EN

RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the SOAC accountability subgroup meeting, number 19 on the 2nd of February, 2017 at 19:00 hours UTC.

I'm Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I'm one of the co-rapporteurs. I'm joined today, already, by Steve DelBianco, Farzaneh may be able to join us, she has some work commitments. If she doesn't join us during the call, we will note her as an apology.

Are there anyone else's apologies that need to be noted at this time?

[Inaudible] sent to the list, staff will [inaudible]. I would like to ask now if there is anyone who is only on the audio channel and not in the Adobe Connect room?

Not hearing anybody identify themselves at this time, we will take our roll call from the Adobe Connect room, and staff, would you pursue anonymous to find out whether they have a second name to add to that very interesting description?

The other thing that I need to do in terms of administrative, which yes, we are clicking, to a minimum, is ask if anyone needs to make an update to their statement of interest? And to remind you all that all members and participants are required to lodge a statement of interest. If you have difficulty doing so, staff can assist you.

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.

Not hearing anybody, suggest they have an update on our call for any comments on what is a particularly lean agenda. Now, we're doing single topic discussions. Is there anyone who wishes to bring up any other business in advance now? So we know to put in time for the agenda.

I will ask at the end of the call as well for any other business.

Again, not hearing anybody [inaudible]. That's pretty much it for call administration, other than the fact that I would request that you identify yourself when you speak to make an intervention, and that you make sure you speak, perhaps articulately, but I was trying to say, slowly and clearly.

Some other hybrid word started to come out, I apologize for that. At this point, I'm going to move on to noting that all of the action items and notes, from our last call held on the 26th of January, can be found on the link in the agenda, the only action item of note from that was for us to encourage more people to join the drafting team, number one, and to continue the commentary into the work of that drafting team, as well as the master reporting document, and weeks go by.

And we certainly need to thank Farzaneh for a considerable amount of work that she's done on documents that we'll be discussing under agenda item three, and that she has sent to the list, I think, about two days ago in her time zone.

Moving onto agenda item number two, any updates? If anyone has any updates from any of the activities in the few days that has passed

between one meeting and the other, now is the time to bring them forward. Obviously, things that are on the agenda.

Not seeing any of those, I'm going to jump at what must be a record time of under five minutes, into our primary discussion, which means we all have plenty of time to look at the topic for today's analysis from our data [inaudible] exercise. And today's topic is outreach as an activity, as an aspect of participation.

I want to thank everybody has contributed to [inaudible], I want to note, in particular, the work that our co-rapporteur has done, and I want to hand over [inaudible] I'd like to hand over predominantly now to Steve. I help you handle the queue Steve, but you've got your hand up, you've got the microphone, and it's over to you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks Cheryl. It's Steve DelBianco, and Cheryl, I only need a few minutes to tell folks about the edits I made to the transparency part of our capture document, due to suggestions that came in, and the submission responses that came in since our last call.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Perfect, Steve. It's Cheryl for the record. If you just want to run the update, which I obviously wasn't paying enough attention to the list, as I should have got [inaudible] so I finished off item two, and then roll into item three. Thanks Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:	Thanks Cheryl. The document is in front of you, in the Adobe Connect. You'll see under ALAC, thanks to the efforts of Alan Greenberg, who has got a lot on his plate right now, we've got a very detailed response from ALAC. And Alan could benefit from looking at the way we were analyzing the other ACs and SOs, and he was able to target his…
	And then Alan did the favor also, of addressing the risk of capture, internal capture. Kavouss, that's the kind that we're talking about. And you can see the two paragraphs in here, where Alan covered captured explicitly. And I appreciate that Alan did that. We did not get similar explicit discussions from the other groups, and I understand why.
	It's not as if we called it out to say please include how you address capture. Instead, we just repeated what the bylaws had required. As you know, our bylaw we're working under, said we were supposed to review and develop recommendations for accountability, transparency, and participation, that are helpful to prevent capture. Okay.
	So, I appreciate that from the ALAC. If there are errors in how I have summarized the ALAC response, I'm sure that ALAC members will let me know. And then scrolling down in the document, if you do, in this section, GNSO non-commercial stakeholders group, in the middle of page three.
	And let me thank Avri Doria for preparing and submitting that to the non-commercial stakeholders group. And Avri, I pasted in each of the links to things like the minutes, members, and executive committee, [inaudible]. And pretty much the most transparent of any groups, other

than I'm unclear as to whether all of NCSG meetings are open to non-NCSG members.

Other than that, I have to say, Avri, that everything is published and open. Every email list, it looks to be, NCSG is a paramount of transparency, but Avri, if you could clarify, what is the…? Okay, thank you [inaudible], something that has captured. But what is the status of meetings at the NCSG? Open to all or just members?

AVRI DORIA: This is Avri speaking. I think for the most part, meetings are not open. Certainly the ones held at the face to face meetings are all open, all calls are not necessarily open, but nobody polices them.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks Avri. I'll add that to the…

AVRI DORIA: Yeah. So in other words, if I can clarify. So that means that we announce the meetings on our open public list, and while the meeting is for members, no one goes around saying, are you a member, to those participating.

STEVE DELBIANCO: When you declare them on this list, Avri, and this will come up, and you scroll down to the recommendations part, but when you declare them on the list, do you declare at the time to say this is a meeting that is for

NCSG members only? Or do you make any declaration at all on open versus closed?

AVRI DORIA: While I don't think we have a fully prescribed way in which all the meetings are announced, it changes with every, you know, policy committee chair, with every executive committee chair, with every NCSG chair. I don't remember, I'd have to go back and look, but I don't remember seeing that line.

You know, but I have to go back and check.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah, this is so on point, because in the recommendations, we may end up saying that it will be a best practice to indicate that meeting is open to all or open to members, and then whether a particular regime permits it, as you say, ends up being a matter of discretion. And I'm saying that as a matter of policy, I fully understand that meetings where we're doing elections, or debating our position on a public comment, are completely and appropriately open only to members of the BC.

So, not attempting in any way to suggest everything should be open, but we try to pick up a best practice. On last week's call, and you see it as the fourth bullet, which was, and this is the fourth bullet under draft recommendations, which says that all meetings should be declared, as either open or closed, giving specific reasons for holding a closed meeting, and then we went on, I already had this on last week, which

was during each ICANN meeting, at least one SO AC meeting, face to face as you call it, should be open to public observation.

So, we can debate the merits of these recommendations, but Avri, before I move on, did I capture accurately, so far at least, accurately at what NCSG sent in?

Okay. I'll take that as a yes.

AVRI DORIA: Sorry, I had to find the mute button. Yes.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks Avri. And Kavouss, I know your hand is up, but let me try to show you some respected appreciation, because last week, you wanted to be sure that the notion of these independent reviews could be clarified to say that the independent reviews are conducted by outside consultants.

So Kavouss, in the middle of page four, I added, note that these are required to be independent reviews. This is from the bylaws. That are usually conducted by outside consultants, hired by ICANN. So, I hope that helps you out, Kavouss, with that clarification. And then, please everyone, just scroll to the recommendations for transparency, which I just covered the one with respect to open and closed meetings.

And then a little bit of [inaudible] on that, starting with Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I have another point that I wish to wait until you finish this one. I have a point about the openness or disclosure. I heard that we said that [inaudible], some constituency, face to face meeting is open. [CROSSTALK]

STEVE DELBIANCO: No, that's not what I said, though.

KAVOURSS ARASTEH: No one said that?

STEVE DELBIANCO: I'm sorry, Kavouss. I said that when… One of the best practices… If you look at eh fourth bullet, I'd be interested to see your ideas on the fourth bullet. It says, quote, this is a draft, Kavouss, during each ICANN meeting, at least one SO AC meeting should be open to public observation. And that's the recommendation. I would like to hear your views on that.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I thought…

STEVE DELBIANCO: It's certainly true of the GAC.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: [Inaudible] the GAC what?

STEVE DELBIANCO: I said it's certainly true of the GAC. Many of your meetings are open to public observation.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: All of them are open now. [Inaudible] with that?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. They haven't been telling you about that? I'm just kidding, I'm just kidding. I'm just joking. No, you're right. The GAC is very open to public observation. That's just my American sense of humor, Kavouss. I'm just kidding.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: My point was in the same context. We are dealing in the GAC with that [inaudible]. And on that, I received a message that somebody from the [inaudible] has asked for the document, and in the email sent to everybody, said that this document of highly confidential. I don't understand the high confidentiality of that, and in the email, the chair of the GAC asked permission to release or disclose highly confidential document to the party of that [inaudible] that they want.

Otherwise, they said that the GAC advice that was given… So I want to know that anyone else, or whether there is a definition that [inaudible] highly confidential document. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:	Thank you Kavouss. When you look at the analysis of the openness of email list, I think that goes to the confidentiality. Every group publishes, for the public to see, whatever they arrive at as their final comment, final advice, or final letters. That the part that falls into potentially confidential, is the eternal email list, or the email archives as we're calling them.
	And as far as I can tell, all but one group have both closed and open archives, but as I indicated earlier, the NCSG, Avri Doria's group, looks as if the only email list they have is publicly archived. I note that the GAC's is not archived publicly, and that email list is where confidential discussion for debate about position, or advice, are contained, and they're often email lists where there are attachments that represent interim drafts of positions.
	And so, Kavouss, you ask a good question, like, what are the others doing? And there is a mix of answers to that. But keep in mind that we have a two-step process in this analysis. The first step was to describe what the ACs and SOs do based on the responses to our questions, and our own research.
	And then the second step is to recommend best practices for consideration by all of the ACs and SOs if they should wish to follow them. And that is what is on page four of the transparency, page four. There are six bullets here of things that we might recommend. And you'll note that we are not in this draft, we are not recommending that all internal emails and document drafts are publicly archived.
	We're not recommending that. Go on, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Kavouss, anything else to add or any other questions I can help with?

Okay, Cheryl, unless anyone else in the queue has comments on these six bullet recommendations on page four, they will have survived at least two readings within our own little SO AC accountability group. We determined we moved far enough along, we can put this aside, move on to the other topics, as we start to develop our report for the full [inaudible]. Thank you Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Steve. Cheryl for the record. And yeah, I think that's an absolutely excellent plan. We do have to move on now to hopefully about a half hour or so, discussion on the fresh topics [inaudible], which is outreach as a function of participation. But while I have the microphone, I do note that staff have told me that the person listed as anonymous is only on the phone line, so there is no way that they can contact them to assist them to identify themselves, they would be able to do so.

Is, of course, not a requirement that one is identifying one's self in these meetings, but it certainly is a courtesy for, if anonymous [inaudible] listening, and they do feel comfortable, it would be appreciated if they could, at some point during today's proceedings, identify themselves. If not, no great tragedy, just a courtesy that most of us tend to use in

these calls where many of us, as members, have done far more than identify ourselves, [inaudible] interest.

So that Steve, I think I'll allow you to take a full breath. That was a little breather for you. And I'm going ask if we can now load up the documents that Farzaneh had forwarded to the list, and we'll dive into the next topic. Yes, go ahead, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks Cheryl. That's the same document that's already in Adobe, because it included transparency. And there is a topic called participation, and one called outreach. And [Farzi?] was kind enough to follow this sort of approach of analyzing the responses and making recommendations. And it's under outreach, it begins on page five of the Google Doc.

And I want to thank [Farzi], I know she's not with us in the call today, but she did a great job summarizing all of that. This is an opportunity for those of us on the call that are part of each group to be sure that this, in summary, captures our activities on outreach. And someone is typing, and it might be helpful to mute your phone if you're typing on a loud keyboard, thank you.

I'll start us off by saying that if you scroll to the BC section, and that lives on page six, already has a pretty extensive discussion of outreach, and I was the one who prepared the BC's response, and I can tell you, it's something that we are keenly attentive to, and it's because the BC is, I think, underrepresented by many geographical regions around the world.

We have taken our money, our own dues money, and used a significant portion of it, and 10 to 15,000 dollars, 10 to 15,000 Euros a year of our dues money, to help to support events, outreach events, where we try to publicize the importance of participating at ICANN to the business community to the geographical regions, that aren't as represented as well in the BC.

The BC is very strong from Europe and from North America. Pretty strong in South America, but we are really trying to increase our outreach in Asia and Africa. We're very strong in Australia as well, but we are always spending our own money and time on outreach. And I'll note that the outreach that we believe is important, is geographical.

It isn't as if we asked for a particular demographic group, or linguistic, speakers of a language, instead, we want to be sure that we honor our target community, which is the business community, the business registrants and business users, and we believe that has a global reach because the internet is a global resource.

And that's why those are in there. Now, Kavouss, your hand is up, go right ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, I [inaudible] but one of the recommendations in some of the bullets, I have some amendments, that [inaudible] not or when it is not time to do that when you talk about SO and AC [inaudible] declared as [open or closed?]. I have some amendment for that, thank you.

EN

STEVE DELBIANCO: Kavouss, it's fine with me, if you want to ask everyone to scroll back up to transparency, that is on page four everyone. There are six bullets at the bottom. Kavouss, which of these bullets do you have a comment on?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: The bullet four, all SO AC meetings should be declared as either open or closed. I would suggest that all SO AC meetings should be normally be open, and then if it is closed, then continue to have [inaudible]. So, we should not say it would be normal, are you open or closed? The state should be normal open, this is the objective that should be open. I went to one of the meetings of GNSO, and they told me that please go out, this meeting is closed.

No reason was given. So, I would like that it should be normally be open, then normally that means we proceed, some exceptions, and we should continue that in case of closed meetings, reasons specifically be provided. This is a change of amendment that I propose, thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Kavouss. So on the fourth bullet, where it now reads, all SO AC meetings should be declared either open or closed, we would put a sentence in front of that to say that SO AC meetings should normally be open. Period.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And then the second goes on to say, all meetings should be declared as open or closed, giving specific reasons for holding a closed meeting. So, it's adding a new sentence in front of that one on four.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I have no objection to that. Thank you Kavouss. I'll ask, any objections or comments on making that our best practice? Check from Cheryl. Give everyone a moment to consider that. So, it's a little bit [normative?] in terms of a best practice. We're literally saying the best practice is everything is open, and another best practice is that if it's not open, we should declare it and explain why.

Thank you Kavouss. I'll make that edit as well. Thank you. So, let's scroll down to outreach. I just gave a brief explanation, I think, adding some color to what was done in the BC. And you'll note that I tried to distinguish geographical outreach from demographic, gender, age, or linguistic outreach, with the BC believes the most important thing we have is geographic coverage of the business community.

And the business community would obviously reflect, in a particular country, it would reflect the language used by the business community, and presumably reflect the demographics of that particular geographic business community. And I say this because the BC's revised charter is out for public comment until the 15th of February, and one commenter

suggested there was a lack of French speakers in the executive committee of the BC.

And so it caught me unaware as the BC makes no effort to try to deliberately recruit linguistic diversity, instead we make it about geographic outreach. Not diversity, but coverage. If you see the distinction, outreach can be something that's done, in order to achieve a diversity goal, or it could be to achieve our target community coverage.

That the BC thinks of it in a business like way, no surprise there, the dot target coverage. So, I've gone on long enough. I hope to hear from other folks on the call who participated at helping to develop their responses on outreach, and then we'll move on to the recommendations. Mark Carvell, I'll note in the chat, that you do outreach to the governments who don't yet belong to the GAC, and you do so at high level meetings, which is a great idea.

And Mark, since you mentioned that, let's take a look at [Farzi's] summary, and we'll see that she only has one bullet in there from the GAC. Would you like me to add your chat bullet under GAC? Mark.

MARK CARVELL: Yeah, thank you, Steve. Mark speaking. Hello everybody. Well yes, I think I would like that added if there is agreement. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I'm glad to do so. I'll post it in there. Thank you Mark. Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. [Inaudible] participation, and outreach, really we on the position to declare that we do every effort for participation for outreach or not?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Good question, Kavouss. We have made a distinction between participation and outreach. Outreach is what we're discussing now. Participation, the work hasn't been done yet. The work on participation has not been done, we're doing outreach right now. We're glad to have someone else from sub-team one assisting us in that.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Is it today or the other day?

STEVE DELBIANCO: We're doing outreach right now. We can't do participation until someone steps up, volunteers to do the work that [Farzi] and I did with respect to transparency and outreach. So, we won't have a discussion of participation until a volunteer on the subgroup does the work.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, that is a very important issue. Due to the events…

STEVE DELBIANCO: Of course it is. Of course it is important, but it is also important for people to join a working group [CROSSTALK]…

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Let me explain.   The importance is not generally important, the importance [inaudible] on this date.   There is some limitation or restriction for participation [of some persons, of some countries?]. This is not correct.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: This is [inaudible] problem, and cannot enter, that is not correct. So participation is participation. Freely participate, and also if there is any permission of participation, from particular governments, this is not also correct.   So, you have to have this [CROSSTALK] please take it [into account?]. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: We will. We'll have to be careful, since you're in the GAC, you're aware of this, we'll have to be careful to suggest that we're going to tell any country what it must do or not do with respect to Visas that it grants to people who visit that country for physical meeting. I myself have had to obtain visas for many countries that I travel to for ICANN meetings.

It's just a fact of life, and it's what a sovereign government may or may not do. All right. Any other comments so far on [Farsi's] work on analysis? Because if not, we'll move to [Farsi's] best practices, now on page eight. There are five bullets on page eight that [Farsi] has come up

with based on best practices to be gleaned from what the groups have been doing so far.

The first was to use newsletters or other communications and publicizing tools, two websites or Wiki pages to advertise outreach events. The challenge there is how to derive attention to someone's Wiki page if they're unaware of what ICANN do, or unaware of what the NCSG does. Outreach program committee, mentioning outreach in the bylaws, making it a foundational commitment of an AC or SO.

And an outreach strategy. And I would contrast that [Farsi's] five draft recommendations are at perhaps a less specific language that I used for transparency, or tried to make the transparency items a little bit more specific and actionable.

I'd love to see what members of this working group think, should we attempt to make the outreach recommendations a little bit more specific, or are they fine the way they are?

All right, Cheryl, seeing nothing, I'm guessing we can count this as a first reading….

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You have Greg now.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, Greg. Sorry, Greg.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. I think the recommendations we have reached sections, would probably be more robust. I think there is an assumption that there is a recommendation for, that outreach event should take place. It's a recommendation to advertise, but there is no actual recommendation to have them.

So, I suppose that a recommendation which should be added. Other than, it makes sense to flesh it out a little bit, you know, it's nothing wrong with these. I'm not sure [inaudible] necessarily best practices, but certainly having an outreach committee of some sort, an outreach strategy, I think are probably sensible, whether some sort of communication, but use whether per se, versus websites, versus blogs, other things that kind of get mixed in together.

So, I guess, you know, the question is whether we would want to also be more specific with types of outreach, with what the goal of outreach are, as well, as opposed to just kind of a tool based set of recommendations. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Greg. Appreciate that. Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Just a small question. We are [inaudible] for this issue. I think, I think that we have five topics [inaudible]. Do we expect to have [inaudible] recommendations from each of these at a latter state? Thank you.

EN

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you Kavouss. Kavouss, the bylaws for this group, are laid out on page one at the very top. And our task from the bylaws of ICANN, is to review and develop recommendations on SO AC accountability. So one of those is to review, and the second is to develop recommendations.

And they are included but not limited to improved processes for accountability, transparency, and participation, that will help to prevent capture. So Kavouss, as I think we've discussed for almost three months, we do have to both review and develop recommendations. On our last two calls, we decided not to make recommendations highly specific to each group.

For instance, we're not going to recommend the BC. You need to make your email archives public.   Instead, we are going to develop recommendations in the form of best practices. Then we're going to be able to put them out there for the consideration of all the ACs and SOs who may adopt them to the extent that they see that they fit.

And we discussed earlier on the call the recommendations about transparency.   You yourself added a phrase to the best practice recommendation for meetings normally being open.   And what you were doing in that case, was helping us with the recommendations part. We're also discussing those five bullets on the bottom of page eight, those are the recommendations that [Farsi] has initially drafted with respect to outreach.

We'll need to do the same thing on participation and accountability, but we need people to pick up the pen and draft those sections. I hope that that was clear, Kavouss, because we are, we are charged by the bylaws

to develop recommendations. We're doing it in the form of best practices as opposed to, you know, diving in and telling them various constituencies, here are the things that you need to change.

Kavouss, does that answer your question?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, but not very clear. I don't know, these point or what? One of them or two of them [inaudible] that we have mention of the outreach in the bylaw.   But when you say recommendation, do we accept that somebody [inaudible] recommendations, who recognizes to whom? And what recommend? [CROSSTALK]

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, I can answer that for you. Since we are one of the work stream two groups on AC SO accountability, we're following what the bylaws said. So our group will develop a document, it will go through two readings, after we approve it, and that document will include recommendations for best practices.

If the plenary of CCWG approves it, it goes out for public comment. It will get public comment. It will be our job to react to public comment. Then, those recommendations will go to ICANN's Board. And you know the bylaws for work stream two, create a very high threshold for the ICANN Board to reject any of these recommendations. We are a special case, though, because anything we are recommending is not a recommendation to the ICANN corporation.

Our recommendations are to the SO and ACs in the community. I'm not exactly sure what ICANN the corporation would say about recommendations. When our recommendations are out, they would considered to be the community's recommendations, having been approved by public comment and the ICANN Board with work stream two.

When they're published, I guess you could bring them up at a GAC meeting and say, hey, these recommendations indicate through best practices, some of which we ought to think about adopting. And I would do the same in BC. But there is no obligation on the ACs and SOs, to implement the best practices we come up with.

But I do think it's completely clear that our charter is to review and develop recommendations. Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, that… Okay, [inaudible] it's not quite clear, that you said this was recommendation SO AC, [inaudible] for public comment [inaudible]. It is up to that SO and AC to [inaudible] of the recommendation, and once recommendation is prepared, it is now [inaudible] implement that recommendation, some over there [inaudible]. Correct me or not. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Kavouss, whether they are correct or not, what you said is exactly what I would agree with. The way you just represented it, is my perception of

what we're up to here. But if others don't agree with Kavouss or not, let us know now.

[Farsi], welcome, welcome back. We were all complimenting you on the work that you've done on pages five through eight on outreach. And we were taking comments on the five recommendations at the bottom of page eight. One comment that Greg Shaton and I have, is that we could add more specificity and action verbs to the five recommendations.

And, as an example, just having the word outreach strategy might be better to say that each SO and AC should have a strategy for outreach on parts of its target community that are not well represented. So [Farsi], it's not yet making a language of an action that someone could follow, as opposed to a heading item, like outreach strategy.

And we were doing that, thank you [Farsi], and then Kavouss was asking more questions about the difference between review and recommendation. And prior to you getting on, I was making a big pitch for extra volunteers to take care of participation and accountability, a few other topics we have to deal with the same level of rigor that you've addressed here.

So [Farsi], I would like to turn it back to you, if you want to give any more comments on the four pages of work that you've done on outreach. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII:	Thank you Steve. I'm not sure if you can hear me. We also have connection problem today at Georgia Tech. So, what I did was to go through the responses that we received about outreach and kind of let, it has to be irrelevant parts, and then I looked over to see what kind of outreach, what kind of responses are out there that not all of the SO and ACs include, for example, some SOs and ACs have newsletters, and so I thought it would be a good idea to recommend that it might be good to have a newsletter, or, for example, some SOs and ACs have outreach program [inaudible], while others didn't have.
	Like a formal active program [inaudible], it is recommendable I think, to have a program [inaudible]. So, this was kind of my understanding of the responses, and that's how I captured the data, and that's how I came up with the recommendations. But I do not [inaudible] I think it's a very valid point, it has to be more action based and yeah. I agree with that. And I will modify it to reflect that.
	But what I'm also interested to know is whether people that have actually read the document, whether they think they can think of other recommendations that I might have missed out on, or that would be good to add to these recommendations, if anyone thinks that we should add more. But that's about it, thank you.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	[Farsi], when we stay on that point, I put, in the chat box, I put another way to, for instance, make the word outreach strategy more action oriented and specific. So, you could say each AC and SO should have a strategy for outreach to parts of their targeted community, and that is

whoever they think their target community is, that may not be adequately represented at the time.

And that would mean that the strategy for outreach differs for over time. We could find ourselves in the business constituency, having very light representation for Latin America and our strategy for 2018 might be that that's where we're going to devote our outreach resources. So [Farsi], would that be acceptable to adding action to number five?

FARZANEH BADII: Yes, thanks [inaudible]. I totally agree with that. I don't know what sort of phrasing we want to use, but I think this is the approach that we should take, which is be more action based. So, I can copy and paste this language that you have if you're into the document with everyone else, at least.

STEVE DELBIANCO: [Farsi], before I turn to Cheryl, I put it into the document to make things easy, but of course, we can take it back out, but I wanted to also let you know that Mark Carvell, before you joined, gave us another bullet on how the GAC does outreach to non-GAC member specific government gatherings. And I had pasted that to the GAC portion of your review document earlier in the call. Thank you.

Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Steve. Cheryl for the record. I'm just going, I'm leaving myself in the queue, but I'm going to go to Kavouss. Kavouss, over to you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, [inaudible] that time to this call, [inaudible] as you proposed, this should be a textual element, just to each of these recommendations that we propose. The only thing that we need, what is proposing is that to slightly modify the last portion of that, [inaudible] adequately represented at the time. It's quite vague.

All the things that may not be representative at the time, because represented is [inaudible] representative, something may be representative for region A, or region B, or region C, but not for region D. So, maybe we need to slightly modify that as a guidance, and then up to provide if they have time explanation for each of this type bullets. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So, you're saying adequate participation, instead of representative, and do not have adequate participation. How about that? Thank you. I just made that change. Thank you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: That's okay. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Steve. Back to me, Cheryl Langdon-Orr. While we were capturing things that had gone on in the chat, and I was certainly keen to make sure that [Farsi] picked up on what was going on in the chat, in particular from interventions such as Mark, was making, I used a very simple term, outreach needs to be fit for purpose. And of course, the purpose may be quite variable between the different ACs and SOs.

So, what I'm hearing is that whilst we've done a first reading through on this particular topic, we do have, I think, still, considerable wordsmithing that needs to be done on the recommendation section to make it more actionable, and to take into account what has been discussed today.

So, to that end, I'm going to suggest the working on that an action item for our sub-team, and that we extract, for want of a better term, the modified recommendations section, based on interventions and input from today. Send it to the list so we wake those people up, who are not on this call, and are only perhaps watching the list, and ask for online contributions, directly into the Google Doc, or to the list, in response to the section, to assist rather than you having to troll through everything.

Now, that may shape up some more input, and I think what we might do is take a small part of next week's agenda time, to come back over, [inaudible] the recommendation section, and see what new drafting has come out of that. I think it's a little, it's very difficult for us to try and [inaudible] anymore into those calls in the time we have available, but it's quite clear that we need to hone in on some greater detail.

These recommendations in these sections are very important, and we certainly definitely need to get our language as optimally designed as possible. So, if there is no more requirement for anyone to make some comments on this matter no, our homework assignment for the outreach aspect will be to assist the drafting team with list work, and with direct work on the Google Doc, to improve the drafting of text.

We'll have a look at that text drafting where we're up to on that in next week's call. We will dedicate no more than 15 minutes on that. So, if you have substantive input to make on re-drafting, you really do need to make it in advance of the call so that what we are looking for is minor polishing, minor comments, and hopefully the building of consensus on recommendations for this section.

That's going to bring us to now deciding what the majority of you would like to have as the topic for our discussion on next week's call. And just to remind you, our call on the 9th of February will be at 05:00 UTC, that's a time zone which notoriously for this group, is not particularly well attended. So again, it's pretty important that we do work in the very short amount of period that we have between our meetings online and directly to the Google Docs, so that we see this as a generational of drafting exercises, not just one meeting, one shot, move on, because I don't think we can afford to do that at this stage.

The other thing I think might be worthwhile noting for overall these recommendations, is that what we're aiming for, I believe what they're aiming for at a relatively high level, is of course, something that's going to be a continuous improvement program. And so by the sharing of best practices, and the encouragement of the ACs and SOs to

continually look at those, and continually improve their accountability in the various forms that we're suggesting, that's, I would like to think, the end game and that problem needs to be captured somewhere earlier in the document.

So now we need to open the floor for suggestions on topics for next week's [inaudible] exercise, and not only topics, but volunteer or two, preferably from drafting team one, but not limited to drafting team one, for our single topic discussion for next week. So, floor is open. What is it that you would like to discuss?

And I do need to wrap this call up very quickly. Many of us have back to back calls today, and that means if we finish this call a few minutes earlier, some of us can at least get on to the next call on time. Steve and Farzaneh, do you have any suggestions on the topic if we're not going to choke it out of the rest of the group?

STEVE DELBIANCO: I would do participation, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sounds like a plan to me, Steve. Is there any objection to participation being the single topic for discussion at next week's [inaudible] exercise?

FARZANEH BADII: Farzaneh speaking here, Cheryl. I agree with Steve. The only thing is that one aspect of participation, and are we going to cover a different outreach, I think wasn't this a part of, also of participation? So, what

STEVE DELBAINCO: Thank you [Farsi]. If I could answer that. It's Steve. Outreach is finding part of your target community that either doesn't know you exist, or ha not yet decided to participate at all. They're not joining. That's what outreach is about.

Participation would say, given the people that have decided to be members of NCSG, or decided to be members of GAC or BC, how is their participation at decision making, discussions, drafting, and election, how do they participate in that activity? And is the best practice a way that ensures that we are open for all to participate, because they've indicated that they want to. Are there barriers to participation?

And those could be linguistic, vocabulary, technology, time zones, culture. Are there opportunities for capture? Where one group, or one industry, or one company can drive things in a certain way because we're willing to do all of the work? We've all seen that in the working groups we've been in before. Every once in a while somebody decides to take on the work, and it might just be because they care, or they might be trying to advance their own interests.

And maybe that is a form of capture if others don't bother to take up the pen. So, participation says that of the target community that is chosen to participation, in your AC, SO, or subgroup, what are the methods that you use to ensure that they can participate actively at the

development of positions and documents, decisions that are reached, and elections?

How is that [Farsi]?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Steve, Cheryl here. Can I jump in? If we qualify the question to the group then, as participation methods and mechanisms, then that has given us a set of control points for discussion of next week.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's certainly true, Cheryl. And that was one of the questions we asked, and the response has been, we can mine those responses and summarize what each group does in the area of participation, just as we did for transparency and outreach.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I think that's what we will do. So, if we can make that, that will be the topic for next week, and if people have overwhelming objections, you've got limitations then on what could be a very general drift otherwise, and it's not going to be our only [inaudible], the larger topic of participation.

The aspect of participation we'll be looking at, in our data capture review next week, will be the mechanisms and methods. There might also be limitations I've identified there. Kavouss, over to you.

Kavouss, we can't hear you. Check if you're on mute.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yeah, do you hear me please?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can hear you now, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Okay, thank you. In participation, we have to possibly [inaudible] physical participation, and physically being able to participation. As far as participation as physical meeting is concerned, we should be quite clear that no restriction to anyone from any invitee entity for participation is accepted. So if [CROSSTALK]…

Yes, sorry, let me finish. If entity A invites to have a meeting, it's not, it's general restrictions for any participation. This is quite severe and quite severe, and we have to make it quite clear that in UN is a country, that invites people and puts restrictions to other countries, that country would not be accepted to host the meeting, unless it certainly advised that there is no restriction for participation.

That is why sometimes we are not able to have international meetings, because they have some restriction for participation. So this has been no restriction for any participation, otherwise that host will not be accepted. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Kavouss. Cheryl for the record. And of course, what we're doing here is analyzing the declared participation methodologies that ACs and the SOs have provided as within the data capture. What you've described is undoubtedly a desirable outcome of our recommendations.

So, let's go through the process to get to the endpoint, which I doubt very many people would disagree with barriers to participation should be minimal if non-existent. So, Kavouss, are you able to do the analysis? It has been left to the co-rapporteurs to date. We have a number of people in the drafting team.

I note, Kavouss, you did not join the drafting team, but I do know that you have deeply held interest in all of this. So, did you wish to volunteer to do the analysis of the data captured from the surveys on this topic? And it's okay to say no, but I did wonder if you wanted to say yes. Up to you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I wish I could have said yes, but unfortunately, at this time, I am [inaudible] person, because my [inaudible] has been operated out of this problem that I have [inaudible] it is in [inaudible]. So I have some handicap situation. I wish to do that, but it takes some time. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, thank you. Understood. I would like to think then that with what limitations your current [inaudible] authority is allowing you, you'll be able to continue to endless discussion. Is this [inaudible] stepping up?

Tatiana, are we taking your name down here? I'm sure that [Farsi] will help, but I think if we can put you down and ask [Farsi] to assist you, along with Steve and the others from drafting team one, it will stop it looking like, because it is not the case that the rapporteurs are leading the direction.

We are in fact, recording the direction wherever possible. We try and keep our personal intervention as clearly delineated from our administrative roles.

Ladies and gentlemen, you know the [inaudible] meeting, you know there are action items on us all. I want to thank Tatiana for stepping up, I appreciate that greatly. I want to thank the staff. I want to thank each and every one of you.

And I would like to think that other than a lot of on-list and in-document collaboration between now and next week, we will have as many of you as 05:00 UTC on the 9th of February, as we had today. With this, a few seconds ahead of the hour, I'm going to finish up today's call, and ask the recording now be stopped. Thank you one and all, goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]