RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. This is Steve DelBianco, one of your co-rapporteurs. We also have Farzaneh Badii, and Cheryl Langon-Orr is the other rapporteur. I'm hearing an echo and I don't know why. My Adobe is on mute. Staff, are you able to identify which phone needs to be muted? Okay, thank you for doing that. I appreciate that. Are there any updates to statements of interest for members of the working group?

Are there any members who have dialed in and are not listed on Adobe? The 703 number is me. 615-6206 is Alan. I dialed in from a hotel here in Iceland, where we just finished the intercessional for the non-contract party house of GNSO, a very productive meeting. Alright, I don't hear anybody who's audio only. There were no updates to SOI's so as far as action items from the previous call. I missed that call because I was traveling. And so Farzaneh, would you be able to review any action items from the previous call, please?

FARZANEH BADII: Hello, Steve, yes. Farzaneh Badii speaking. So during the last call we discussed the participation part of our document which Tatiana [inaudible] volunteered, then draft it. And we actually volunteered and the team two come up with -- to do kind of like follow the statements as you push forward and we'd continue in the documents to cover the policy procedures for accountability and the reviews of policies and

procedures, and also any unwritten policies. So these are the three segments that we wanted to address. And the drafting team was supposed to work on these three aspects which kind of captured the rest of the questionnaires, and captured their responses to the resulted questions. Anything else? No, I don't think there was anything else.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Farzaneh. This is Steve DelBianco again. While I was here at the Intercessional, I thanked Tatiana for the work that she'd done on participation and I want to thank you for the drafting you've done for this call. The drafting on the accountability section of our document. And so Farzaneh, it's my belief that our job on this call is to dive into the Google doc that was indicated in the agenda and on the Adobe chat. and go straight to the section of that document that you've just added over the last several days. It's the section on, I want to say the review of policies and procedures, or is it the one on accountability? Which do you prefer us to start with? Maybe the accountability, which is on page 13?

FARZANEH BADII: When I started doing the policy and procedurer for accountability, the SO and AC, I noticed that Steve you have a summary that kind of says where policies and procedures are on pages like 1, 2, 3. So, although I went ahead and, again, extracted the responses about the policy and procedure for SO and AC, I was wondering if I kind of repeated it. So Steve, since you drafted this first three pages, you can tell me if this is

just a repetition and it's not needed. Or if we can go ahead and just scrap it.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Farzaneh. This is Steve. I believe we can do a lot of clean up and consolidation at a later stage, and certainly very soon, clean up and consolidation. But I thought the first task was to be sure that we've documented our review of all these aspects of accountability, for all of the groups from whom we have information. And then we'll do the clean up later. So I would recommend starting on page 13. Now, Farzaneh has pulled together for us accountability at SOAC's. And this is the opportunity on the call where members of respective AC's, SO's, and subgroups can make annotations or notice things that we've missed and pulling from your responses or looking at your websites to ensure that we've got everything captured. So this would be page 13, 14, 15, and 16. So we should take a queue on that, and I did want to note that the GAC section, on GAC operating principles on page 14 hasn't been filled in yet. So I'm guessing a member of the GAC can help us with that Farzaneh. Do I have that right?

FARZANEH BADII: Yes, because of the response that we got from GAC was kind of like a couple of pages of responses. It wasn't based on questions. They mentioned that their operating principle is their [inaudible] so that's why I put it in there, but I would be grateful if a GAC member could elaborate on this. Also Olga, also commented on the document, but she didn't comment on this part.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Right. I think Olga's comment was on a different section. Okay. And again, so to refresh everyone's understanding. Our job is to review and develop recommendations included but not limited to accountability, transparency, and participation that are helpful to prevent capture. So on previous calls we've covered transparency, participation and in participation we expanded to include outreach to the target community who had yet participated. And if we are able to cover accountability on this call, then I believe we will have at least covered all the basis that the bi-laws require of us.

Now, we may be missing groups. I'm aware that within the GNSO I believe we don't have substantial responses from the registrars as of yet. And I'll look at the staff to help me with that. Registrars and registries have not replied. Thomas was the one who was going to do some outreach to see if we could provoke a response, but are there any representatives of registrars or registries that are on the call right now? Alright, hearing none, we're going to need some outreach in that regard. And I would ask, Thomas is not on the call today to help with that so I would ask perhaps if staff could help us with that. Give me the right people to reach out to and we need to check with them. Because I think it's glaring by absence if we don't pick up registries and registrars. Given that they're the contract parties controlling most of the filing space. Alright. Kavouss, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Do you hear me, please?

STEVE DELBIANCO: I do.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Okay. I didn't understand, what is the issue of our point and principle of GAC?   Just for your information if I'm not mistaken, we have an operating principle. We are on the process to revising that, but before this vision would be available the existing opposing principle is valid, so I don't believe that we should say they're still waiting for that.   We should add at the end of that GAC currently is considering certain revisions of its operating principle, full stop. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Kavouss, this is Steve. Thank you, Kavouss. If you scroll to page 15 on the document right now, I'm assuming you have access to that, you'll see that the GAC is one of the many AC's and SO's from which Farzaneh took a draft attempt at pulling from your responses one of the particular elements of accountability. And when we asked the question on accountability, it gets to the notion of are there ways to challenge decisions, appeal the kind of processes that reinforce the way that GAC is accountable to its members in the GAC. Again this is internal, I think that's the expression you like to use. This is internal accountability. So we're well aware that the GAC has operating principles, right?

And so all that Farzaneh has done here is to note that we have to go see the GAC operating principle, but that won't really be sufficient for the production of our report. To produce our report, one has to reach into

those principles and find principles that are on point for how we can challenge a decision, and other aspects of accountability. And again, it's all internal, Kavouss. None of this has to do with people from outside the GAC reaching into the GAC for accountability. The GAC leadership structure is accountable to its members and if anyone differs with that interpretation this is a great time to speak up. Farzaneh, let me refer to you for a moment. What was your understanding of the way you addressed the accountability question? What elements were you looking at?

FARZANEH BADII: So, what I looked at Steve was, I looked at the responses. So the question in the questionnaire was: what sort of procedures and rules they have and if they can point us to these rules and procedures. So some of the groups included just said, "Yes, we have rules and procedures and here they are." And they referred us to them.

And so sometimes they were kind of being more creative, but I would say it didn't fit in the answer. For example if you look at the ASO, they say that to assist the newcomers in understanding the terms that are used in these materials they have a glossary, or also they have frequently asked questions about the [inaudible] general function in these procedures. So some of the answers were more elaborated. So what I tried to do really was look at what kind of things are out there that are like interesting and other SO's and AC's haven't done. And at the moment that's why you see in the recommendation that I have come up with that SO's and AC's are recommended to provide a glossary of the terms that they use in their procedures and accountable

documents. And also to document their procedures or rules, like have written documents. And so this is how have I approached it. I can still go through and see what else I can kind of extract and what sort of recommendations we can come up with, with the answers that we have for now.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Farzaneh. Before I go to Kavouss, we should put into this document the questionnaire that we circulated. On page one I have the transparency question at the beginning of the transparency section, but I believe for each of these sections we should refer to the questionnaire, so that readers will understand which questions we're trying to review and develop recommendations.

Now, Farzaneh, it would be my observation, strictly personal that things like a glossary or Frequently Asked Questions really belong in a transparency section and I'm pretty confident that when we did the work on transparency we covered all of that. So it isn't necessary, I think to refute and we'll get to that in the consolidation section. It isn't necessary to refute the fact that we need Frequently Asked Questions, we need full documentation. I actually believe in the recommendations we came up with, with respect to transparency. Go ahead.

FARZANEH BADII: Steve, sorry to interrupt you. Yes, that's exactly my comment on this document as well. Which I actually think that we have to [inaudible] receiving the transparency, so we can just cross out the recommendations that I came up with and come up with other

recommendations. The fact of the matter is that was when I was extracting things because it was simply going—simply they were describing their procedures and with what documents they had, I just put them in there and I frankly have not come up with any recommendations, so maybe the group can work on that and see what we can do better with that regardless.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Farzaneh, the question that's on point here is the question that we asked when we asked them, Does your AC and SO do internal reviews of your accountability related policies and procedures? And that would be a question that we'd want to review in this section. We also asked everyone where their policies and procedures for accountability reviewed or updated over the past decade. And clarify if they were updated to respond to specific community requests and concerns.

We also asked them if their AC and SO has mechanisms by which their members can challenge or appeal decisions and elections, and these include where the mechanisms are consulted. And these accountability sections that you authored is exactly where we would want to review these notions of challenging or appealing decisions and elections as well as whether they've done any internal reviews. So we can go back, we don't have to do it on this call right? We can go back over the next couple of days and fine tune that because I don't think we need to repeat in accountability things that we've already covered in transparency. I'm sorry, did I interrupt you? Did you want to go on?

FARZANEH BADII: Yes, because I actually have done. That's what I said in the beginning, that maybe—I actually have done the review and challenging decision on page 16 if you look at the reviews, our policies and procedures. So I have extracted the responses with that regard and also I have extracted responses about challenging decisions, which is on page 90. So I have done that, Steve.

If you think that the parts about accountability accounted in the procedure is just redundant because we have repeated it, then I think we can just discard it. But to your point, the part about reviews of policies and procedures, the answers and the recommendations from page 16, I'm hoping that we all are on the same page, to page 19, and I'm sorry I wasn't unclear in the beginning. So if you have found that, then you can work on that, on those answers. And Kavouss's hand has been up for a while, so perhaps you could [inaudible] him.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Thank you, Farzaneh. And you're right, you did cover nearly all of the remaining work, and it's just distributed across multiple pages and I guess I was sort of stuck on the accountability section which may or may not be necessary because you've covered the details afterwards. Thank you, Farzaneh, and let's go to Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I have difficulty with what was explained. My simple question is that do or does your group still missing some information from GAC at this stage? For which other SO and AC has replied, but GAC has not replied. This is my question, that's all. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Kavouss? Yes, Kavouss. This is what you could do. You and Olga, as GAC members on this group,—we're going to do a clean-up round of the document in the next couple of days, and Farzaneh and I as your rapporteurs will lead that. We'll try to clean this document up and make it a little tighter so we don't have as many redundancies in it and that it's clearer with respect to which section is responding to which question we ask.

Once we do that, you'll be able to scroll through it and you'll see GAC listed, and what we'll need you and Olga to do is to suggest edits to the document, so that we've done an adequate job reflecting what it was GAC came back with. Because we may have missed something in GAC's response, or in the case where GAC simply referred us to the operating procedures that GAC has, we didn't necessarily go in and find which operating procedure in the GAC is responsive to the question, for instance of challenging a decision. If there's no such operating principle for the GAC, that's fine. But when we come up with recommendations we may end up saying that it's a best practice, that there's documentation of procedures that a member of an AC and SO would be able to challenge or appeal a decision or an election. That there's sort of a standard element of accountability and where's the Table of Contents at the very beginning?

I think that this group needs to discuss how we're going to actually structure the deliverable we'll need to make to the full CCWG plenary. We have many documents right now and it's clear, we need more than just a Table of Contents, Ellen. If you recall we have three tracks. The

track on, for instance the mutual accountability round table. The track on IRP which are things that we've already drafted. We need to pull all of this into a single document. Along with the 19 pages that we have in front of us right now and start to put our document in a way that sets forth what we were tasked to do. And then how we approached it, our questionnaire and I have to believe that it's going to take us a couple of weeks to get the document cleaned up. Have all of us go through and review to make sure it's complete, and then determine whether our working group had consensus, sufficient to publish it to the plenary. Working backwards, what is our current target date? This is where staff could be helpful. What is our current target date for getting something to the plenary so that they can do a first reading? Can somebody help me with this? Kavouss, your hand is up. Bernie's hand is up hopefully with respect to an answer! Bernie?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Steve. The last day to get something to the plenary for the upcoming 22 meeting is past, it's seven days. And so the next meeting is unclear if we will have a meeting on 1 March, but the co-chairs will be asking the plenary if we think we need nine days before the face to face meeting.   If there's no face to face meeting on 1 March, the next deadline would be 23:59 UTC on 3 March, so that the plenary has one week on the list to look at the document. I hope that's clear.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Bernie. If we've finished our document by the 3rd of March, and got that into the plenary, on what day would the first reading occur?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: That would be on the face to face meeting on the 10th of March.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Got it. So everyone this is purely speculation as to whether we could get there, so just what we understand what we would be working toward, if we used the next two weeks to pull together our three documents into one, and use our next calls to try to discover whether we have consensus, then we'd have a shot at getting the document to the rest of CCWG for a first reading at the March 10th face to face in Copenhagen it would be a splendid way to go through first reading since we would be able to explain and answer questions from our CCWG colleagues. It's far easier to do that face to face, and that would occur on the 10th of March in Copenhagen. But that requires us to take all the good work that's been done so far and to organize it carefully and review it.

And that can't happen on these one hour calls. Farzaneh's done a fantastic job. I'll join her in the next couple of days to get one document ready as your rapacious, but then all of you are going to have to do a reading of that document and begin to react to it so that on our next call we have something that we can start to drive towards the 3rd of March deadline. So I'll put that out there as something we could aspire to and I'd love to take a queue on if whether people think that

that is doable and happy to take a queue on that. But Bernie did I have that right with respect to the date, that would be March 3rd for a March 10th first reading.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yes, March 3rd, 23:59 UTC.

STEVE DELBIANCO: If we missed that date, then we would not be able to do a first reading in Copenhagen, but instead the first meeting after Copenhagen. And just so I'm clear Bernie, what would be the first plenary session after Copenhagen?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Let me check, it will take just a second. The next plenary after Copenhagen is scheduled for March 29th.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And so backing up seven days from that, March 22nd would be the circulation date in order to make the 29th. Okay.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: That is correct.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes. Okay. So let's do our best to get to that first one. Are there any comments with respect to the goals that we have in mind? Okay. At

this point there have been three chief contributors for the actual document: Farzaneh, Tatiana, and myself and we are going to need some detailed review once the repertoires pull all this together. And it won't be very productive if everyone waits till the call to actually read the document. In an ideal world, whenever we begin these calls hands would go up because those of you who are a part of this group would have read the section that Farzaneh just added and you'd be able to speak to whether you agree with the way things have been represented and the recommendations that are there. Okay, so Farzaneh, do you have anything else you want to add, because at this point we're not hearing any reactions to your first draft and I think I could ask staff to put the agenda back up.

FARZANEH BADII: No I don't have anything to add. I just think that we can just go through the document in the next couple of days and make it prettier and then come back to the group with that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay Farzaneh, I'll since you've taken a big stab at the last six pages, I will undertake to consolidate. Again the consolidation is of two kinds, first you bring in the statement we've made about neutral accountability round table, several weeks ago. You bring in our conclusions, preliminary conclusion with respect to doing the IRP within AC's and SO's, and the answer was no on that one, preliminary one. And then we take this 24 page document here and try to consolidate it a bit and add it to. So we're probably looking at about a 30 page

document that would be called the Draft Report from the SOAC accountability group. So let's take a queue on whether that sounds like the right plan to proceed on.

Are there any objections to that plan? Matthew Shears, thank you for volunteering for writing an executive summary. Once we've finished pulling the document together. So in the document we'll put a marker—so in the document we'll put a bracket in there, executive summary to be added. I do think the summary should be added last. Alright if we have no other questions based on your review of the document prior to the call. And if you have no other comments on the plan for how we're going to proceed then I don't see any need to waste all of your time on the call and we could conclude this call early. Is there any other business that anyone on this call wants to undertake? Sebastien, please.

SEBATSTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Sorry, thank you very much, Sebastien Bachollet speaking. As you know, I am a rapporteur of the ombudsman drafting team and I was wondering if you know the specifics in this current work that the ombudsman group needs to take into account in their own work. I know that I may have read all of the things of the subgroups, sorry I didn't, my fault. But I would like to be sure that there is nothing we need to know in the ombudsman subgroup.

Now, I tried to put them all together in parallel with the definition of the external review. Thank you for your help for that and I don't need an answer straight on. I was just putting this as an issue and it could be

answered in the next few days. There is no hurry to answer me straight on. Thank you once again for your help.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Sebastien. I'm aware of at least two sections where the ombudsman is implicated. The first is the IRP section. When I pull that back into the main document and circulate it for review, you'll want to see that the ombudsman is an alternative to unleashing a full blown external IRP for concerns that happen within AC and SO. So we'll want to make sure that we've properly cited the role of the ombudsman can take.

The second area, Sebastian, would be the area that Farzaneh just added in this report back on page 19. It's the section on challenging a decision or an election. There may be some AC's and SO's who don't have an internal mechanism or procedure for a member of their group or somebody we'll say, an eligible member, who is somehow being denied membership. How do they challenge it? If that procedure isn't something that the AC and SO has already documented on its own, then the next step is for that individual to call the ombudsman and suggest, "I believe I'm an eligible member of the BC, but the credentials committee is not allowing me to join."

Or a BC member might say, "I voted in the election, but I don't believe the results were tallied correctly for our officer election." Or a BC member could suggest that you've just approved a policy for posting a comment, but I don't believe there was an adequate review period, or I don't believe that my comments were taken on board. Now ideally,

individual members of the BC would work that out within the BC using the policies and procedures for challenging. But if an AC and SO doesn't have that internally, Sebastian, then I think we have to turn to the ombudsman. So those would be the two sections, IRP and challenging decisions on eligibility, elections and policies. Bernie, your hand is up.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Apologies, old hand.

STEVE DELBIANCO: No worries. Okay. So if there are no further items on there and no objections, then I think there's a chance at least that on our very next call, 23rd of February at five UTC, each of you would have had a chance to get through our first draft document. Farzaneh and I will work on that and hopefully get it out—I would hope by Monday, Farzaneh, which would give everyone 3 or 4 days to review. I hope that that would be doable. But thank you Sebastian for your question.

Okay, if there's no further hands up or comments, thank you all for your time, and please allocate some time next Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday so that you can get through the document and be prepared to offer edits. Okay, thank you everyone. Staff, you can conclude the call.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]