CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. Thank you very much.

This is the, I believe, 17th meeting of our Work Stream 2 SO/AC Accountability Sub-group Meeting, and it's being held on the 19th of January at 05:00 UTC. If you are only on the phone and not in the Adobe Connect, if you'd be so kind as to let us know now.

Not hearing anybody indicate that, we'll be taking our roll call from the Adobe Connect listings today.

With that, I'm going to ask, is there anyone who needs to update their Statement of Interest?

Not hearing anyone indicate that, I'm going to get the call started proper now. Just before we do, if I can remind you all to speak slowly and clearly and identify yourselves before you do start speaking, with your name to help in our records that would be greatly appreciated. We're not inundated with people here today. It's a fairly small turnout which is disappointing, but these things happen and hopefully a few more people may turn up as we continue through our call.

With that, the agenda is in front of you. It's a fairly similar agenda to last weeks' call, although we will spend our time in the main looking at and discussing the methodology that's likely to be proposed and used by our Drafting Team 1, which is looking at the capture of the data from the data points coming in from the responses from the SOs and ACs from our survey.

With that, the first thing we'll be doing is covering of any of the action items that were from last week's meeting. Primarily, last week's meeting action items were upon the group as a whole to see if we could shake some more volunteers into joining the Drafting Teams, and in particular, Drafting Team 1. I'm unaware of any new people who've joined that, but perhaps some [of us have become] more active I'll find out when Farzaneh brings us up to date with Steve in just a moment on that.

I just want to note is there any apologies that have gone to the list, if staff would be so kind as to collect apologies from the list for today's call, that would be great.

I just want to mention that it's a very important thing that if we are to finish on time and get our work progressing as fast as we need to before Copenhagen and beyond, we will indeed need to ask a lot more of our Drafting Teams. And today, I'm perfectly happy to spend the bulk of today's call for Drafting Team 1 to progress forward further with our group as a whole, but also to see if we can encourage some additional volunteers in engagement if at all possible.

The other action item that was from last week's call was one predominately for us to reach out and, in particular via Thomas, to see if we can encourage more of the responses to come in from people who've indicated that they would be doing so from the cohort predominately within the GNSO that we're expecting some feedback from.

We've been told that we're very close, just waiting for a few sign-offs on some additional responses to the survey coming in, and in this last week we have also received and noted the input from the Intellectual Property Constituency, so that's excellent. So, we do need to encourage any others that are going to be putting in any of the survey results to do so as soon as possible.

One of the things I wanted to discuss in today's call is, if indeed, we need to have a specific cut-off date or not – we may go either way – with the continuing addition of data for our data capture exercise.

With that, I'd now like to see whether there was any particular Sub-team activity since our last call. I'd probably ask that we see if there's any activity on general drafting first. To that I'll turn to Steve because once I turn to Farzaneh and the work being done for Drafting Team 1 on data capture, we may as well roll straight into our review and discussion on the main work that is I know being done already by, in particular, Farzie about the other group and move into our next agenda item.

Steve, over to you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I would honestly say that there has been no changes to the current state of the general draft report. I guess I'd prefer to move to Track 1 and, as you said, the next item on the agenda unless Farzie take us in to the same thing we were talking about on our previous call, which is how do we analyze the responses that have come in? If that's okay with you, let's just move to that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's more than okay. And, apparently, I'm taking far too long covering the first three items of the agenda. I do apologize, Kavouss, if you feel we're not valuing the time of you or any other participant. I would have thought, having in fairly short order and certainly without being other than to our timing for each of our agenda items as published, already being on the third point in the substantive discussion for today's call, that we were progressing perfectly well. I assure you there is no indication from any of your co-Chairs that we other than respect and value everybody's time and everybody's input.

With that, Farzaneh, over to you.

FARZANEH BADII: I'm sorry to have missed last week's call. I'm just going to bring up the method that we are going to use for data capture of the responses to the questionnaire. What I suggested before, and I provided a sample of the work, was not to go specifically through each question and capture based on constituency in SO and AC, but categorize these responses.

The categories that I came up with was first, whether the designating commenting in SO and AC did, and if they go beyond the ICANN Bylaws. The second is the rule making mechanism; so, what sort of operational documents do they have? And the three is [unit] accountable to mechanisms that they have that is unique to their SO and AC. And the convergence of the mechanisms and answers, and the divergence.

I came up with this method because I thought that, perhaps, we don't want to go to a compare and contrast exercise of the constituencies and Advisory Committees because they are, as we all said and emphasized, they are different in nature. One mechanism might fit this SO well while it might not fit the others.

The other reason that – sorry if I'm going too long; just cut me off [inaudible] if you think I'm talking too much.

But the other thing that I came up with this method is not to call out on the SO and AC and have a general feeling of what sort of transparency mechanisms are out there – there are SOs and ACs in general that are lacking some sort of accountability mechanism – and then draft a work plan based on that. This was my initial idea to come up with it like that.

Kavouss, in response to your question, no we have not received responses from everyone. That was another point. I'm glad you're bringing that up because if we want to compare and contrast these SOs and ACs, what if we don't get some responses from some stakeholder groups and constituencies? Are we not going to come up with work plan specific to them?

I think a general approach and a very fast – only recommendation suggestions for the work plan would be desirable in my opinion. I would like to know what the group thinks because we have to come up with a method and then analyze all the responses, and we really don't have time.

We are also trying to find volunteers and we have a couple of volunteers, but we really have to finalize the method and then just go

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Farzie, apparently Kavouss would like more details on the specifics about the type of reply from the chat. He says, "From those who have replied, did they reply to the substance of the questions or merely reply in very general manner?" And of course, the document that does link to all of the replies received as well, I believe. But perhaps you could address that question.

And while I have the microphone, ALAC, I believe, as one of the particular Advisory Committees that is yet to make the final effort to hand their homework in – I live in hope – is still outstanding, but we believe it is pending. But we do have them in from the ASO, the GNSO, the ccNSO, the SSAC, and the RSSAC. We are also getting them in from various component parts of the GNSO – so far the BC, the NCUC. The IPC has recently come in or about to come in, and [we will] follow-up from NPOC as well. I think it's a more than reasonable sample.

Back to you, Farzie.

FARZANEH BADII: Steve's hand is up. I'm just going to quickly go over Kavouss' question. Kavouss, yes. Some of the responses that we got go to specific details on how they do things and reply in very long answers on various functions and all that, and accountability mechanisms. Some of the

replies are more general and directing us to their documents that they have.

As to your…I don't have a list of ("May you pls who replied and who has not replied"). I don't have the list of all of the people who have replied. I'm sure I listed them last week where we have received, I think, one other – I believe we have received these two additional. And then I'm just going to go down and [leave] the mic.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Farzie, as you're listing those, I did want to note that only two Sub-groups, I guess in GNSO, had not, I think, even indicated to Thomas that they were preparing an answer. And that was the two contract parties – the registries and registrars. This is assuming that we'll continue to see the responses that were promised.

And I wanted to mention that when Brenda Brewer has pasted a link to the community page, I believe that Brenda's link contains more than the Google doc folder that Farzie kindly created earlier. So, the link itself includes more answers than the six that are arrayed in your line-up.

Kavouss, frankly, what Farzie is attempting to do – let me try to be a tiny bit more direct with you. The task is very difficult to answer your question of did they respond as expected. We asked four specific questions, and each of them gave responses at varying degrees of detail to our four questions. The only real way to answer your question is to simply read those documents. I don't believe that it's easy to characterize, "some did, some didn't." There's different degrees involved, so it's much better to just read it.

And while I have the mic, I wanted to deal with Farzie's question.

Kavouss, I believe that would be something that I'm sure that Brenda could help us with, is to put both pdf and doc. If you go to the link that Brenda has put in there, there is a pdf for each and every one. So, if you click on the link from Brenda, you'll see both a doc file and a pdf with everything in there.

Back to Farzie's question about how do we analyze the responses we have? Farzie, on the last call we brought up the document that you had drafted with examples, and the four ways in which your example looked at the responses was listed in the document – the designated community and whether they go on the Bylaws', rule-making mechanisms, what's unique about their accountability, a convergence of their mechanisms, and a divergence. There was no criticism of that as an appropriate approach.

But what we pointed out on the last call is that the Bylaws require from us that we review and develop recommendations. So, we have to review and develop recommendations. And it would strike me that that could be rather specific if, in fact, we review and develop recommendations. And in the recommendations, the Bylaws themselves say that what we look at for each SO and AC, including, but not limited to, accountability, improving the process for accountability, for transparency and for participation, that are helpful to prevent capture.

So, the questions that we sent out to the ACs and SOs particularly brought up accountability, transparency, and participation. And so, we

endeavored to invite the SOs and ACs to tell us about those aspects. The four questions that you initially designed don't shine any particular light on participation – like recruiting and eligibility of members. And it doesn't specifically mention the word "transparency."

I think on the last call there was a general realization that perhaps the four general topics of questions – the five that you have – may not get us the specifics we will need to do a review of all of these groups with respect to how they deal with transparency, accountability, participation. And since the Bylaws indicate that that is the plan, we felt that was appropriate to discuss on the next call.

At the end of the last call, I took on to insert into the working document – the one that's displayed in Adobe – to insert the Bylaws that guide what we're supposed to do on this particular track. That's at the top of page one. And then right underneath that, I just repeated the four questions that we put to the SOs and ACs.

With that having been said, I don't really know the right work plan to get this done. But I do know what the expectation of us is – that's the Bylaws on page one – and I do know that the questions that we asked were designed to get specifics on things like transparency and participation.

And if the end result of what we do is to review what all the SOs and ACs do and to develop recommendations about how they improve those processes, that strikes me as rather specific. So, let's debate that, Farzie, because it strikes me that it's more specific than just a general

review. We are supposed to develop recommendations on improving their processes. Thank you.

Farzie, you're asking in the chat, what if some don't provide answers? But then we'll just simply skip them. I agree with you. There's no need for us to get into that. If they didn't provide answers, we did what we could.

But I don't believe we're going to be short. We're going to have all of the ACs and SOs and several of the sub-groups inside of GNSO. The participation's been outstanding.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Farzie, back to you, I think, because it's important that we do discuss this methodology further. Remember, ladies and gentlemen, please feel free to put your hand up and make interventions and suggestions. This is meant to be a development opportunity and a discussion of the methodology, not just a limited dialog between a couple of our co-Chairs.

Farzie. And then if you wouldn't mind recognizing Greg when you've made your intervention, Farzie. Go ahead.

FARZANEH BADII: Thanks, Cheryl. I was not sure that our actual mandate to come up with working plan for enhancing accountability to each SO and AC. That is a very… We have to work hard on that. If we have to extract everything and attribute it to each SO and AC and then we have to categorize it [and we've got to grade them], it's going to be complicated.

Now, I can see that Kavouss is mentioning that if there is any further clarification – that we have to ask for clarification if we don't understand the answers, which would delay our progress. But I don't know if we have the means to do this. Also, if that is the case and we want to provide a recommendation or work plan for each SO and AC, I recommend that a lot of people join the Drafting Team 1 because it's impossible otherwise.

Okay, Greg.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, please, Greg. We can't hear you if you're speaking.

GREG SHATAN: Sorry. I was falling asleep. No, absolutely not.

I guess one question here, one point, in terms of just how we deal with the answers that we receive, I follow the same thinking as Kavouss, to put this all into some big spreadsheet either simply by answer or, if we want to be a little bit more careful, we can try to match the answer types a little bit more closely.

As to what we provide as an output, it seems to me that rather than providing customized responses for each SO and AC and SG and C, that something more along the lines of a Best Practice sharing type of document noting trends and, perhaps, providing overall advice. I think that each organization's procedures should not be identical. The organizations are not identical. And I think it's up to each organization in

its own way and using its own means to look at this and operationalize it or interpret it. So, I think that's, to my mind, what we should do.

And I think it… [Thinking along here], giving personal comments back, I think it just opens up a whole – not so much personal, but tailored comments for each group really involves a whole lot of… It opened up a can of worms. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I don't think we can compare across the board. The groups are overall – certainly at the AC/SO level – the groups are almost unique in that they each have their own structure and their own class or sort of constituency – and I use that term very generally. So, I really don't think there's going to be a lot of similarity between many of these.

Certainly, within the GNSO, you're going to find more similarity than in the other units because most of the groups within the GNSO represent a class of entities of which some subset or part are active and some are not. One can look at those with more commonality between them. The Registrar Stakeholder group represents registrars and some of them are members. The same could be said for registries. The same could be said for IP – Intellectual Property – lawyers or ISPs.

There's going to be a lot of similarity there and you might be able to put them into a spreadsheet or something, but I don't think, across the AC

and SO's, we're going to have nearly as much uniformity as that. I think all we're going to be able to do is essentially present what they have given to us, perhaps in a summary form, so one can read it and not have to go through dozens of pages. But I'm not sure we can do a lot more. And I'm not sure that we really want to be in the business of assessing whether they're doing a good job or not.

That being said, I have a question. In the ones that we've received so far – and I ask this question as I'm in the process of drafting the ALAC response – to what extent are people self-assessing themselves and giving a candid review of to what extent they are accountable, to what extent they have to make changes, or that kind of thing? Are we getting any of that or are we just listing facts?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Farzie or Steve, if you want to respond to Alan's question before we move to Kavouss, please?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Cheryl, I put into the chat that I'm not being an advocate. I'm simply being accurate as to what the Bylaws – approved by ICANN and all of us – the Bylaws say. The Bylaws charged us to review *and* to develop recommendations. And the recommendations are how to improve processes.

So, I don't see any need to make a giant wall chart and simply paste the responses that came back. They're not actually easier to read that way. The only way that made things become easier to review or digest is to

summarize, and Farzie did quite a bit of good work at summarizing some of the responses that came back in the two-page draft that we discussed last week.

But it will not meet our charter if all we do is review them. Our charter says to develop recommendations to improve the processes for accountability, transparency, and participation; and that, by nature, has to be specific. We can't just say, "Improve the processes across the board."

I believe we'd have to suggest, "Improve the processes in GNSO because there's an inadequate amount of transparency," or "it's relatively less transparency than the other groups."

I don't think we have to do detailed work plans on each and every AC and SO and subgroup to tell them how they would need to improve processes. Leave that to them to do so. But if our review stops short at simply summarizing, then we wouldn't have met what the Bylaws asked for.

It might just be too much work to meet what the Bylaws say, and this group could conclude, "Sorry, we just can't get it done." And that's fine if that's what we conclude.

I'm simply trying to be accurate to what the Bylaws and the charter for this group set forth for us to do, and review is only half of the job.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that, Steve. Alan, your hand for [inaudible] before we move to Kavouss?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I wasn't going to reply. I did ask a question, though, and I didn't get an answer to that. And maybe no one has reviewed them enough to answer that, but I thought I heard that Farzie has in fact looked at them in some detail. And I'm just wondering to what extent there is a candid self-analysis of how well people are doing or not.

I know, certainly from the [inaudible] At-Large, we are doing that. We're in the process of that and the report will say so.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alan, that would be helpful, since none of the other groups – I have not seen that kind of self-examination or suggestion for improvement from the other responses.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, let's put a pin in that. Farzie, are you going to be answering Alan's question directly?

FARZANEH BADII: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Great. Okay, let's get that over and done with, and then we'll move to Kavouss. Over to you, Farzie.

FARZANEH BADII: Okay. Sometimes in some of the responses they say that, "We are reviewing our Bylaws," or "We have reviewed our Bylaws and we have reviewed it to provide for this shortcoming or that shortcoming," like that.

But because our questions are really like we are asking them, "Do you have such and such mechanism?" These are positive questions, so they give us positive responses. They say, "Yes, we do have." We didn't ask them, "Do you think you have shortcomings?" [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: [laughing] Okay. Perhaps some of us are more candid than others.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [laughing] Thank you, Alan. Perhaps that is the case.

Just as we move to Kavouss, I just want to point out that we have some excellent commentary going on in the chat and we do need to make sure we are all also reading that. But it does appear that we are honing in on the fact that we are, at this point, still in the review – the data capture and analysis of those data points part of the operation. But most of us are honing in on preference, if not [unresigned] probability that we stick to relatively high level recommendation documentation.

Kavouss, over to you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, thank you. That was a helpful [external view] or helpful discussion, but still, we need to work out how to take it from here. First, whether we wait until we receive the answer from those who have not replied; and second, to see whether the recommendation would be on each question or the substance of each question, or it would be other way around. How many recommendations would have.

And then, I have difficulty with some colleagues' way that propose that we do not go to the detail of the reply and just take what they have said. Because if we put reply from one AC with the replies of the other, put them together, [that may either] overlapping or maybe inconsistency, maybe noncoherent. So, there is a need to do something, to try to find something which fits the definition of recommendations. At the end, it goes to the CCWG and to the public, or ICANN later on and so on.

So, I think there are two ways to do that. Either the Co-Chairs try to talk to each other to see what way they propose further on to review the situation, or they open an e-mail discussion asking further questions, because this call may not be sufficient to do that.

But there are many things, and perhaps also to understand how this questionnaire has been replied. I know how it has been replied in the GAC. In the GAC, the secretary of the GAC – or the secretariat of the GAC – prepares a reply. Put it to the comments of all GAC. No comments at all.

So, what you're discussing is the views of the secretariat of GAC on the accountability. Is it what we're expecting? I don't know what happened in the other constituencies or other SO/AC.

So, we need to hear from those how the questionnaire were replied, how it was sent, and how it was collected and so on and so forth.

So, these are the things you have to know, otherwise [it would be a] recommendation which may not look like a recommendation and may be difficult to implement. So, there is a need to do some work, some homework, how to proceed and how to do with those who have not replied. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Kavouss. I'm going to have to ask you a question in reply to your intervention, particularly to your last point. And obviously, we need to recognize that, yes, there is a great deal of work to do and we had, in fact, decided to go through a drafting team process – a subteam process – to better facilitate that work because we, at no point, expected it to be done only on weekly calls.

But if there were discovery on our getting back to everybody, as you proposed, and we asked how was it or who was it that filled in the survey questions and we tried to compare and contrast whether some were filled in by secretary and subject to – if not endorsement, some sort of commentary, which seems to be what you described happened in the GAC – and another group went through a demonstrably more bottom-up process, and another group went through some third,

fourth, or fifth style of response, what difference does that make if the answers are true and accurate?

Just interested to know what additional information of who held the pen and, indeed, even how it was signed off upon. It would be important if it was not signed off upon, but surely, the how of such responses were signed off upon are subject to the local requirements of the entity.

So, just help me understand what we would be gaining by that additional question. Not suggesting we don't do it; I just want to know why we're doing it.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I am not suggesting that you ask additional question. I am suggesting that once we read the reply and you want to put the reply together from all SO and AC to establish the skeleton of a possible recommendation, should we face something that requires clarification, we need to get that clarification.

Either we could forget something which isn't compatible, which may not be right, or we need clarification to really understand. And I fully agree with the [inaudible] recommendations [will be at a] very high level and does not go into the detail, so we are not going to put all those things.

So, [inaudible] I think there might be some time that we need to look at all replies to one question, and if you found some inconsistencies and so on, we have to try to remove that in order to have a recommendation which is readable, understandable, and implementable.

That is just what I said: that I am suggesting that you, current Co-Chairs or whatever you prefer, still continue to discuss the way how to proceed. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Thanks, Kavouss. Would any of the people who have been putting comments into chat like to use the audio opportunity and have their comments into the audio record as well? Because there are some excellent interactions going on.

Steve, your hand is up, go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Do you have to be objecting?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm just asking if there's anyone who's been using chat, whether they'd like to take the opportunity to put their hand up and make an audio intervention, but I noticed Steve's hand up, and now I'm going to Steve. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Cheryl. Farzie's original set of analyses was to look at unique mechanisms and convergence. Unique and convergence. Convergence would be places where many groups were in common. And then divergence.

So, that is an analytical way to approach it, but it stops short of the judgment call to suggest– Well, take a look at how the BC recruits new members from parts of the world that aren't currently participating. That looks to us like a best practice. They're collecting member dues, they're spending money on outreach events.

And I'm just making this up as an example, please. It's just an example. That starts to move towards the subjective judgment to say, "Wow, I think we've identified here what the BC is doing is a best practice."

Then we can, in the recommendations, simply recommend that groups who don't meet that best practice consider, in their own way, improving their processes to converge with the best practice. Of course, everyone is agreeing we would never delineate the specifics of how, for instance, ccNSO would then implement outreach efforts. We would never do that.

It's about doing the work together, the information. And then to highlight and describe the best practice in the areas of transparency, accountability, participation. And we did capture quite a bit on a subtopic of accountability called the ability to challenge the leadership of your AC and SO if an election or a decision didn't meet with a particular member's view of appropriate processes.

So, categorizing stops short of identifying what is the best practice. So, our subgroup would have to do additional judgment work to come up with a best practice. And it could be that the best practice at a given area like outreach or participation could be a combination of something

we observed from the BC and something we observed from the GAC and put that together as a best practice.

And in that instance, maybe not anyone is meeting it today. I think this could avoid the awkward part of comparing, say, GNSO and cNSO and suggesting that one is better than the other. We're going to have to, whenever possible, avoid making direct comparisons of one to another because, as you've said – Kavouss and others – they are very different, these groups.

We have different structures, different target communities served, and they can't all be the same as a result of an exercise like this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that, Steve, and of course, underlining what you've got in bold text on page 1 of what's on the screen, which is the new header section which gives the mandate direct from the Bylaws. And of course, these improved processes for accountability, transparency, and participation are the ones that redeem, that are helpful to prevent capture.

So, with our mandate firmly in mind, I'm relatively confident we can find a pathway forward. Kavouss, back to you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I agree with Steve that going in the direction of the high level he just described, the convergence among all SO/AC, and also when necessary – or if necessary – talk about the departure or divergence [inaudible]

However, I suggest that before [inaudible] the whole job, we do start with one – I call them pilot question answering. That means we take answers from all SO/AC with respect to one question, and to see how we could implement it in the way that Steve described.

And then come back to that draft to the meeting, one of the meetings, and to see whether that course of action is sufficient before going to the others. It would be helpful because that would make a trial and error effort, and would correct us how we should proceed.

Otherwise, if we start to all question and try to make, we may need to redo the job, which is too much. So, it is better just to take, just by chance, a random one question and reply from all SO/ACs, and [inaudible] what would be the possible compilation of those in the line that Steve described. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that, Kavouss. With that proposal in mind, I'm going to ask Alan directly, perhaps a less random approach, if the drafting team wants to go down the pathway that Kavouss just suggested, and that would mean us perhaps committing ourselves to another call – may as well be the next one, if possible – to look at a particular question in that way.

Is it possible for the ALAC response on even one question to be in our hands by then so it can be part of the review, or should we put off any consideration of Kavouss' proposal until the ALAC has its complete response in? Do I sound weary on this, Alan? Yes, that's deliberate.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, you do.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Good. I'm meaning to, my dear.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will not guarantee that it will be an answer that has been fully approved by the ALAC. You will have something, if nothing else.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So, that could be –

ALAN GREENBERG: You may have the whole thing that has not been approved by the ALAC, but it's not likely to change completely.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think at this stage, Alan, we would appreciate even a draft that is still under time of signoff.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then, barring major illness, you will have it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Well, stay healthy, please. That would be very useful on a number of levels, and certainly for our work as well.

Just noting that delightfully, Greg apparently thinks that I can be bullied by song lyrics, but not sure at my age I would classify as a young girl. But, thank you for the effort.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's all relative, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right, that is true. Can I ask Farzie and Steve then to respond to the proposal that Kavouss made about doing an exercise? Perhaps I've embellished it a bit by suggesting it being exercised on one of our calls, or discussed on one of our call – probably the next one – for a single question, be it a randomly selected one or not. I'm being met with deathly silence.

FARZANEH BADII: [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, there we are. Farzie, seriously, don't leave me hanging like that. Over to you, Farzie.

FARZANEH BADII: Sorry, Steve. Did you want to intervene? Because I was actually going to ask Cheryl again what Kavouss' proposal was. Sorry. It's late here and I've been up since a long time ago.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. If I can paraphrase Kavouss to some extent, Farzie, as I understood it, he was suggesting that a linear approach was taken to a single question, randomly selected or otherwise – he was saying randomly selected; I said I didn't particularly care – where we go through the response from every AC and SO and, obviously the component parts of the GNSO, to a single question and we do an analysis of that in greater detail.

That, I believe, is what Kavouss was suggesting. And if he could let us know in chat if I have the [inaudible] there. Steve, you've got your hand up. Do you want to react?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Cheryl. I've put into the chat that if we took on the linear approach, I would recommend we pick the easiest of the attributes we are to review for best practices, and that would be transparency.

I truly believe that accountability and participation are more complex, and transparency was a direct question. Transparency was part of our Bylaws charter, so it's one where we could analyze their responses on transparency and try to come up in a linear fashion with the best practice we can observe.

It doesn't have to be just one group who does it the best. It might well be that it's a combination of attributes in different answers that we received, and then we could describe what is a best practice. And if we're ambitious, even suggest that we would recommend that some groups move towards the best practice because our review indicates that their transparency diverges from that best practice by a significant margin. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Farzie?

FARZANEH BADII: Thank you, Cheryl. This is a very good suggestion, but unfortunately, in order to implement it we might face challenges because when I was looking at the answers, some of the answers, as I said, are very detailed, and sometimes they are not really responding exactly to the specific question.

But extracting these responses and kind of interpreting them might lead us to kind of interpretation of the text of the response, which I don't think is a good idea. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Kavouss also notes that the easiest question – this exercise that the easiest question may not represent the validity of the methodology in terms of how applicable it would be to a more difficult question.

But, I guess that's something we can still explore. So, I have the two primaries in the drafting team taking two entirely different views in response to this. I'm going to have to get a tie breaker in here shortly.

Kavouss, over to you again.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I agree with Farzaneh that some of the answers are so general, when I look into the GAC reply, that it may be difficult to get something out of it to fit in a recommendation. Nevertheless, it would be quite – I would say, [inaudible] that we make an interpretation by one or two persons.

I have no problem if you could guess what or how we understand. But that understanding should be shared with the whole group, your group, to be sure that the understanding of the person is correct, but not directly understanding of Kavouss from the answers put in a recommendation, goes to the CCWG and so on and so forth. That would not be good.

So, perhaps we should be careful about these general answers. I'm sure that many SO and AC have provided general answers, because it's more easy. You provide general answer, we [inaudible] saint. If you go to the details, devils are in the details. So, that is always everywhere. It is a difficult task if Farzaneh, for instance, was to interpret that.

She may need to share her interpretation – or anybody else – with the others to see whether we have the same impression. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm not seeing the clearest pathway forward here, and I'm also very aware that we have a reluctantly small group on today for such an important discussion on methodology. So, with a couple of minutes towards the top of the call – and we do have a hard stop because I, for one, have another meeting starting in a moment or two – let me do two things.

Let me propose to you that we've had a number of important suggestions captured in the discussion today, so this has been quite a valuable exercise. We are continuing to have our plea for more volunteers to step up and be involved in this drafting team, but the likelihood of you doubling your number, Farzaneh, between now and next week's call, I suspect, is extraordinarily small.

So, let's see if we do these cutting our teeth exercises, as Greg describes Kavouss' suggestion, to a single question at next week's call. So, we'll involve a committee of the whole on it, which will enforce us to explore our methodologies further.

To that end, with our next meeting being on the 26th of January at 13:00 UTC, and you'll note in the agenda the following and future meeting dates are scheduled for your edification – that we ask the existing volunteers in the drafting team number one to grab a question – it may very well be transparency – get back to us on which question it is, and lay whatever groundwork they need to do for us to do this exercise with our committee who never turns up. Hopefully, more people than today on our next call.

So, if you are in agreement with that, please put up a green tick.

But before you do that, Kavouss would like to make another intervention. Go ahead, please, Kavouss. Go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Excuse me. Next meeting, the agenda items should be concentrated only on this methodology but nothing else. So, we have to concentrate on the methodology in order to have our way forward for the future. But not having so many so many items on the agenda. Thank you. If you agree.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Kavouss, with the exception of the administration which is mandatory, I think that is exactly what I suggested we do. So, we will have to do the admin because we have to do the admin, and all that means is we won't do updates before we get into this discussion as proposed.

So, with that, I'm going to do something that I feel is mandatory, which is thank you all at the top of the hour for your attention and for attending today's call. Thank the staff for their assistance, and thank, in advance the drafting team volunteers who are going to do an interesting picking a line question out of the hat and getting back to us for a dedicated call on our cutting of the teeth exercise.

Okay, ladies and gentlemen, thank you one and all, and this call is now terminated. Bye for now.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Bye.

EN

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]