thank you, Michael, for volunteering – Michael Abejuela, Olga, myself, Farzi. Any others? Christopher Wilkinson, I mean now that your holiday [inaudible] return to you, maybe we could enlist your help on this.

Thomas Rickert, to your point in the chat, gentle harassment of the nature that you can practice might be necessary to determine whether the other subgroups besides GNSO who tend to respond. We only got Business Constituency and Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group. I don't know whether we'll get responses from the other groups and there are several: the CSG, the NCUC, IPC, ISP, CPE, Registrars, and Registries. It might even be NPOC for that matter. But let's compose that along with

your outreach to the RSSAC to see whether they would respond. Would that be okay?

And thank you, Christopher Wilkinson, for volunteering. Great. So given that we have a set of volunteers, one thing I will volunteer to do, Cheryl, is I will paste the Bylaws and the charter for Track 1 into the top of the document you have on the screen. That way whenever anybody is looking at that document, they'll be reminded of what it is we have to do. I think I'll also paste the initial questions, just the questions themselves, and paste that at the top of that document. Therefore, you don't have to jump from doc to doc to understand, "What are we supposed to looking at in this exercise?" I hope that will be helpful.

It's available under our agenda and I think we have the time, what does this group think of the summary that Farzi has prepared so far. Take a queue on that. I'll throw out a question. One of Farzi's observations in the divergence, which is point number five, is that sometimes among the seven responses received there are no formal appeal mechanisms to appeal a decision like voting on a position or to appeal and election. With regard to transparency, some ACs have closed meetings. Some don't do reviews.

What would our assessment be on that? Are we supposed to be normative here to suggest, yes, each SO and AC must have a review mechanism for decisions and elections? We can't just jump to that conclusion. If we jump to that conclusion, we'll probably have to justify it. There are some SOs and ACs that might resent our suggestion that they have review or appeal mechanisms.

Yet if we do it as a comparison basis, we compare them all and it turns up that two of the SOs and ACs don't have an appeal mechanism, well then, we're simply stating the fact without necessarily recommending – which is our next step, to recommend whether they add an appeal mechanism. I guess we could recognize that each of the SOs and ACs who fail to have an appeal mechanism that we recommend that they consider adding one. We might even indicate that there are some examples from the SOs and ACs who have appeal mechanisms that they could follow.

So no more closed meetings in the GAC. Olga, I think you offered that as a humorous addition as opposed to a recommendation. But what is the degree [to which] you want to go? If we do a comparison on something like appeals, what does this group feel about whether we should recommend that all the groups have an appeal mechanism? We'll go into the queue now, and thank you for raising your hands. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I think we have to be careful and not dive into the grass or weeds or whatever and make recommendations on implementation as opposed to intent. The ALAC as an example does not have an appeal mechanism for elections, but we do have a mechanism of removing those who have been elected should we decide that it was inappropriate. Now those aren't the same mechanism, and an appeal may address what is believed to be a process error, but the net effect can be the same thing. So I think we can't get too much into the detail and saying are there effective mechanisms for the community that is being served to overrule processes that take place. I'm not sure we

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alan, I just included into the chat the way in which we asked the question was, "Does your AC/SO have mechanisms by which your members can challenge or appeal decisions and elections?" If we catalog that answer, it would really be helpful to have nuance in it. So if we determine that election appeals aren't explicitly in the ALAC, there's an effective mechanism in terms of recalls. That's a great subtle observation we can make.

want to go into more detail than that of forcing groups to set up processes which in the past they have found there's absolutely no need for. Again, an opinion, but thank you.

I was hoping to get your opinion on the general question that says that if we compare all the seven SOs and ACs if there's one of them that doesn't have a decision appeal mechanism, we'll observe that in our review, but does this group believe we would be recommending that any SOs and ACs that lack a decision appeal mechanism consider developing one? Before we move on to Cheryl, Alan, did you have an opinion on that?

ALAN GREENBERG: I could live with "consider." I would not want to mandate.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Got it. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Steve. I thought it was important I pop myself in the queue. I'm [inaudible] came in after Alan because one of the things I definitely wanted to raise here rather more as a participant in this process than as co-rapporteur is exactly what this little interaction between you and Alan and the group now has started to drill down to.

And as the sub-team gets into the ongoing nitty-gritty of teasing out these issues and hopefully with even some more data to work with in the near future, I think this highlights exactly how incredibly carefully and cautiously and diligently we look at how we word, draft, and text-smith any recommendation we come to, remembering of course that we are then presenting the CCWG, etc.

But it think this matter has to be handled with extraordinary sensitivity and that of course, ladies and gentlemen, one of the reasons – now popping my rapporteur hat back on again – that we specifically wanted the sub-team who will be holding the pen in this early stage for all of us on the analysis aspect of the data at least in this current matrix has been into a [inaudible] and thanks again to Farzi for carving it up to this extent. It may be carved up in other ways as well. But it was to this extent to allow for an ability to see what the responses are to the different questions by category.

We definitely need to word very cautiously and very carefully anything that can be considered an implementable action or recommendation. This is a very important task, and it's one of the reasons why I've continually reminded you all that anything we need to do to facilitate the work of this sub-team we will do. But we also have a very short amount of time to do it in.

With that, I'm going to stop again and hope that other people will also have some comments and some guidance for the sub-team to start looking at. I see that some wonderful things are happening in the chat. So even if you're not getting to queue up for oral interventions, Steve, you might want to go through what's happening in the chat now as well.

Just a time check, we can probably only spend another 5-7 minutes on this.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Cheryl. On a time check, I had the impression we have another 15 minutes or so, right?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We do, but we have a couple of other things on the agenda, that's all.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Got it. I'm sorry then. Okay, so quickly, [inaudible]. Christopher Wilkinson has agreed to help with Track 1, and I'd just encourage you to take a look at the document.

So in the document, Cheryl, I will do two things. I will paste the Bylaws charter for Track 1 and, pursuant to your second suggestion, this notion of suggesting how we carve up the answers that came in, Farzi has done a good job I wouldn't say so much carving up but comparing and contrasting in one through five in the document on the screen in front of you.

If I paste in the actual questions we asked – one of which is in the chat – that is another way that Cheryl just suggested we carve up the responses. We carve up the responses to each of the questions we asked. So underneath question five about appeals mechanisms we get to indicate that, for instance, four of the seven responses indicated explicit appeals mechanisms for decisions and indicate the two or three that do not have them.

That sort of factual statement about what we learned doesn't tread into the area of making recommendations. As Alan said, we have to be conservative, careful even, about recommendations for what should be considered in the SOs and ACs but we schedule be I think deliberate and explicit in reporting what we learned in our review. The reason I say that is that's the whole purpose of this subgroup. If you look at the SOs and ACs and ask whether they're accountable to the communities they're designated to serve, we're supposed to review and describe the mechanisms they have for that accountability.

In fact, the whole mutual accountability roundtable – if you all recall that, it was I believe Track 2 or 3 for us – the whole mutual accountability roundtable was justified by the SOs and ACs getting together and comparing their best practices with regard to accountability. Well, that's exactly what we've done. We're trying to compare the practices without saying who is best. We're trying to just compare the practices in the seven SOs and ACs. As we compare them, we should describe in our review differences.

I hope that those differences could include a statement of whether or not, for instance, one particular group has a very strong outreach

mechanism or they're funding – from their members' dues – they're funding events to do outreach to increase membership from underrepresented demographics or underrepresented geographical areas. If we observe that, we could recommend later on that other groups consider if they have an under-representative from certain demographics or parts of the world, that they consider a funded program of outreach.

Avri, we did receive one for the GNSO itself, and it is on our wiki page. If you scroll down, you'll see it pasted in. It was sent in by James Bladel. So we do have one from the GNSO. We have one from the NCSG and from the Business Constituency. So we have three so far from GNSO itself. Okay, Avri?

I'm sorry. Now, Avri, thank you for correcting me. We did get one from NCUC. So, Avri, let me ask you. Do you think we will also get one from the NCSG as an umbrella group on top of NCUC? Thanks, Avri. Avri, are you aware? Does NCSG itself have a charter that's distinct from the charter for the NCUC?

AVRI DORIA: Yes, they do. Each of NCSG, NPOC, and NCUC each have their own charters. NPOC's and NCUC's have to be consistent with NCSG's, but there are many things they can do on their own as well.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Avri, thank you for that. I'll ask you one favor. Let's suppose that we don't have anybody at NPOC that wants to fill out our questionnaire.

We could still get a link to the NPOC – NPOC is the nonprofit operating constituency. It's part of the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group of the GNSO. But if they didn't want to respond to the questionnaire, Avri could simply provide us with a link to the charter they have – because I presume that charter is available online someplace – and that could be the basis of our review. What do you think, Avri?

AVRI DORIA: I expect it is online. I expect I can get access to it. I'm not a member of NPOC, but I do believe it is available. And, sure, but we can also just ask one of them if none of them happen to be on this group. I can certainly ask one of them. But I don't see any in the meeting at the moment, and I'm not sure if any of the NPOC members are actually members of the group, but I'll check.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, thank you, Avri. Sebastien Bachollet just posted a link to the NPOC's homepage. So I clicked on that to open it, and it is a few paragraphs describing their purpose, what they stand for, and maybe that is what passes for a charter unless there is some other document available. I don't understand it. They list members. They have committees. But I don't see a charter per se on that page. If anyone does, let me know. Thanks, Avri.

ALAN GREENBERG: Steve?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: My recollection is to come into existence, they had to present a charter to the Board, so there must be a charter.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Maybe I'm just failing to see it when I look at the website link that Sebastien provided. So, Avri, thank you for that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Have you never seen a website which is difficult to navigate or doesn't include information?

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's why I took the blame for it because it's likely to be me, you know what I mean?

ALAN GREENBERG: Or it's not there.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Exactly. Let's be persistent because I think we will end up – because of our review, that's what the Bylaws told us to do – our work will end up making it obvious that some groups either failed to respond or failed to have posted a charter. And that group is going to feel a little bit chagrined about that even if we never call attention to it. It will be

obvious from our report when we present it to the Plenary, and then suddenly that particular group is going to scramble to come up with something.

If it turns out we should have found it all along, we just didn't ask the right people, then we're all going to feel a little chagrined and we're going to have to go back and redo our document. Alan, for instance, has just found a PDF for 2011. I'm going to bring that up. Thanks, Alan. Good work.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is the charter.

STEVE DELBIANCO: It's 20-some pages long. There you go. So we have a 20-page charter that could be used to answer the questions. So I'm disappointed that NPOC didn't respond and, Thomas Rickert, this falls within your camp because they're part of the GNSO. And I do hope we would resend the questions to NPOC and invite them to respond. They can draw you upon their charter.

One of the reasons we didn't count on the charters alone is that many groups have perhaps unwritten, undocumented procedures that are outside of what's in the written charter. We wanted to invite them to provide interpretations, clarifications, and expansions.

This has been a great exercise. It shows quite a bit of work left for us in data gathering even before we get to analysis. Between what Alan,

Sebastien, and Avri have put into the chat, we already have quite a bit more than we had so far.

Cheryl, I think that's about all we have to cover. Alan, your hand is still up. Do you want to go on?

ALAN GREENBERG: No. Sorry.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Cheryl, I go back to you for where we go from here. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Steve. Where we go from here, I hope this exercise and discussion in today's call has made clear is that now that getting the sub-team and again the advertised "please come and join us" this is still out there. I know Farzaneh when she put the link out to this document to the list, did ask on the list for people to volunteer. So perhaps we'll shake a few more helpers out of the tree with that as well. But there's an action item on us to follow up again as well via, for example, Thomas to specifically parts of the GNSO.

I think Alan is probably well and truly aware how important it is that we get the material so that we not only have Christopher and I believe Seun if memory serves volunteering to assist in the sub-team, we also have the material for them to work with from the advisory committee that they're particularly going to be coming in from. It would be nice if our material was there as well, but we can only do so much as volunteers.

So I appreciate all that work that's to come, but it gives you a small view, ladies and gentlemen, in where we are at this stage and where we need head in very short order on this part of our work and documentation. And, yes, this is going to be a lion's share of our activity.

I also want to remind all of you that these are open processes. Please watch what's going on in these documents, make comments as it goes on, make suggestions, have interactions on the list.

With that, I want to remind everybody that we also have overall reporting. I think quite wisely, this particular group has run a continual improvement program including one major overhaul at the end of last year of our overall reporting. As we've come close to a form of [stable] opinion let alone [contentious] which we certainly had on things like our work on the track to do with whether the SOs and ACs should be subject to an IRP for example where the response to that question was overwhelmingly no, we will not be recommending that. We've captured that in another document and link to the [inaudible] that document is there for everyone and remind everyone to go and have a look at that.

But [inaudible] we have I think something like less than seven weeks now or only about seven weeks between now and the Copenhagen meetings starting. It would be extraordinarily useful and indeed very important if our overall reporting document inclusive of the outputs of this Sub-Team 1's work on our data capture exercise at least to see how far we may have got on our compare and contrast matrix is in a form that it can have gone to quite possibly the last of the CCWG Plenary meetings before Copenhagen. So that means we're more likely five weeks than seven away from that point in time, so that we can have a

good reading and discussion of our documentation and the level it is at during our Copenhagen face-to-face meeting.

So I wanted to just make sure that we're all aware that the other document is also continuing to be updated and reviewed and needs to be continued to be updated and reviewed. We do have significant work which we are committed to do, and we would like to see that we have our documentation in a form so that we can get it to the CCWG in advance of our face-to-face meeting at Copenhagen so that we can have a considered and considerable Plenary-wide discussion on our work and taking some opinion and guidance from [the whole of the] CCWG.

It may be that we are perhaps able to even have something like a formal first reading – I'd love to say second, but I dream – first reading of our reporting or at least parts of our reporting while we are in the Copenhagen meeting mode. That's our intention. That's a very tight timeline, and this is a reminder for us to all get onto that work. That means more than just at our weekly meetings. It means between our weekly meetings by use of our mailing list.

With that, I want to take you to our next agenda item. We won't go into any substance on that last point, but our next agenda item is just to bring you up-to-date on our next meeting and future meetings. For whatever reason, I've only managed to remember to list the next two in January. Obviously, we're also going to be meeting in February. But the next meeting will be on 19 January. And unfortunately, our request to change our timing of that meeting was not possible, so it will be running at 05:00 UTC. That's 19 January at 05:00 UTC.

Our following meeting, inconveniently for me I can assure you, is on 26 January at 13:00 UTC. That's not just the extraordinarily awkward hour that is for me in the [inaudible] on 26 January. Anyone who knows anything about Australia will perhaps recognize that day as a national holiday. So I will be on my annual retreat with friends to [inaudible] out. But I can, being the "vampiric" organization that is, will have my attention despite the fact that I will actually be away supposedly on vacation at what I can only describe as a somewhat unattractive hour of the day.

We'll make sure that the February dates are also added in the notes when they go out from this meeting. I do apologize for not having them listed on the agenda already.

I'm going to call now for Any Other Business. Christopher, you have your hand up. Was that a little something else? I think that's something else. If it's not, just jump in. Any Other Business? Not hearing any, that's good because we're running out of time for that.

I believe that looking at the notes the action items on our follow up from today's call have been properly captured, and we will work with co-chairs mainly via Thomas obviously to reach out re: RRSAC input. We know we'll be getting ALAC input. We'll just have to hold the seat of the leadership of the ALAC to the fire shortly if they don't get it to us in timely [inaudible]. We'll look to Thomas Rickert also to see who else we can shake out of the GNSO cluster of sub-entities to get any direct responses to our survey as well as individuals to join us in our activities in our drafting Sub-Team #1 for this data capture and analysis work.

EN

With that, at a minute past the top of the hour – I apologize for that intrusion into your time – I want to thank each and every one of you for your time and input to our work and joining our call today and declare this meeting to be completed.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]