CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much. Today's meeting will be the 22nd meeting of the Work Stream 2 Support Organization and Advisory Committee Accountability Subgroup.

We're meeting on the 23rd of February at 05:00 UTC.

I do hear a funny ringing sort of sound on the phone line, but if I can see if staff can – Yvette, if you can find out what that might be caused from. It may be annoying some people more than me, but [it's certainly annoying me].

Just the usual administrivia. If I can ask you all to identify yourselves before you start making your intervention. If I can ask you to speak slowly and allow for people who do not have English as their first language – a lot better chance of hearing and understanding you; and also to staff who are trying to take notes as a result of our deliberations.

We will be taking attendance from the Adobe Connect room today. We have received at least one apology that I'm aware of, from Giovanni, which I've passed off to staff. And I'm assuming that staff will catch any other apologies sent to the list.

The question I now need to ask is, is there anyone only on audio? Seems that nobody is only on the phone line, which is good. It makes our management of queues for questions and interventions easier. But if someone does join, obviously we will compensate for them not being in the Adobe Connect room.

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.

And now I want to ask, is there anyone who has any updates to their Statements of Interests that they need to share with us? Not hearing anybody, that seems to be status quo for these and other calls I attend. We're all very [static] in our work lives, obviously.

Or perhaps ICANN's taking up so much time, they don't have the opportunity to look for other employment or future opportunities. That's only partly a joke.

So, with that, let's move on to our agenda. The agenda's been distributed. Is there anybody who wishes to make a suggestion of change of order in the agenda items, or to mention that they had some Any Other Business that they would like to bring up?

We will ask for Any Other Business again at the end of the call, but if you'd like your Any Other Business known now, please do so. Therefore, we will take the agenda as it is presented in front of you, and I just want to remind you all that our first agenda item, as usual, is a review of action items from our last call, which was on February 16th.

The course of action from that was for more of you to get involved in our edits and commentary to the documents, both the data capture documentation and the general report – the consolidated draft report work that's been done. And I want to thank every one of you who've taken your valuable volunteer time over the last week to do a considerable amount of input. And I think the documents that we'll be reviewing today show how much we have benefited from your input and valuable commentary.

So, with that I'm going to now move to ask, are there any updates? And here, I mean any updates from any activity that is not covered in the rest of the agenda items as listed. I'm not aware of any, but there may be some.

If not, I'll just mention that the plenary met earlier in my today. That's yesterday to some of you. I would encourage anyone who was not able to join the plenary meeting to go over the recording. I think it was a useful meeting.

We certainly did – perhaps not progressed as far as some of us would like to have on some topics, but it will outline a good outline for our way forward, and particularly some important food for thought on how our future planning in terms of using blocks of time allocated to functions can be done.

And I would strongly encourage anybody who wasn't on that call to hear Bernie's excellent – he calls it simplified; I call it pretty darn impressive – presentation on how we can look at a couple of alternate dates depending on how we program ourselves as one or two public comments. It's well worthwhile and important for all of us who try to wrangle this work towards a final conclusion to look at and to discuss.

So, with that, unless anyone else would like to raise anything that came out of the plenary today...? No? Well, this is good. We'll power on and we will –

SEUN OJEDEJI: This is Seun. I'm audio only.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Seun. We note you're audio only. Do you want to make a comment on anything we've said?

SEUN OJEDEJI: No.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, thank you, Seun. Thank you for letting us know. Just let us know if you want to join a queue on anything during the call.

Okay, with that, I want to now move to our discussion of draft documentation. Today we're going to spend the last of our call – so [inaudible] it's going to be approximately 45 minutes of our call – dedicated to looking at the draft documentation that we had.

A copy has been propagated out to you in both cases. That's the Part A, which is the data capture documentation; and part B, which is the whole consolidated draft report that we would (thanks, Steve; I'll get back to that in a minute) that we would be looking at on today's call.

If you haven't been able to get onto the Google doc, you were provided with both PDF and Word copy in both cases. We hope that everybody has had time to read and review so that today we should be polishing and agreeing on.

This is going to be, for our work team, basically a first reading for our work team on the – certainly on the consolidated draft document. This

report that we're going to be looking at in the second part of our next section of the agenda is going to then be given the opportunity for us to have a few participants of today's call compared to our total number will have, between now and next week, time for some final polishing and commentary.

Our intention is to have a second and final reading for the work team at our next call next week, and to have this document – an agreed upon consolidated draft report – going to the plenary on the 3rd of March, which will allow us to go to the 10th of March CCWG face-to-face meeting for a first reading during that agenda.

We didn't specifically discuss that in today's plenary because those dates we will establish within the review process in a number of our groups of the different topics. I mean to have first readings going out with documentation on the 3rd of March so that they can be discussed for first reading on the [fourth] plenary on the 10th of March meeting.

So, we're doing what a number of other groups are doing and we're on track to do so – provided we get on with the job.

So, I'm going to let Farzaneh start off and very briefly – as briefly as she can – get through the data capture documentation which she did propagate earlier. And if we can just spend between about 10 and 12 minutes on that, Farzaneh, and then spend the rest of the time on the consolidated report, that would be good.

Recognizing, ladies and gentlemen, that what you're seeing in this recommendations work is, in fact, incorporated into the consolidated

draft report as well. Therefore, we're not going to be duplicating this part of the work when we go into the full consolidated document.

For that, let's hand over to you, Farzaneh. And if you can make sure you let people know what page number you're up to as they all have scroll capabilities. [inaudible] Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADII: Thank you, Cheryl. Steve rightly so said in the comments that we don't really need to review the data capture. It has been consolidated by Steve in the report that he shared today. I have gone through it beforehand with the group last week, actually. We discussed it, and there's nothing new that I added.

Steve has made some edits that are visible, so I would say that we can go directly to Steve's document. Is that possible? Steve, is that possible?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Farzaneh, I'm happy for you to do that. [To me it means] that you may run the risk of opening up discussion twice on the – well, not twice – but opening up discussion at the very end of our meeting unless we go in the reverse order through the consolidated documents because the recommendations that have had the least discussion and the most amount of work still required on them are at the end of the document.

But I bow to you two and you'll both just have to muddle through and see if we can get through it all. Go ahead, Steve.

EN

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Thank you, Cheryl and Farzaneh. As Farzaneh indicated, over the weekend, as promised, we incorporated all of Farzaneh's data capture doc into the consolidated doc that was circulated to all of you on Monday. That was version one. And I appreciate the attention it received from a number of quarters and the comments that came in.

That led us to do a 1.1 version that was circulated approximately 24 hours ago. And that 1.1 is what you see on the screen in front of you. In that 1.1 document, I was able to incorporate some edit from Tom Dale on behalf of the GAC. Thank you, Tom.

I was also able to incorporate all of the registry constituency's comments because, apparently, they had submitted them in January. But looking at the e-mail trail, it's not entirely clear they emailed them to us. They emailed them to staff and they may have never made their way to us. Fortunately, we resolved that and I spent some time working all of the registry comments in.

We also got comments from three members of NPOC: Joan Kerr, Juan Manuel Rojas, and Poncelet Ileleji. And while I appreciate the NPOC participants updating the Google doc, not all of their updates were consistent with each other.

And I understand in the last few hours, there was another update from an NPOC member to the Google doc – and that was Martin Pablo Silva Valent. And I guess I will look at those, but not on today's call. It will have to happen after the call.

So, I take it from that that the NPOC is not going to do a formal written response to the questions that we circulated. But instead, NPOC is just

EN

updating the actual draft report. And I noted that in the draft report as well.

That means only two groups are left who did not respond in writing. One is the Registrar's Constituency, so I reached out to them again yesterday, reminding them that they don't want to be excluded. The other was the Root Server Security and Advisory Committee (or the RSSAC), and then I understand that outreach was done and they're not going to respond.

Only one other item of note before we dive into the document, and that is that Sébastien Bachollet – who's the rapporteur for the Work Stream 2 project on ombudsman – had asked us on our last call where he should focus with respect of ombudsman implications. So, I'll quickly share with you what I told Sébastien yesterday.

[I've appointed] him to pages 4-9 because we have mechanisms for the SO/AC subgroup members to challenge elections and decisions, and I asked Sébastien if he wanted to add a recommendation on page 9 so that the ombudsman office was available to handle challenges as well as the internal SO/AC mechanisms. I haven't heard back from Sébastien, but I hope that he will.

I also mentioned to him that our recommendations on transparency and participation might also be placed as the ombudsman could play a role.

And then finally, on our track three recommendations, where we recommended whether to use the IRP for SOs and ACs, I told him that point number three already mentions the ombudsman and that he should take a look at that.

So, all of those edits were done, and thank you for those who contributed. The document is here in front of you, and I think that we consider today to be our first reading of our document within our workgroup. And while it is important to update the review part, it is more important that we come to consensus as a working group over the real meat of our draft, and that is the recommendations.

And we have recommendations in track 1, track 2, and track 3. Of course, in track 1 the recommendations are cut up into sections on Accountability, Transparency, Participation, Outreach, and whether the SOs and ACs are updating their policies and procedures.

So, that's the way the report's organized and we hope that this group could focus on the recommendations parts of it. I'll take a general queue now on both process and the full document. And then I honestly believe the best thing for us to do is to scroll to the pages which contain the actual recommendations and see whether there is any discussion on this call.

So, a general queue. Any general observations or comments? Okay, great. Thank you.

So, let's go immediately to the first –

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Hello.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Oh, okay. Thank you, Steve. Just [inaudible] document has been shared [inaudible] I don't know whether it has been. I've not seen it yet. Thank you. [inaudible]

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Seun, it was sent to the entire workgroup on Sunday and it was again sent yesterday – both in Word, PDF, and Google doc. If you do not have it, it might be because you're not on the proper working group. I'll ask Bernie and Yvette on staff just to assure that Seun's e-mail address is in the SO/AC Accountability Working Group. Thank you.

Okay, so let's get straight to it then. The first recommendation of importance shows up on page four. So, if you'll please scroll to page four. These are the recommendations with respect to –

Yes, it's actually a little bit further down. Four, five…We begin the Accountability on page four, but we don't get to the recommendations...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's page nine, Steve.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: It's on page nine? Thank you, Cheryl. It's the bottom of page nine, everyone – the recommendation. We'll take a queue on that. We have only, in this case, three recommendations with respect to

Accountability. I believe we are a little sparse in this area and could be better.

So, our recommendations are really more about process – about what should be documented. All three of the recommendations on Accountability start with the words, "The SO/AC/Subgroups should document…" In this case, challenging both for members and non-members, and through unwritten policies to be turned into written policies.

If we present to the full CCWG plenary, it would be my personal opinion that, in this area, it would be seen as if we didn't do – we didn't go very far. We didn't reach very high in terms of setting the bar [on] best practices with respect to Accountability.

And it's my personal opinion that, in this instance, we might be vulnerable to not reaching high enough. I'll take a queue on that. Any other discussion or ideas that we can then polish on Accountability?

Bernie observes in the chat that. "document and publish." I think we could add that. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I tend to believe that all of these recommendations should be "The AC/SO/subgroups should consider," and then the rest of the statement. Not all of these apply to everyone, and to say that everyone is not following a best practice if we do not document things when they don't apply, I believe just sets the wrong tone.

There are lots of decisions that groups make that – I don't even know what the concept of requesting, of challenging a decision means. If the ALAC votes on something and we document the vote, what does a challenge of the decision mean?

So, I am not sure how much these apply. If you look at the Accountability procedures we have put to the Board, the community can question some types of things but cannot challenge the Board in every decision they make. And I'm not sure that it's applicable in all of these cases.

So, I completely agree that we should require that they consider it and document the consideration, but not necessarily document all of these things if they just don't make sense or don't apply in a particular instance.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Thank you, Alan. Earlier on the Transparency area, we had a caveat above the recommendations. I'll read it to you. It says, "Our review leads us to recommend that each SO/AC/Subgroup consider adopting the following best practices." And we then listed them. So, we had said the words "consider adopting," and if the group is so inclined, I can add that caveat to every one of the recommendation sections.

It says that, "Our review leads us to recommend that each SO/AC/Subgroup consider adopting the following best practices." There seem to be a few folks who believe we want to add "where applicable."

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: I certainly believe so.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Any objection to, "where applicable"?

Okay, I'll make that change to the master document. Alan, anything more you want to add?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, that's it. Thank you.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Thanks, Alan. Let's go to the next in the queue. Farzaneh?

FARZANEH BADII: Hi, Steve. So, Alan raised the point that I think it was number one, that SO/AC/Subgroups should document their procedures for members to challenge the results of elections and decisions. I think that challenging the results of election is fine, but challenging – like a blanket kind of thing – decisions would be too broad.

So, perhaps we can cross out "decisions" as a general – like if it means decisions about anything because I don't think we can recommend that the members can challenge any decision that is being made at executive committees or any group because then they cannot really decide on things. So, maybe we can limit this to "challenge the results of elections."

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Thank you, Farzie. I did want to note that the questions that we all agreed to in November of last year – question number three was mechanisms for challenging or appealing elections. "Does your AC and SO have mechanisms by which your members can challenge or appeal decisions and elections?"

That was the question that all of the SOs and ACs responded to. So, we sort of settled on that vocabulary about three months ago, and I feel as if it would be respectful to carry that through. That's what we called it. I think that by adding the caveat, "where applicable," I guess if there is an SO or AC that doesn't allow its members to challenge an announcement of an election or an announcement of a decision – well then, it's really only the ombudsman that could help those members.

So, Farzie, I would go back to you on that. How do we change our vocabulary three months after we introduced the notion of challenging and appealing elections and challenging decisions? Okay, thank you, Farzaneh.

Next in the – Tatiana. And thank you, Tatiana, for the work you did on the participation. It would be best if we could focus on this page nine.

TATIANA TROPINA: Can you hear me well? Oh, sorry.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: We do.

TATIANA TROPINA: Oh, thanks a lot. So, I had the same concern as Alan and Farzaneh. And I thought that with regards to challenging decisions, maybe we will make them, you know, to state clear which decision can be challenged and which decisions cannot be challenged, and then document the procedures.

I believe that, of course, any AC and SO can limit the – how to say – scope of the issues where decisions can be challenged because from our experience, me and Farzaneh, when we were drafting the bylaws, it was an issue. Can a member challenge any decisions? It can make the work of [inaudible] of the whole constituency, of the whole AC and SO just stuck.

So, I believe that it's up to them to decide which decision can be challenged and which can not, but this has to be decided and clearly documented. Maybe that's what we can recommend, and then each AC and SO and constituency can just decide for themselves.

So, we can recommend – I don't know how to shape vocabulary. I'm sorry. It's a bit early here, 6:00 AM. But maybe just we have to say that they have to state clear which decisions can be challenged and document their procedures in challenging the decisions.

Then I have a comment on the second recommendation about members and not members, and challenging the decisions regarding their eligibility to become a member. I believe that we have to put it clear that "where applicable," because not all of the ACs and SOs – and especially ACs – are based on membership, upon application.

So, we do have to be clear here that sometimes it wouldn't be applicable. So, depending on their internal structures, because it wouldn't be applicable to everyone. Thanks, that's all from me.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Thank you, Tatiana. I wanted to repeat the general caveat that we'll have on every recommendation, which we covered a little earlier in response to Alan, and see whether you think that would be sufficient. So, each and every recommendation block would begin with the phrase, "Our review leads to recommend that each SO/AC/Subgroup consider adopting the following best practices where applicable."

If that is in front of every set of recommendations, I wouldn't think that we would also need to repeat the words, "where applicable" on every single recommendation. How do you feel about that?

TATIANA TROPINA: Hi, Steve. I actually agree with this. The only thing is, it's like the inapplicability or applicability would be different for each of the recommendations. For example, if we're talking about challenging the decisions, like it's up to the AC and SO to decide which can be challenged, and it's completely different mechanisms for – for example, from the predetermined structure of membership or no membership.

I will be fine with this. It's just I feel it's a bit of lawyer mind that, as the issue of applicability would be different for each of the questions, it might be a bit tricky. But for now, I'm fine with just stating it's [generally the same] [inaudible].

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Alright. Thank you, Tatiana. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you. I don't have a concern on both Farzie's and Tatiana's issues because of those words "applicable" and "consider." Yes, we're going to have to look at the wording carefully and make sure that it is applicable in the appropriate circumstances for each of the recommendations.

I'm not trying to wordsmith that now, and I certainly don't believe we should be doing that online. But just to give a particular example, I do not believe that anybody of our members, for instance, within At-Large should be able to challenge a decision of the ALAC, assuming it was made according to the rules of the ALAC.

If we counted votes properly and we had quorum and all of the process was followed, then I would not want that decision to be challenged. It could be raised by an ALAC member and said, "Let's reconsider it," but that's not challenging it. On the other hand, people should be able to challenge that the ALAC is doing things against its own rules.

So, that's why I believe that the "applicable" has to be there and it has to be flexible enough so that we can interpret it properly when we make that consideration. But again, that's wordsmithing and I don't want to do that right now.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Thanks, Alan. Let me invite you when this call is over to help articulate in our recommendations on page nine precisely that – that the challenges would be on whether process was properly followed in the making of the decision or the announcement of the results of an election. In both those cases, it's a process point more than a concern of a member who believes that the group, using proper processes, somehow came to the wrong decision. That isn't what's meant by challenging it. It's about challenging the process. So please work with me to fine tune that on page nine.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. My time right now is very limited for reasons I won't go into, but if you send me a targeted message, I will try to respond to it.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Thank you, Alan. If there are no further comments on page nine, looking at the time check, let me go to the next on, Transparency. On our Transparency recommendations, they begin at the bottom of page 13. There are six of them.

We actually gave these quite a bit of time about three weeks ago when Transparency was the first group that was produced, so we probably don't need much time on this. Thank you, Cheryl, it is page 13. Any comments on the recommendations for 13?

It's these more robust comments that I believe makes us look a little deficient on the Accountability area. Alan, your hand is up.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, actually that's an old hand, but I'll take advantage of you calling on me anyway to add, perhaps, a little bit of levity which isn't funny. The ALAC right now is – the ALAC is being subject to a review right now and, among other things, it's being pointed out that if we just use web and e-mail, it's not public enough. We have to publish things also on social media to make sure all the world can get hold of it regardless of what methodologies they use.

So, you're never going to satisfy everybody.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: True enough. And I do appreciate the levity there.

ALAN GREENBERG: This world needs more Tweeting, obviously.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Any other comments on Transparency? Farzie.

FARZANEH BADII: So, number six says, "Filed comments and correspondence with ICANN should be published for anyone to view." Do we mean by this it's like for a public comment and statement? Because, probably, the private communication [regards] we might not mean that.

EN

STEVE DEL BIANCO: We should definitely broach that topic. Is it a best practice that all comments by an SO/AC/Subgroup that are filed with the Board, whether it's a comment in the public comment or correspondence. Correspondence, as you all know, is fully disclosed – both to ICANN and from it. It's under the correspondence link on the ICANN website.

So, it's my impression that this is the status quo; that comments filed by an SO/AC and correspondence with the Board are all published for anyone to view. These aren't the individual comments of a single person, but of the SOs, ACs, and Subgroups.

So, Farzaneh, I do believe this is current practice. We're substantiating it as best practice. Go on. Farzaneh?

FARZANEH BADII: I'm sorry, that was an old hand. I don't have any other comment.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Okay. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I'll note that on occasion, one does have correspondence that is confidential for one reason or another. And I don't know if we need weasel words or the general statement always has exceptions, but the reality is on occasion there are confidential things that cannot be disclosed for one reason or another.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: So, I'll ask the group if anyone can please follow up after the call with any phrase that would be appropriate to add to number six – meaning, as you say, weasel words for not disclosing, and therefore saying that the best practice would still be to not publish a comment or correspondence with the Board and management.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think it applies to comments but it does, on occasion, apply to correspondence.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Okay. Alright, let's move on to the next section. This is on SO and AC participation. This would be for target members of the community and their ability to participate in the activities of an SO/AC or Subgroup. (Thank you, Cheryl.) The recommendations begin on page 19.

For Participation, we have six of them. Rules for participation and eligibility criteria – the process for appeal, which is very similar to the second under Accountability where we said that a non-member could appeal a decision for them to become a member. So, we repeated it here because it is relevant.

And then this is a comment on for any meetings, be they closed to members or open to anyone, we covered this again about two weeks ago and I believe this one has probably survived a couple of readings. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Again, that was an old hand. I'm not finished reading. I may have a new one in a moment.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Okay. Alright. We'll move on past Participation to the other flipside of Participation, which is Outreach. And Outreach is all of us trying to do outreach to our target community to get them to participate. Alan, did you have something on Participation?

ALAN GREENBERG: No. I have it on page 19, whatever section that is – that for any meetings, be they closed to members or open to anyone, the members must have access to the minutes to access minutes and the recordings. I'm not quite sure how that applies to the minutes of a council or a committee when there's a much wider set of members. There may be meetings where the members are not invited. They are closed meetings. Does that imply that the minutes of those meetings and recordings have to be then made available?

STEVE DEL BIANCO: It does. The best practice here would be that meetings and/or – sorry, minutes and/or recordings would be viewable to the members.

ALAN GREENBERG: Again, there needs to be exceptions somehow allowed, either in the introduction to it or in the special things. The ALAC on occasion, or ALAC leadership on occasion, has teleconferences where we talk about

individuals in our practices. Those are held in camera and we don't publish them because we're not in a position where we want to talk candidly about people for selection to an appointment or something and do that in a public area, in a public way. So, there has to be some level of condition that these – that exceptions are made.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Alan, on number four, then, I will note in the current draft that "exceptions for matters regarding individuals – for confidential matters regarding individuals – "

ALAN GREENBERG: Just "confidential matters." I don't think you need to restrict it to individuals. But the process needs to be documented for when things will not be public. But that doesn't mean the result is implicitly public.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Yes, so I'll add the words "subject to exceptions for confidential matters," and we'll see whether that will survive our next reading.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Thank you. Alright. No other hands up, so we should scroll ahead to Outreach, please. In Outreach, review recommendations – the review

part begins on page 19. And for Outreach, our recommendations start on page twenty–...

ALAN GREENBERG: Three.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: 23, thank you. Page 23. We have five recommendations on Outreach.

Okay, seeing no comments on Outreach, the next section and the last one in track one is our discussion of updates to actual procedures. And that is on page 23. Thank you, Cheryl. Starts on 23, but we only have one recommendation and it is on page 25.

The recommendation is rather short. It says, "Each SO/AC/Subgroup should review its procedures and charter at regular intervals and make changes to operational procedures and charter as indicated by the review." That is on page 25.

Any concerns with that, or suggestions for additional best practice recommendations? We didn't specify how frequently. We said "regular intervals." And just put yourselves in the shoes of our colleagues on the CCWG plenary when they review our report – soon, I hope – and whether we've been robust and aspirational at best practices.

Best practices aren't supposed to be necessarily easy. They're supposed to be things that we reach for while attaining the ideals of the multistakeholder model. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just in the mode of adding levity to this, I'll comment on recommendation three on Outreach, which says we should consider creating a committee to manage outreach programs and so on and so forth. The current draft of the At-Large review is recommending we abolish our outreach committee.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: [laughing] Alright. So here's what it is, Alan –

ALAN GREENBERG: [laughing] But they're recommending we abolish all of our working groups, so it's an equal opportunity abolishment.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: And this was the outside consultant's review, right?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Okay. That's just been posted for public comment. [It happened] just the other day.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's right.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Thanks, Alan. Farzie?

FARZANEH BADII: Thank you, Steve. [laughing] That's quite funny.

ALAN GREENBERG: We don't really think it's all that funny. [laughing]

FARZANEH BADII: So, when I was going through the Outreach [inaudible] I saw that a couple of constituencies had these outreach groups. But the thing is that the outreach group has to be small. It cannot be consisting of ten people. Then you cannot decide on anything. So, I don't know what [laughing] [inaudible], but this is something that other constituencies or other groups have done.

I read it from the questionnaires that they have had this. So, I thought maybe it's a positive thing because it is a more structured, organized way, so if someone doesn't do it, the other one will take responsibility.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Thanks, Farzaneh. The recommendation you're speaking of for outreach is on page 23. It's number three. And what we have in our recommendation is that "Each SO/AC should consider creating a committee to manage outreach programs to create additional eligible members, particularly from parts of their targeted community that may

not be adequately participating." Are you suggesting adding the word "creating a 'small' committee"? "A 'manageable' committee"? What would be your edit?

FARZANEH BADII: Yes, a "manageable" committee. I think that would be good. Thank you.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: We currently say "creating a committee to manage." We'll try to come up with something. We'll put the word "small" in there as a placeholder.

Okay, any other coments on that? Let's move to track two.

If you reach way back in your memory, track two was Mutual Accountability Roundtable, which begins on page 27. And in there we recount what the CCWG final proposal asked us to look at. We have the text from Willie Curry who was an advisor to the CCWG back in May of 2015, almost two years ago.

And our conclusion on the bottom of page 27 is pretty clean. "We conclude the Mutual Accountability Roundtable as originally described is more of a transparency exercise whereas best practices may be shared. While the exercise is viable, we do not recommend it for formal implementation."

We go on to say that "SO and AC chairs have a standing e-mail list and may convene calls and meetings at any time. That creates an appropriate and adequate forum for sharing of experiences and best practices on accountability to their respective stakeholders."

This has been in our mix for over two months, and I would think it has been read enough that we are comfortable with it as our consensus recommendation for track two. Any objections?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Can you hear me?

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Yes, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: [inaudible] I do think [we shouldn't necessarily add any other clause to what has been written already.] [Standard] recommendations [inaudible] committee is fine. Let's define what [inaudible] small committee or a big committee, or any manageable committee. In the case of At-Large, we have representation of RALO by region [inaudible]. And, yes, it can be considered large. The number [inaudible] large or too small for other communities, but let the community decide on what they feel is an appropriate number.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: That is implied, Seun. I guess we will say "a committee of appropriate size." Instead of the word "small" or "manageable," say "a committee of appropriate size." How about that?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes, that'll be fine.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Okay. Alright, good. So, Seun we're back on track two now. This is the Mutual Accountability Roundtable. Let's get back to that, please. Any Accountability Roundtable?

Fantastic. Only one more left and that is track three. Track three is the fact that the Bylaws and the Transition tasked us to assess whether the independent review process or IRP should be applied to So and AC activities. And we lay all of that out on Page 29. We come up with a three-part answer.

We say, "The IRP would not be applicable as currently described in the Bylaws." Number two, "While the IRP could be made applicable by amending the Bylaws significantly," we conclude, number three, that "the IRP should not be made applicable to SO and AC activities."

We explain why. We said "it is complex and expensive, and there are easier alternative ways to challenge an AC or SO action or inaction."

Again, this is almost two months old and we have not had objections to this in quite some time. I should think we'd be clean, but this is always a great opportunity to revisit something before we present it to our colleagues in the plenary.

Alright, fantastic. Seeing no comments, we've made only minor edits on today's call. I will watch the list for further comments. And as I noted earlier, one individual in NPOC has made further edits since I circulated last night. I'll take a look at those and probably circulate a new draft in the next few days.

Cheryl, Farzaneh, anything to add to that? Or Cheryl, I'll turn it back to you to manage the rest of the agenda.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan Greenberg, you've put your hand up. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I just wanted to note that there will be some very minor changes to the document I submitted. There's nothing substantive, but there's some cleanup that has been suggested, and I'll be trying to get that to you as soon as I can.

If it doesn't get in in time for first reading, it won't have any real impact. But I will get it to you as soon as I can.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That would be greatly appreciated, yes.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Thank you, Cheryl. And Alan, if it's all the same to you, I'd ask you to use the Microsoft Word doc and mark it up. It's far easier than working off the Google doc.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's fine.

STEVE DEL BIANCO: Thank you very much. Sorry, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No problem. Thanks, Steve. And thanks for taking us through all of that. And I am unfortunately painfully aware that we have ten participants on today's call, which is nowhere near the number of people who are signed up to our work track.

So, it is important that we note as our next meeting is discussed – and I'll cover that [inaudible] now – our next meeting will be on the 2nd of March, at 05:00 UTC. And on that meeting, we will be taking a second reading within our work team on this document.

So, it is important that when the minor edits and modifications that have been discussed in today's call and any that have come into the Google doc up until a point next week are going to be taken into account, that we see are perfect for next week's call is a final agreement that the document by the end of next week's call will be going out for first reading – perhaps with some minor imperfections – but for first reading with the CCWG at the end of our call so that we meet the 3rd of March deadline for the face-to-face meeting in Copenhagen.

So, the face-to-face meeting in Copenhagen will act as a first reading for the plenary. To make that happen, the action item on all of us is to respond as soon as you practically can to the document when it's propagated out to the list. Leaving it until five minutes before the meeting starts on 2nd of March is not going to be very helpful because that is not going to allow the rest of our group and perhaps those who

are not able to make next week's call time to properly consider those suggestions.

So, let me make an action item on us all – and that is for those of us who want to do some final polish on this document to review as promptly as possible. And I know, Steve, you'd be more than happy to even just react to a comment put back into the e-mail list if that is the only way you can get the comment [to him] in a timely manner.

Thanks for that, Farzie – sending reminders to the list to read the doc. That really does help. We will, however, put it out as a Google doc to be updateable, the PDFs that people can read in all sorts of formats, and a Word document which will allow markup for people who have used the different technologies. And of course, the list [inaudible] traffic.

I'm unaware of any other action item, other than perhaps at next week's call, if those of you who are travelling to Copenhagen could let us know which of you will be attending on the 10th of March for the face-to-face meeting, it would be good for us to know who of our work team on accountability subgroup are going to be in the room so we can perhaps rely on you to respond to some of the comments, questions, and criticisms that we may get during our plenary discussion.

So, with that, I'm now going to call for Any Other Business. Being met by absolute silence, I'm going to assume that there is no any other business, remind you all that the AI is on us all for those of us who want to do a final polish on this consolidated document to do so in as timely a manner as possible, to recognize [that, of course, when it] goes to

plenary, there will be undoubtedly additional changes suggested and proposed from the plenary discussion. And that's okay.

The plenary discussion is going to allow us to make this a more readable and better understood document. And so, our job will not be to defend our text, but rather to value the input of the plenary to make it the best text we possibly can do.

With that, I'm going to give you back almost five minutes of your lives, and thank you all. I look forward to lots of lovely list and Google Doc and Word doc input over the second half of the coming week, and talk to you all again on the 2nd of March at 05:00 UTC.

Thank you, staff. Thank you very much, attendees. And I do recognize that we're running two calls at 05:00 UTC after each other, but that's because the plenary happened to be at a spot where we would normally have rotated our time to earlier today.

Thank you one and all. Thank you, Farzie. Thank you, Steve. You're doing a lion's share of this, and I know that if I was to poll the whole of the work team, each and every one of them would appreciate the work you're doing. Thank you all. Bye for now.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]