
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The recordings are started.

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you very much. My name is Mathieu Weill. I'm the ccNSO co-Chair of the Cross-Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN's Accountability. This is our Work Stream 2 Plenary #15, and I welcome you all to this call.

I have to provide some apologies for a little bit of background noise that I have here, the arrangement for making meetings which are not always perfect. I hope you can hear me okay. I also hope that everyone, and especially the Copenhagen participants, had safe trips back. This is our first meeting after Copenhagen and we're back into the intersessional set-up which I hope we can make as productive as possible today.

I will start the meeting with the usual roll call and ask whether there are any participants to the call who are not on the Adobe Connect, but for right now and on audio only so we can add you to the roll call.

THOMAS RICKERT: Mathieu, I'm only on audio now and I will join the Adobe in a few minutes.

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you, Thomas. You're noted.

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.

JORDAN CARTER: Same situation.

MATHIEU WEILL: Okay, Jordan. Thank you. Anyone else? I see Barack Otieno as well is on audio.

Okay. That will be it for the roll call. Now, are there any updates to Statements of Interest? I am hearing none and seeing no hands.

THOMAS RICKERT: Mathieu, I have not yet put that into the SOI, but I'm now a member of the domain advisory council of nic.at which is purely advisory. It's sort of a mini-multistakeholder group that convenes to discuss policy issues for nic.at. That's a change in my SOI.

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you, Thomas, for updating us, and congratulations to you. I don't know if we should congratulate you or nic.at for that new position. Probably both. Thanks very much.

If there's no other update, a quick reminder of the Standards of Behavior that we need to make sure we are honoring during these calls as during all the exchanges that you place within this Cross-Community Working Group.

With that, I am moving to Agenda Item #2 which is the review of the agenda. As you can see on the notepad in the screen, we have an agenda with some of these issues as well as an update from the Legal

Committee. That should be rather quick. And then we have two second readings in Item #5 regarding the SO/AC Accountability and the Diversity Questionnaire. A quick point on the next Plenary, and Any Other Business.

I know on the list that Kavouss requested a discussion on another item. I think the best would probably be for me to give Kavouss the floor to explain what his proposal for an extra agenda item is.

Kavouss, you have the floor.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. Good morning, good evening, good afternoon, good whatever time you have. Thank you very much. Mathiu, I raised an issue within the mailing list. The co-Chairs, I shared with everybody and we need to review of the level of the CCWG, not level of the group, level of the CCWG at least to consider the progress of the work in the written and method of the work.

Some of us are not happy neither with the progress nor with the working method, and I would like that we include that somewhere in the agenda but not on the Agenda Item #7 because it is not AOB. It is real [inaudible]. This is not other business. But any part of the agenda please can we include that as for some short discussions and to see what we can do. Thank you.

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you, Kavouss. My understanding is you would like an update on the progress and the work plan of the Jurisdiction Subgroup, noting that –

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: And working method, too.

MATHIEU WEILL: Yes. No specific documentation has been provided in advance. There's reminders e-mail on the subgroup list that was shared. I don't know if Greg is with us, but I'll be reluctant to add a last-minute agenda item on this right now. So that's why my proposal was to put it for a preliminary exchange in AOB if necessary. And if we find it appropriate, if the group wants a fulsome discussion on the issue, then we can prepare it with the subgroup rapporteur and the various participants at the next Plenary. That would be my proposed approach.

I understand that that's not exactly what you were expecting, but I think in terms of meeting management, it's always difficult to have last-minute conversations that people haven't been warned about earlier, and especially since we are without, for instance, Greg Shatan hasn't been informed of that earlier as the rapporteur, so that wouldn't be very appropriate, I think, to take that discussion right now as a full agenda item.

But obviously if there are any objections to that – apart from Kavouss obviously – in the group, [inaudible]. I'm seeing [two ticking] for this tick directed to the approach I was suggesting. Avri is supporting that

approach in the chat. And indeed, it's important to keep every view the time to be heard before we have the Plenary conversation, and I think we would probably address this in the AOB and that should be giving us the opportunity to define exactly what we're expecting for our next plenary. So that's in line with what you're saying, Avri.

I think with that I'm not seeing any new or other voices, so I would tend to move to the next agenda item which is going to Administration Issues. Sorry for the background noise once again. I'm going to turn actually to staff for take us through the Administration Issues.

Bernie, are you taking the lead?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Hello, Mathieu. Yes. I hope everyone's on Slide #4, "Administration: Staffing Changes." I guess we will look to Karen to bring us up-to-date on some of those.

Karen?

If you're speaking, Karen, you're mic is muted.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Karen is saying that she's on [inaudible] only.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Okay. I'll take up that part then. Karen is focusing her attention on starting up the Stability and Security Review, and so we'll have less time for us. She's not leaving us, but she'll be less focused on our work as she

has been in the past and so we will have the pleasure of having Patrick Dodson from [SSSI] to work with us taking over most of the heavy lifting that was being carried out by Karen.

I see Patrick's there. Would you like to say a few words, Patrick?

PATRICK DODSON:

Hello, everybody. I was just going to type into the chat. Greetings all. I've already been in conversation with the co-Chairs and a few of the different rapporteurs but looking forward to jumping in and helping out where I can.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you very much, Patrick. And for those who think they recognize the voice, you do indeed. Patrick was part of the Explain Team that worked with us in Work Stream 1 and now has moved over to ICANN and the MSSI Team and he's giving us a hand. So we welcome Patrick to work with us.

The review actions from the previous meeting – I just noted that we didn't produce an official action item list from the 10 March face-to-face meeting, so we'll take that over the net if there's anything.

Dashboard data and completion dates – we've only received three updates to the dashboard, and so we're really asking everyone to focus on this so we can get that done as fast as we can because we really depend on input from the rapporteurs.

Status on open public comments – we have three activities that are going on right now. We have the Good Faith Public Consultation, we have the Transparency Public Consultation, and we have the Jurisdiction Questionnaire, which are all live currently. I will note that all three of these activities have not gotten significant amounts of postings. I believe we have two for Transparency, one for Good Faith, and four for the Jurisdiction Questionnaire. It's common that people post at the end of these public consultations so we're hoping that that will be the case in this.

Finally, one of the action items is that we are working on the extension, and we are hoping to... the point where we are now is working with ICANN Finance to define the key elements of expenses so we can build a budget with the co-Chairs for a full extension of Work Stream 2 to all of fiscal year 2018. That would be from the beginning of July, 2017, to the end of June, 2018. So we hope to be able to do that in the coming weeks and be able to post that to the public consultation on the ICANN Budget.

I see Kavouss' hand up. Actually I'm done here so I'll return to the co-Chair Mathieu.

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you very much, Bernie. I don't know, Kavouss, whether that's a new hand or an old hand.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: No. Old hand. I'm sorry.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Alright. Thank you. No worries.

Christopher, your question in the chat, if your comment hasn't been acted on, I'm quoting you, by the subgroup on Transparency, you indeed are invited to copy and post this for the public consultation probably. That would be my proposed way forward. I'd like to also add an item on this because first of all, welcome Patrick to the team. You've been part of some of the effort in Work Stream 1 and it's good to have you with us, supporting this group in this new capacity as well. And I understand you haven't come empty-handed. You have a special gift for Kavouss that you want to share.

PATRICK DODSON:

I don't know if I can take credit for it. I did want to update everybody on the group. For those of you who recall the pilot program that we did back in February or late January with the Diversity Subgroup Team, on a single call we introduced real-time English language captioning. We're actually looking to turn that service on for all subgroup and plenary calls in English language captioning. This will simply show up in another message pod on the Adobe Connect room. It will allow us to follow along for those of us who are not native English speakers, it will also provide a faster capture of the conversation than the transcript service that we're currently using which carries a few days' delay before it is posted.

This should be up and running hopefully in the next week or two. We're working with the vendor to get this set up, but this will also help replace

the detailed note taking that some members of staff, myself included, have been making on the calls. We will still monitor and capture in the notes section of the agenda as well as any action items and follow-up efforts and also decisions made, but the complete transcripts will now be handled by a professional service. So we're looking forward to having that for everybody and it means that in very short order after each of the calls that occur, we will have the captioning posting as well as the actual recording of the calls. Transcripts will still follow a few days later so we have those for the record, but we will monitor that as well and working with everybody on this group to see if that's still a necessary step or if the captioning can effectively replace that. And that would actually help us on some of the costs involved in that service as well.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Excellent, Patrick. Thank you very much. This is a great improvement. I'm sure it's going to be of great use for our group considering the amount of calls that are taking place and the importance of having staff support-focused on value added tasks.

And last point on Administration, following up on the update on the public comments and the questionnaire. I would suggest to have an e-mail list exchange to identify who is aware of people preparing submissions for the various public comments open so we can ensure that we have sufficient feedback, maybe encourage others to chime in. I think that would be extremely helpful. So my suggestion is for an action item for staff to see if [inaudible] request on the list to assess which organizations or parts of ICANN or individuals actually are preparing comments for the various public input periods that are currently open

because we need to be very aware that if basically if we have very little feedback, that might be raising suspicions about the integrity of our process and its ability to actually engage with the various stakeholders. So it's really important that we can make sure we are getting the right type and the right level of feedback across the various organizations.

I see Sebastien's hand is up. Sebastien, is that a comment on this or another topic?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Mathieu. Can you hear me okay?

MATHIEU WEILL: Yes.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Thank you. It was finally both – it was for the previous topics – I wanted to ask a question about the captioning and the request for interpretation in the Diversity Group. Any link or it's two different topics? Anyhow, what is the answer where we are with this request from the Diversity Group?

But before I give you back the floor I wanted to [hear] from you – I wanted to do that at the end in Any Other Business but as you asked for with public comments – it's just to inform you that the ICANN Ombuds Office Subgroup is now working with the reviewer team and they start some interviews and they may interview some of you. But in the same time we are working, they are working with us on the survey, then

survey will be sent out in the next few days I guess, maybe end of this week or beginning of next week. It's not as such a public comment and it will not be treated like that, but it's an element of a request from inputs from various participant of ICANN to answer those question and it's belonging to our Work Stream 2 and to you, too. Thank you.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thanks, Sebastien. You're invited to actually share this survey when it's open on the full list. That would be certainly useful. And Patrick provided an answer on your first question actually two different topics – captioning and translation for Diversity Group. The Diversity Group official request has been sent now to ICANN very recently, and so it's in process basically. Hope that helps.

And with that, I think that concludes our Administration agenda item. I'm now going to move to my esteemed co-Chair Leon for the Legal Committee update.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, esteemed Mathieu. We have pending the reply from ICANN Legal on the Jurisdiction questions that were sent to them to answer and they acknowledge that they received those questions and they told us that they would back to us as soon as they could. And I sent a reminder to Sam Eisner on this issue asking her for an estimate date for a reply, but I haven't got any reply from her to this reminder. So the update is that we have not received these answers from ICANN Legal and we don't have an estimate time for the answers from ICANN Legal. So that will be the Legal Committee update on my side, and now I

would like to turn to my esteemed co-Chair Thomas for our next agenda item.

Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Leon. The next agenda item I have to improvise a little bit because I'm still trying to get into the Adobe room. I've been traveling so I apologize for that. But we're now going to have the second reading of the SO/AC Accountability paper, and I would like to ask the rapporteurs of that group to take over and introduce what they've done in the meantime.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thomas, I might just get us started on that if you like.

THOMAS RICKERT: Please do.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Both Steve and Farzie, co-rapporteurs with me on this, are on the call and I'll be very quick to handing over to them.

I just wanted to recognize our mutual appreciation for the comments and edits following your comments that came out of our first reading at our face-to-face meeting. Steve's going to be taking you through the red line results of what the work team has done as a result of those comments and suggestions from the Plenary meeting. I also wanted to

recognize the additional work that Steve did in Copenhagen which those of you who've read his updates on our behalf on our work will know he took the time to do a deep dive really with a number of other community leaders within the GNSO.

So with that, I just wanted to note for the record the additional work that's being done by fellow co-rapporteurs on all of this and hopefully mark a little bit of appreciation from the Plenary on that as well.

So Steve, red lines up, over to you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Cheryl. It's Steve DelBianco with GNSO, and this won't take long to do a second reading since we made very selective edits on our call following the Plenary in Copenhagen. But the edits are significant because I think they reflect that we took on board the feedback that all of you gave us in Copenhagen, both at the Plenary on Friday as well as meetings that happened during the week.

On the Executive Summary on page one – and this was circulated about a week ago – on the Executive Summary, the key change here is that we note that the Best Practices, as opposed to “might be considered by all the SOs, ACs, and groups,” we went with a stronger language suggesting that they should, “Implement the Best Practices to the extent the practices are applicable and an improvement over present practices.”

We continue to say, “We are not recommending changes to the ICANN Bylaws to reflect the Best Practices.” So we went from “may consider”

to “should consider” to “should implement.” And I think that that is reflective of so many of the comments that we heard in Copenhagen.

We go on to suggest – and I’ll detail this in a later page – that, “The Accountability and Transparency Review Teams – or the ATRTs – in the future should be encouraged to examine the extent to which Best Practices such as this have been implemented among SOs, ACs, and groups.” And when I get to that detail page, since we’re only now on the Executive Summary, I’ll explain that we have to be cognizant that the ATRT has so much on their plate when they do a review that we don’t suggest that we require them to perform an entire review such as this SO/AC and team did. So I get to that on a subsequent page.

And then finally on the Executive Summary, we took on board the suggestions from many of you that, “Some aspect of this mutual accountability ought to be preserved, even if only an optional conversation once a year at the annual meeting.” And I’ll cover that in detail when we get to page 32.

For now I’d like to quickly advance to page 3, and this is a change that was made at the request of John Curran on behalf of the numbering organizations as well as the IETF, I realize that those groups are part of ICANN. The ICANN Bylaws gave them roles within ICANN, but, “None of these Accountability Best Practices or Transparency Best Practices or any of them, should reflect any obligation on the numbering organizations or the IETF on the activities that they perform outside the scope of ICANN.”

So this is to clarify something that's not even controversial that we are only speaking of the activities of outside groups when those outside groups participate within the ICANN process. I think that makes great sense and we repeated it at the top of Track 1.

Now I can quickly advance to page 6, and page 6 is the summary table of the Best Practices. And the significant change to this is under "Transparency." Michael Karanicolas, who is one of the co-rapporteurs along with Chris Wilson on Transparency, had indicated some potential reasons – in this case five specific reasons – that we could suggest to the ACs and SOs that you could cite as the reasons for you to close a meeting instead of having it open to the public, your meeting would be closed to your members only. So there's no suggestion in here that you cannot close a meeting, but if you did close a meeting these are five reasons that a Transparency expert has suggested would be completely appropriate. As you suggest, "Here's why we're closing this particular Business Constituency meeting on March the 15th because we are going to have an invasion of personal privacy with the medical records." So these are really offered as suggestions.

We also cleaned up the way we refer in Item #5, cleaned up the way we refer to notes, minutes, and records, of all membership meetings. So we tried to be expansive with respect to that because some of you [knew] do a summary which I would call a notes. Some of you do more detailed reports of your meetings and call them minutes, and for others there are other records that are kept including recordings or chat transcripts. So to try to be expansive, we're suggesting, "Notes, minutes, or records, of membership meetings should be made publicly available." And it may be that for a closed meeting you keep a summary of actions taken and

not disclosing in that summary any of the confidential items that gave rise to the reasons for you to close the meeting so that it was available only to your members. And I hope that helps there.

So now we can take a look at the next page because on the bottom of “Outreach” we are trying to give some recognition to the dimension of diversity. And we suggested here on Item #5 under “Outreach” that, “Each of the ACs and SOs and groups should have a strategy for outreach to parts of your targeted community that may not be significantly participating at the time.” And we added the phrase, “while also seeking diversity within membership ranks.”

So the key here to Outreach is each of you do outreach to the community you serve. So the Business Constituency does outreach to the Business Community, and we may target our outreach to parts of the world where businesses do not yet belong as members of the BC. And that alone fulfills our obligation to serve our community. However, let’s add a full recognition that we would also seek diversity within membership ranks. And that diversity could be further defined, depending on the work of the Diversity Subgroup here in Work Stream 2, as to whether you’re going to qualify that to suggest gender or other forms of diversity – linguistic – and if that comes up, we’ll add it to the Best Practice. But we didn’t want to get in front of the work of Sebastien’s group.

The very bottom of page 7 and the top of page 8 – it’s a little difficult for me to show them both because of the page break that is in here – but we did want to indicate that these Best Practices are not recommended to be installed into ICANN’s Bylaws nor would the Bylaws require an

implementation of Best Practices. Let's keep in mind that the Bylaws would be no place for Best Practices since those practices change over time, but more importantly I don't think those Bylaws should tell the SOs and ACs how they must behave but merely give them a normative and suggestive set of Best Practices that they can use.

There was significant interest in Copenhagen to see some sort of follow-up, that if we just published these Best Practices in the middle of 2017 and then they went away forever, that we really wouldn't be following up on what we approved when we came up with the Accountability report in order to suggest that SO and AC Accountability become part of ICANN's culture. And I want to remind you that all of us in the CCWG in Recommendation #10 of our final proposal – I'm scrolling it up on the screen for you all – is that we said, "In Work Stream 2 we should include the subject of SO and AC Accountability as part of the work on the Accountability and Transparency review process." So that was Recommendation #10 approved by all the Chartering Organizations and authored by those of us in the CCWG.

So to follow up on that, we suggest that, "The future ATRT could examine the extent to which the SO/AC groups have implemented the Best Practices in the areas of this report." This could be added as a suggested issue in the ICANN Bylaws in Section 46B because that's the place in the Bylaws where potential ATRT issues are listed. They're not listed as if they must be covered by the ATRT and they're not listed as things that can only be covered by the ATRT. As you know, in the new Bylaws in Section 46 the community appoints the members of the review teams and then the review teams themselves look to the Bylaws to set guidance on how it is they conduct the review.

So for ATRT, there are sentences with respect to examining ICANN's accountability but what we suggest we could add is that, "The Accountability and Transparency Review Team could also look at whether Best Practices have been implemented by SO/ACs and groups in the areas of accountability, transparency, participation, and outreach." That would be a tremendously difficult task if this 21-member review team had to look at all of the SOs, ACs, and groups, and do the same kind of deep dive review that we've done for the past several months. That isn't anticipated. What's anticipated is that, "The ATRT, if it wanted to, could look at these Annual Reports that the SOs, ACs, put out, compare them to Best Practices, and pass some sort of an evaluation as to whether there's progress towards accountability, transparency, outreach, and participation, among the ACs and SOs created by ICANN." So I hope that that will help and we are firmly recommending it be changed in the Bylaws, but remember that it can be also placed in the documented procedures for the Accountability and Transparency Reviews.

The documented procedures is a project that ICANN staff and Board have undertaken for several months. I've yet to see a first draft of it, but when it comes out that would be the place where topics like this and suggestions could be made available to a review team as soon as they convened.

I see a question in the chat. Christopher Wilkinson.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Just a minute while I unmute.

Good afternoon. Steve, I have two points about this. One is a question of the English language and the other is a question of interpretation. I've referred in everything I've written, to gender balance. I think gender balance is quite distinct from all other aspects of diversity. Contrary-wise, I think it's misleading to subsume gender balance into diversity and I would be pleased if that distinction in language could be made in general and specifically in this report.

I also need a little bit of help from you about what happened to the mutual accountability question. I've noticed in one of the recent documents that convening a Mutual Accountability Conference is an option, whereas in the working group where I worked with you on this we strongly recommended that the mutual accountability question should be deferred, and from point of view of labeling it, should be more about mutual transparency [as] in mutual accountability.

I'm just wondering where has the push-back come from. Who or which SO/AC is actually arguing for the Mutual Accountability Conference that was proposed and has, to the best of my recollection, received very little support. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Christopher. Your first suggestion was with respect to the dimensions of diversity that we added to the aspect of outreach. And Christopher, we are not going to get in front of the Work Stream 2 Diversity Subgroup. We will wait for that group to suggest, when it finishes its work, whether the specific dimensions of diversity would be added to that fifth Best Practice under Outreach. For now, we suggest

diversity without specific dimension and we will wait for the work of the Transparency Group.

With regard to the Mutual Accountability Roundtable, we're going to go to the very next and final item that we wanted to cover on this call which was page 32, regarding the Mutual Accountability Roundtable. So I'd like to walk through that first, and in so doing, I believe I will address the question you raised. But keep in mind, if you were present in Copenhagen, Christopher, the members of the CCWG who all represent different parts of the community indicated a significant interest in preserving some opportunity for mutual accountability conversations – I guess that's maybe what to call it, a mutual accountability conversation – as an option. Inside of the Work Stream 2 Group for SO and AC Accountability, we did not believe in our initial first reading that it should be implemented but we are trying to be very responsive to the Plenary of CCWG since it's not the subgroup but rather the Plenary whose views would be presented to the community for public comment.

Let me turn now to the page 32 and 33, where we describe another way to handle Mutual Accountability Roundtable as opposed to – we didn't recommend deferral, Christopher. We recommended not implementing it. We suggested that the SO and AC Chairs and the group Chairs already have a standing e-mail list and that they may at their option convene calls and meetings at any time. We said that that created an appropriate and an adequate form for the sharing of experiences and Best Practices. But those of you in the Plenary at CCWG in Copenhagen suggested let's tee it up as something that could be done, and here's what we've come up with.

This was a suggestion that came from the audience and we did our best to accommodate it. We noted the significant interest among CCWG participants in having a regular conversation or discussion about accountability. So we suggested that, “The ICANN meeting planning staff would take these steps prior to each Annual General Meeting – so it’s once a year – and it’s two steps. The ICANN staff would by e-mail ask the Chairs of all the SO/ACs whether they wished to hold a Mutual Accountability Roundtable or conversation to discuss accountability with respect to activities within ICANN’s scope. If a majority of the SO and AC Chairs agreed to do this, then ICANN staff would put onto the agenda for the Annual General Meeting a 90-minute public session. It would be open to all the SO and AC Group Chairs and open to the public, and it would be joined by the ICANN CEO and Board Chair. And the Chair would designate a moderator for the conversation or the session. “

That reflects the final change. I now wanted to turn back to my co-rapporteurs for anything else they wanted to add and then we’ll turn back to the queue.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Farzie, did you want to make any contributions at this stage?

Thanks, Farzie.

With that then, Steve, one of the things that I think we can ask now is whether or not the Plenary is in fact happy for us to take this as a second reading with the Plenary and with no significant or substantial edits being proposed or discussed – or at least not that I can see in chat

at this stage although I note Kavouss' hand is still up so I shall hold that thought.

Sorry, Kavouss. Over to you please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. I have two questions and one general principle question which is to the Plenary, not to you. The question to you or to Steve is that in the outreach mentioned, the membership ranking, do we have any ranking for membership – one is higher than the other or one is lower than the other or one is subordinate to the other? This [inaudible] this ranking of member I don't understand. This is the first.

Second, the issue of implementation of this Best Practice recommendation. Before Copenhagen we had the term "to be considered." In Copenhagen we discuss and put a little bit more [inaudible] that [inaudible] considered. And now I see in the paragraph, it is mentioned "requires." "Required" is much stronger than "urged," so I wonder why you have departed from what at least discussed in Copenhagen still remain "urged" but not "required." So you could not put "requires this" because that was not agreed at the first one.

And then [inaudible].

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Kavouss. I'll reply quickly. There is no "require." I don't know where you saw that word. I have the Executive Summary on the screen and it says, "recommend." There is no requirement.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: No. Somebody says that all ACs are required to implement because the paper [inaudible].

STEVE DELBIANCO: Right. It says “recommend.” There is no requirement. By no means did we do that.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I saw the “required” but I can’t find it because the page is not available to me. It is not I don’t have access to the document, as I’ve mentioned before. And then it was search, [inaudible] required to [receive] that. So we don’t want to see “required.” So if there is “required” it is a mistake. One area says “recommended.” The other says “required.” [Inaudible]. It is subject to verification. But I saw that one there at the end you said that it’s required to do that [inaudible] but I don’t – I cannot turn out the pages. [inaudible] maybe Executive Summary that you want to require to do that.

This is the second thing [inaudible].

THOMAS RICKERT: [Inaudible] can we do a run through the document and confirm that the word “require” is not included so that is taken on board? But we see on our screens in front of us is “recommend” and not the word “required.” But it will be double checked, Kavouss.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thomas and Kavouss, let me clarify that the word “require” shows up when we say that, “The SOs and ACs should not be required,” and that is at the bottom of page 7. We are not recommending [inaudible].

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Could you bring up page 7?

STEVE DELBIANCO: That’s right – at the end of page 7 where it says they should “not” be required. But Kavouss, feel free to do a more thorough review. You’re part of this group and you understand fully that there is no recommendation that any of this be required on the part of the SOs and ACs, and “recommended” was all that was there.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Could you bring page 7 please?

STEVE DELBIANCO: And then, Kavouss, remind me of your first question please. Your first question had something to do with ranks. So let me see if I can address that rank. I’m scrolling to page 7. You can see the bottom of page 7 on the screen.

There is no ranking of SOs and ACs. The way we described diversity, Kavouss, we said that SOs and ACs should do outreach while also

seeking diversity within their membership ranks. I used that expression in English to simply convey [inaudible] membership.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: [Inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's a collective term, Kavouss. In English, it's a commonly used collective term. We can do a thesaurus and see if there's a replacement for that if it worries you deeply. It does not imply any form of hierarchy, rather a collective gathering thereof.

Is there any more, Kavouss, because you have Julie's hand up as well?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: The [more] question is that at the beginning I understood that there is no change to the Bylaw, and now understand that there must be some change to the Bylaw.

STEVE DELBIANCO: No.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: You said that [inaudible] the Bylaw to be changed.

STEVE DELBIANCO: There's no recommendation to change the Bylaws. There is no.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: If it is no change to the Bylaw, how we proceed with this? Where it goes?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Kavouss. It appears that your concerns are all non-issues in terms of we'll just make sure alternate terminologies are looked at so that there will be no further confusion on that.

Julie, over to you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I am [inaudible] if none of these recommendations appear in the Bylaw, good. Then after this meeting why don't [inaudible] the document as a reference document for the ICANN [we see] it would be one recommendation of the CCWG not for inclusion in the Bylaw [that was] sufficient to the ICANN Board for approval. So where all these appear [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much for that, Kavouss. We're moving to Julie now. These additional concerns which would in fact come into any form of decision-making and text editing process that is probably going to happen after public comment can be raised in our work team meeting this week. I look forward to adding that to our agenda.

Over to you, Julie.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Cheryl. Can you hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes we can.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you. I just wanted to make an observation with regard to where we've got to with the Mutual Accountability Roundtable. I haven't listened to the transcript from Copenhagen recently but my understanding was that a couple of people spoke to actually add to the recommendation of the subgroup to do something more with the Mutual Accountability Roundtable, but I don't recall a real temperature of the room being taken on that issue. One or two people spoke. And then we seemed to move on quite quickly and I recall feeling at the time, if I'd realized that we were going to agree to that, I might have spoken out in support of the group's original proposal that this need not be such a formal proposal.

I commend what the subgroups have proposed to satisfy those comments that were made, but my understanding of where we got to there was that we were proposing something even less formalized than what you have suggested, rather that this was a conversation that could perhaps become part of other meetings that were happening between the Chairs on an annual basis, not necessarily something as formal as you've proposed. What I don't want to do is have the subgroup's hard work all backtracked but I just observe that I think I'm not sure that the

lack of support for the subgroup's original position – that is, we don't support a Mutual Accountability Roundtable – was as widespread as has been reacted to and I'm just concerned that what is proposed is really more formal than I was thinking we'd agreed to. Thank you.

THOMAS RICKERT: Steve, will you take that?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Julie, we definitely took a sense of the room without conducting a poll in Copenhagen. And later in the week when I discussed it with all of the leaders of the GNSO and all of the groups that were within there, their inclinations was that it should not be required, and that matches with what we had recommended, but they didn't mind that it be an option. But it would take the majority of the SO and AC Chairs to initiate the conversation. So you're right. We didn't take a poll of the room and I would invite the Chairs today here and now to do such a poll if you're inclined because that would help to give our group some idea of what the Plenary wants in this first reading. And you'll have to admit there was several folks who felt very strongly that some aspect of this mutual accountability conversation should be preserved at least as an opportunity.

So we are trying to react to what the Plenary here is interested in and I'm open to have the Chairs conduct either a conversation or a poll on whether we make it an option – which is what is currently shown on page 32 – an option of the SO and AC Chairs, or we could return to our

original recommendation which was to not have any recommendation for implementation.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Our intention from the work team meeting which came up with this new text was to take a very light touch on this as a minor course correction to a stated option instead of a outright negative approach – not perhaps outright but a fairly negative approach – which is where we were before.

Julie, did you have a follow-up? I note your hand is still up.

JULIE HAMMER: Sorry, Cheryl. Yes. I just wanted to say I agreed with the concept of having an option to have a discussion but my main comment is I thought this was much more formal proposal for that option than I was anticipating. But I do respect the hard work that the sub-team has put in and the last thing I want to do is to cause you further work by backtracking.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Julie. And believe me, the last thing the work team wants to do is go down the rabbit hole of MAR ever again, but it seems to be like a black hole and keeps sucking us all back in as we desperately try and escape from it.

With that metaphor reeling in your minds, let's go to Jordan. We're not hearing you, Jordan. While staff assist Jordan in sorting out his audio connect issues, let's go to Sebastien. Sebastien, over to you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We're not hearing you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sebastien, we're not hearing you.

Third time lucky. Let's try Greg. Greg, glad your audio is connected.

GREG SHATAN: Can you hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can, Greg. Go ahead while the others get their audios sorted. Over to you.

GREG SHATAN: Yeah. I think Julie makes a good point that the term "mutual accountability" implies the concept of mutual accountability beyond merely that of the roundtable, and a mutual discussion of accountability is different from a format where SO/ACs actually hold each other to account and by corollary, engage in oversight of the other SO/ACs and presumably SGs, Cs, and RALOs, and whatever other groups might be within the circle or partially in the circle.

So I think maybe we want to... I realize the report tries to walk a middle ground but I think that I would suggest – sorry to do this on a second reading – that perhaps rather than calling it a Mutual Accountability Roundtable, may we call it a Roundtable Discussion of Accountability?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Greg. I don't know how you're managing to pick the brains of the co-rapporteurs of this group by such distances, but what we really wanted to wrap on our second reading was to in fact suggest to the Plenary – if indeed the Plenary was satisfied with the second reading in the main – that we would take back to the work team our subject matter to look at [new] nomenclature because we feel the nomenclature is still not doing justice to the intent and so as you note in the chat, Farzie's already suggested the removal of the word "mutual" and for whatever reason, if you seem to be scarily telepathic because you've just said exactly what we were going to offer to do – take that specific matter back to our work team and see what we could come up with. So thank you for that, Greg. Did you have a further point? I'm going to assume no, Greg. Therefore move and see whether we have Jordan.

Jordan, is your audio connected now?

JORDAN CARTER: I hope so. Is it?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It is. We can hear you. Go ahead, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: Hi, Jordan Carter, .nz. One of the ccNSO reps. I think that renaming this thing might be a useful way through it because what seems to be the fear is that I think someone else called it a circular firing squad or something. Trying to get a better discussion of accountability within the ICANN community was the reason I supported this all the way through. We take away this sort of fear of people being picked on and just make sure that this is a way to put accountability on the agenda of the long term once this Accountability Working Group is long gone, I think that has sort of achieved what I've been looking for which is making sure that we're thinking about these things and that all of the SOs and ACs are involved in discussions not to try and tell each other what to do but to make sure that they are thinking about the impact of their actions on ICANN and how they can all work together to hold ICANN to account on behalf of the global Internet community.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Jordan. Sounds like we're coming into an agreement on something as a next step.

Sebastien, let's check your audio now.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Can you hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can hear you. Go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Thank you. I am sorry to disappoint you, Cheryl, but I really feel that this organization not just to have silo accountability but also accountability each one with the other, and I don't see why the people are pushing against Mutual Accountability Roundtable. I hope that our government can be accountable to us and I hope that end user can be accountable to everyone else, and then I don't see where is the problem.

The way we discuss it, it was quite difficult to [came] with this sort of discussion at the beginning of the work of the working group because we were in a hurry to go to other tasks and it may be why it came back during the Plenary. I have no problem to have that back to the subgroup but I really think we need to be careful on what we want to do and I am really sorry if people doesn't want to have mutual accountability. How we can set up an organization – sorry, a global system, whatever name you want to give for the full ICANN – and I know that I may have some trouble with the English here, but please, I will stay very firmly on the need for something will allow some mutuality, some mutual exchanges, and accountability. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sebastien. And it's in fact what you articulated which the work team was trying to respond to in its change for this option.

Kavouss, we come back to you. Go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I fully support what Sebastien said. We do not agree to leave it as it is and I do not agree what Julie mentioned that it would really result in conflict. It would not resolve it – resolve to improvement. Everyone is trying to resolve it. There is no [inaudible] so please kindly consider I am supporting the idea and we need not leave it as it is and we have to really be more positive in this system, more objective. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Kavouss.

And with that, I'm going to suggest that the work team has its marching orders on this in terms of looking at the nomenclature and making some perhaps minor course corrections associated with additional thinking that it may come up with in response to this second reading. So unless anyone else has any general comments – and I'm not seeing anybody with their hands up – the work team will take only that section back. We will accept the other red lines within the text, and we'll take that section back and look at nomenclature in terms of hopefully putting to bed for final – well penultimate until it goes out to public comment I guess – effort of getting the accountability conversation mutualism and other aspects of MAR finally tied up in some sort of recommendation bale.

With that, I'd like to hand back to our extremely patient co-Chairs. Thank you very much.

THOMAS RICKERTL

Thanks very much, Cheryl. In terms of procedure, let me just double check with you in terms of the next steps. You just mentioned that you want to take this back to your group for some edits. I was hoping that we could do a consensus call on the second reading today and my recommendation would be – or my suggestion would be – that we take the document as it is, and as far as I can recollect there’s only one edit that seemed to have received sufficient traction to be changed, and that is removing the word “mutual.”

The idea is maybe to do the consensus call with only one edit and that would be removal of the word “mutual,” and the reason for my suggestion to do that is that I think looking at the word “mutual” from the outside might make the recommendations appear limited to only mutual accountability issues while I think the core theme of this work is accountability of the SOs and ACs to their respective communities and beyond.

Steve, you have raised your hand please.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Thomas. On the screen of Adobe, I have the first of two edits. I wanted to correct you on that. The first edit that we would be seeking a consensus on – and I realize that our subgroup doesn’t meet until tomorrow – but we would be grateful if you wanted to do a consensus call if the consensus call included at least the two edits that came up by the rapporteurs on this call.

One is that the word “mutual” be stricken on page 32 at the two places you see it on page 32 on the screen in front of you. So it would be an Accountability Roundtable, not a Mutual Accountability Roundtable.

And the second change is on page 7 where under Outreach we said, “while seeking diversity within membership ranks,” we would drop the word “ranks” since that perhaps didn’t translate well to speakers of other languages and we did not intend to imply that there was a ranking. So we would drop the word “ranks” from Item #5 on page 7 which is right on the screen in front of you. And with those two changes I guess we would be grateful to know whether there’s consensus.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks for reminding me of that, Steve, and I think it’s good to point out that discussion about ranks again which I think we only concluded in the chat and not on the audio. So with those two changes in mind, are there any objections to accepting this as a successful second reading? I’m not looking for support. Only if you object to this please do make yourself heard.

I see that Sebastien’s hand is raised. Please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yeah. I guess it was clear that I think that the word “mutual” need to stay to this document and I keep saying that for the rest of the community. It’s okay but this one I can’t agree and I think it will be a mistake for ICANN to not allow some mutual accountability between and within the different structure of this organization. Thank you.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks very much, Sebastien. I don't see any other hands raised, so it looks like Sebastien, you're the only person on this call at least that is against making such change, and in accordance with usual work practices that we have, if such proposal doesn't get sufficient traction we would leave the view of the majority of this group in the document.

I see that Avri's also supporting this, so that makes two that want to leave the language in place.

Let's just bear in mind that we do not at the moment do a consensus call on the very document, that we are doing the second reading to put it out for public comment. So I would suggest that those who are in favor of keeping the language "mutual" in the report make themselves heard with their comments so that the rest of the community sees this or the subteam might also consider adding this as a remark for the public comment publication. I think it's actually three people – I think Kavouss also support to leave it in there – and then let's see how the community reacts to this and if there's sufficient traction for us to reinsert the word, so be it. But for the time being I see most traction for removing that word.

So, Sebastien, do you have a follow-up question?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Sorry. I was out of the room as soon as you started talk about me. The Adobe Connect closed the window and I don't know what was said, but I just hear your last few sentence. I want to – sorry – humbly disagree. If

we are not able to have a real time – and let’s leave that within the subgroup, not in the Plenary – to have this frank and full discussion on that and you put that into the comments, it’s not good. I don’t think this item have already get a sufficient keep and [calm] discussion of what we are thinking about that, what it is under the word of “mutual.” Maybe it’s is a problem of what you think in one language and not in another. Maybe it’s something else. And I would like to ask you that this go back to the subgroup before being a battle between the one who suggested the comment and the one who disagree with the document. It’s not yet this time of the work. Sorry for that, but I really feel that we need to have more time to discuss this specific issue, for example, within the subgroup. Thank you.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks very much, Sebastien. You mentioned that you want to take this back to the subteam and not have it discussed by the Plenary, but please to bear in mind that we now had two full discussions on this topic with the Plenary and the idea of this whole working methodology is that the subteam prepare something and that it then goes to the Plenary for discussion and for potential changes, and only in those cases where substantial revisions needed to be made that could not be done by collective drafting in the Plenary we would give the documents back to the subteams for refinement.

I guess in this specific incident, given the lengthy discussion that we had, there are only two minor tweaks – I’m not saying that these are minor in terms of the importance that you link to them – but they’re minor edits in terms of everyone can follow what the final stage of the

document will be and therefore I would suggest that we proceed as I suggested, with asking for objections to publishing the document and making this a successful second reading. But I will certainly [steer] to listen to the views of my co-rapporteurs as well as the rapporteurs of the co-Chairs and the rapporteurs of the subteam and then we might need to revisit this.

I see Steve's hand is up. Steve, please.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Yeah, just for the benefit of those who are not in Adobe, I am confident but not positive that our subgroup would happily drop the word "mutual" if it came back to the subgroup as Sebastien suggested. I'm confident in that since our subgroup did not even recommend proposing the roundtable as an option, and was instead offering that in respect of the level of interest that was shown in Copenhagen.

So it really doesn't serve a significant purpose, Sebastien, to have the subgroup reconsider. I think it's not likely the subgroup would decide to retain the word "mutual" since this peer-to-peer accountability is not something that our subgroup was ever comfortable recommending. Thank you, Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks very much, Steve. I see Avri's hand is up and then I think we need to move on.

Avri, please.

AVRI DORIA:

Yes. Thank you. Forgive me for coming in at the end of this and to [inaudible] group, forgive me for being such a poor member and only half paying attention half of the time. I actually think that if it comes back to the group I will join Sebastien in arguing for mutual accountability. I was very disappointed and somewhat disheartened at the beginning of the group's work where we threw out the notion of the Mutual Accountability Roundtable, but that went by in such a blur that it went by and such.

I think that having come up with a notion of an optional Mutual Accountability Roundtable, I prefer that it be required but optional is okay, that the group having come up with that and having presented it in the second reading is that if we're accepting this as a second reading we should send it through with the word "mutual accountability" in it and let the people who object to that comment on it. To say that we'll take the word out and let anybody that wants it to be mutual to please argue for putting it on is not really a fair way to do it in that most of the people reading it won't even know about the notion of mutuality of accountability in this.

So I think it's important that if we are going to call this a successful second reading, we leave it as it is. If we want to edit it, then I think we do have to send it back to the subgroup for fixing and rediscussing the issue. And Steve, I am not at all sure that you're going to have an easy going at removing the word "mutual." Of course, I have to stay awake for the meeting, but I don't think it's as certain as you think it might be. Thank you.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much. Cheryl, you've raised your hand as well.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Thomas. Hopefully I'm heading where you may be wanting to take us. Based on these conversations and also the interactions in chat we seem to have no objection to the two minor edits being adopted as discussed today, and so much non-bipartisoned deeply held views as we had when we discussed this issue of Mutual Accountability Roundtable in our work group, and I don't know how it went by in a blur to some of us, Avri, but it was probably the single most time-consuming issue at the beginning of our work. In fact, it was almost becoming an impediment to our progress. So I certainly think that it's unlikely that we're going to budge the edges of the bell curve toward the middle, so take it perhaps as is in the current text to public comment and let the wider community weigh in which I believe is what Avri just said – and Julie also. Thank you.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Cheryl. So we heard from the rapporteurs as well so I would suggest that as hopefully an agreeable compromise that we make sure that when the document is put out for public comment that we make explicit mentioning of the discussion about the word, whether to be included or not because I agree with you, Avri, that the community members commenting on the document might not request inclusion of the document if it's not present.

I think that with that we can now ask for objections for the successful second reading. I would like to ask those that do object to second reading to be successful, tick the red box in the Adobe functionality. No green tick, but red ticks if you object. Let me pause for a moment that you can find it in your Adobe. It's where you can raise your hand and say "disagree" with the red tick.

Okay. Who's that? I thought somebody wanted to speak.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's me relieved at no red ticks, Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT: I think that's great. So we can now conclude this agenda item but before we do, I would like to summarize where we are. We have the document through the second reading. It will be published with the two minor edits that we discussed. We will make sure that with the publication of the document for public comment we will explicitly mention the discussion about the word "mutual" so that the community is aware of this and can chime in in support either of the options in terms of this language.

I see that there are two hands up. Do we need to reopen the discussion? I would like to ask you to be very brief.

Cheryl first and then Sebastien.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I suggest Sebastien go first because mine is not a substantive [inaudible] change but rather something to do with the work group.

THOMAS RICKERT: Sebastien, then you go first please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Thomas. But if you ask for something and we have tools, then I would like to be that the tool are taken into account and I guess I put a red tick and I don't see how you can have none and it was not say just by you but I guess Cheryl say the same – there was no objection. You force me to be more disagreeing that I want to be, but I am very disappointed that nobody saw my red tick and I want to stick with that. Then I oppose strongly with going to the comments with this document now.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Sebastien. Let us make sure that we note your opposition as is already coming up in the notes section. I actually got word through our chat that Leon saw your red tick, so I apologize for not having spotted that. We will also make sure in the notes that this is not a full consensus by the group, but consensus. So rest assured that your diverging view on this is adequately noted.

Since Cheryl wants to be last in this conversation, I would suggest we hear Greg first, then Cheryl, then we will be needing to move on.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. Just a question which I asked in the chat. What is the overall position of the group? I don't recall it and I don't have scroll control. The overall position on mutual accountability as a larger concept, is this something we are enacting overall? It seems to me that if we are, then maybe a Mutual Accountability Roundtable is just an implementation detail. But if we're not, then it seems quite the opposite that we're somehow putting forth a concept that is not otherwise being adopted, and kind of bringing in mutual accountability on a one-time only or three times a year only basis, which to my mind doesn't actually seem like a method of actual accountability or oversight. And at the same time, I have no objection to discussions of accountability achievements or challenges by groups, but if mutual accountability is not an overall concept I don't see where a Mutual Accountability Roundtable comes from. Thank you.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks very much, Greg. I suggest we include a debate on that when we continue our work on this document after we get public comments back.

Cheryl, I would like to hand over to you for your final remarks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I notice Steve's hand up, though, Thomas. What is it, Steve?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Greg, the subgroup was strongly against having one AC or SO try to hold some other AC or SO accountable to it. That was rejected out of hand.

The conclusion was that each SO and AC is accountable to the members that the ICANN Bylaws designate. And that's on page 4 of our document right from the ICANN Bylaws and I have it on the screen in front of you. So there was no significant support in the subgroup to try to make the SOs and ACs accountable to each other.

However, we are recommending that these Best Practices be shared across all ACs and SOs and that each AC and SO publish an Annual Report to the extent to which it has improved its accountability, transparency, participation, and outreach. And then finally, an option for once a year – not three times a year – an option for once a year to have a conversation about accountability but not a conversation about accountability to each other. And that is why removing the word “mutual” is so significant here and it does reflect what the subgroup wants.

Pursuant to what Thomas suggested, our subgroup meets tomorrow and we will revise our final draft to include a mention that a small minority believe that ACs and SOs should also be accountable to each other, and hopefully get public comment on that topic. Thank you.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Steve. And now finally, Cheryl it's your turn.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Thomas. I'm glad I waited until last. I find myself in absolute opposition to the understanding that my co-rapporteurs have, I actually thought that what we agreed in the deliberations and based on both

Julie's and Avri's interventions in chat and orally, was that we would definitely leave the word "mutual" in despite the fact that it could very well be removed in a post public comment environment because, as I thought you articulated, Thomas, in support of Avri's point that should it be removed, those who have not been living this thrill-packed and exciting topic as long as we have may not even think to add it.

So I certainly come down on the "leave it in but make a note," that in the public comment that we ask the question about if support or removal. I also wanted to ask you though – so that's my added intervention – what I wanted to ask you, the co-Chairs, if this has now gone through a "successful" second reading, are we now up to, in fact, letting staff do the tidy for public comment based on this Plenary discussion? If that answer is yes, then I see no point in us having the meeting tomorrow of our work group, rather that our work again would start in a post public comment environment where we would need to respond, react, discuss, and reframe, text as per public comment input. That was my question to the co-Chairs.

I don't particularly care one way or another. I think we've probably got it to a point where it could be given a quick [inaudible] and ready for public comment post haste with staff control. But if you want a work group to attempt to do it tomorrow, risking being sucked into the black hole of Mutual Accountability Roundtable, I'm sure we'll be happy and willing to do so. Thank you.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks very much, Cheryl.

Now, let me clarify what the proposed way forward was. And if you look at the transcript of this call later you will find out that this was mentioned earlier by me. I think this document does not need to go back to the subteam. So the subteam might be able to cancel its call because the edits that we've discussed and that have been supported by a vast majority of the participants of this call are minor edits. We're talking about changing two words in the report – that is, removal of the word “rank” and its removal of the word “mutual.” These edits can easily be done by staff. They have been noted in the notes section and we can all verify that this has been done.

Additionally, since the discussion that we had on the word “mutual” is important to be brought out to those who want to participate in the public comment period, we will in the announcement where you see where the document is published for public comment, we will mention that there was debate on either having or not having the word “mutual” in there. So my suggestion would be not to put that into the document itself, but to put it in the announcement or in the explanations when we put it up for public comment.

I'm happy for this explanation to be double-checked by the rapporteurs of the subteam, but I do not see any need for revision by the subteam. And also, we just concluded our second reading so I think it's not necessary to unwrap that again.

I see that Cheryl is supporting this. I do not see any other wishes to speak. And therefore I would like to end this conversation by going back to what Cheryl said at the outset, and that is thanking everyone for their hard work on producing the document as well as editing it, taking into

account the wishes of this group. Thank you very much. I'm sorry we could not please everyone, but we have applied the mechanisms that we usually apply in our way towards consensus. So thanks very much, and I'd like to hand back over to Mathieu, I guess it is.

LEON SANCHEZ: It's actually me, Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT: Leon. I apologize.

LEON SANCHEZ: No problem. The next update on second readings that we have planned for today is on the diversity question. So we had the first reading in our previous Plenary call. There were lots of feedback from the Plenary on this questionnaire, and as you can see, we have the red line version on our screens. I hope this is a rather quick walk through the changes. I would like to ask Fiona to walk us through the changes. Fiona, if you are not able to walk us through, I will be glad to do that as well. But as rapporteur of this group I think it's best that you do it [inaudible].

FIONA ASONGA: [Good afternoon] everyone. During the Plenary [inaudible] meeting of the CCWG Accountability [inaudible] first reading of [inaudible]. [inaudible] to the SO/ACs and to the various groups within ICANN.

So the red line document that you have on Adobe [inaudible] the recommendations and the feedback from the [inaudible].

We have discussed it within the subgroup [Inaudible]. And so the document before you is the revised red line document of the changes [proposed] during the meeting. [Inaudible] brief introduction of the ACs, SOs and the groups, and so you have the introduction statement, a description of what we mean by SOs, ACs, and groups [inaudible]. We also open the [parts] to other groups and individuals [inaudible] session interest and/or [inaudible].

LEON SANCHEZ:

Fiona, may I interrupt you. I think that we're having some sound problems and you're very hard to follow what you're telling us.

I think I'll continue with the walkthrough. As you can see, there were some substantial changes to the document. I would kindly ask whomever doesn't have his computer muted, could you please mute your mic so we don't have echo on the call. Thank you.

So these substantive changes can be read on this red line document. Basically there were some changes to the language and – I'm still hearing some echo so I remind you please muting your microphone if you're not speaking.

Okay, so let's try this again.

So there were some inclusions to the language in, for example, the term "physical ability or disability," the "diverse skills," and there was [inaudible] modifications to the set of questions that will be published

and you can see that the first question has now been redrafted to read, “What [relevant] importance does your SO/AC group give to these seven dimensions of diversity?” And it was worded before as “elements” and it was changed. So the set of questions now reads, “What, if any, of the seven dimensions of diversity are important to your SO/AC group?” And we, of course, modified [inaudible] the second question.

Then the third question now reads, “How, if at all, does your SO and AC group measure and track diversity issues related to its work?” which also had some changes.

And the fourth question now reads, “How, if at all, your SO/AC group seek to promote diversity in its membership, its active participation, and its leadership?” As you can see, there were some other clarifying questions attached that have now been removed.

The fifth question now reads, “What, if any, educational, informational, initiatives does your SO/AC group pursue to promote diversity awareness?” And this was also reworded [and] drafted so it could be easily understood.

Then the last question now reads, “What, if any, formal or informal practices [or region or on region] policies pursued in your SO/AC group to promote diversity?”

We are also adding one last paragraph to the questionnaire which encourages anyone to append any additional general comments on the topic of diversity to the reply on the questionnaire. So these are the changes that were made to this questionnaire and I would like to open

the floor for any comments or questions on this second document and now the floor is open for that so I'll give it a couple of seconds to see if we have any questions.

Okay, so seeing none, I would now like to call for any oppositions in having this as a successful second reading and, of course, if there are no objections to this, then we will be asking staff to prepare the document for publication.

Okay, I see green tick from Robin. And I don't see any objections. So this will conclude the second reading of this questionnaire and I would now kindly ask staff to prepare this to be published and, of course, run the public comment on this questionnaire.

Okay, so is there anyone that wants to speak? I think I heard somebody?

Okay, so now I will turn back to my co-Chair, Mathieu, for the next agenda item. Thank you.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thank you. I saw Bernie's hand was up. Maybe we should hear Bernie first.

LEON SANCHEZ:

I'm sorry. I missed that. Thank you for letting me know, Mathieu.

Bernie?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Leon. I will simply remind the group that it was a conclusion from Copenhagen that we would not publish the questionnaire separately for public comment, but that we would integrate it with the draft recommendations from the Diversity Group. So I'm wondering if that still holds the way you presented it.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Bernie, for this reminder. Yes, that still holds and I apologize for making that out.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Very well. We'll note it like this and I think that the Diversity Subgroup has agreed they would present it here for a second reading and they'll present their recommendations for a first and second reading, and then we'll integrate the whole thing for a public comment. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Bernie. And I note that Julie Hammer's hand is up.

Julie?

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks. My understanding of what we agreed in our last subgroup meeting – and I'll stand corrected if Fiona doesn't have the same understanding – was that we need to get this [inaudible] questionnaire out and get responses back, that it will form part of our final report but that there is no reason to stop it being put out to the community to try

and seek responses back to it in advance of the publishing of the final recommendations. Indeed in an ideal world, the responses to this questionnaire would have helped to inform the group's final recommendations, but time may preclude that. So my understanding was that this was to be posted for public comment but that it would additionally form part of our final report with the recommendations. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Julie. So hearing from you and, of course, seeing the many green ticks on the Adobe Connect room, I think we will indeed publish this for public comment and this will, of course, feed back into the subgroup's work so you can produce your report and recommendations accordingly.

So staff, could you please – I see Bernie's hand is up. Bernie?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

I just want to make sure from the staff point of view we understand what we're talking about here because I'm a little unclear. Do we want to publish the questionnaire so we get responses, or do we want to have a public consultation on the questionnaire? These are two very different things and require very different mechanics. At this point, I'm confused.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you, Bernie. My understanding is that we are going to publish this so we can get answers to the questionnaire and not comments on the

questionnaire. So I guess that would be option one as Renata is highlighting on the chat. And I see also Julie Hammer is green ticking, so that would leave us with publishing the questionnaire so that people can answer to the questions.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. All good now.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks. I see Mathieu hand is up. Mathieu?

MATHIEU WEILL: Yes. Sorry to ask a question, but we publish the questionnaire so that the responses form an input [for our] recommendations, that means that we are not going to have recommendations from the Diversity Group until when? Until probably after Johannesburg? Because [Inaudible] the questionnaire is going to take two to three months to get actual answers then analysis then recommendations. Is that the type of timeline we are looking at?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Mathieu. I agree with you. I would turn to Fiona or anyone else on the subgroup to clarify this to the Plenary because I, too, agree that this would take us a long time. So Fiona, could you please clarify this for us?

And I see Fiona's typing on the chat, and what's happening in the chat is that Fiona is asking for guidance as to how long would a public comment take as required within ICANN? Mathieu is answering that 42 days, but [inaudible] SO/AC takes two to three months.

So maybe a middle point for this would be to publish the questionnaire for answers with the reduced timeline. I would, of course, seek the views of this Plenary on whether that would be feasible or whether that would in some way deviate what's intended with [publishing] the questionnaire.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Just a suggestion because I'm conscious of time as well. I think we had the second reading on the questionnaire. There's still some debate on exactly the timeline of publication and whether it waits for [inaudible] group. I guess that question would be best handled first in the Diversity Subgroup, so we should probably put an action item for the Diversity Subgroup to consider the timeline and efficiency [inaudible] of those options and come back with [inaudible]. That would be my suggestion. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you, Mathieu. I think that is a good way to go, then we would have this action item for the subgroup to consider the timeline. I think that as far as the questionnaire is involved, then the second reading has been successful since we all agreed that this is the questionnaire that we would like to have people answer. But we are now going back to the subgroup to ask them to consider the timeline and, of course, come

back to us with their considerations. Does that reflect accurately what you said, Mathieu?

MATHIEU WEILL: Yes. Absolutely. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Perfect. Thank you.

Okay, so I will now turn back to you, Mathieu, for the next agenda item.

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you very much, Leon.

Agenda Item #6 is just a reminder that the next Plenary is on Wednesday, April the 12th, 19:00 UTC, and documents to be considered by this Plenary are due by April the 5th. So that's just a reminder of those topics. And it gives me a good segue into our AOB discussion that Kavouss requested at the beginning of this call regarding the Jurisdiction work plan and progress so far.

Kavouss, I understand your request as having a discussion in the Plenary about this work plan and how the Jurisdiction work group is progressing so far, following up on obviously [Parminder's] e-mail that you shared on the Plenary list but also giving time for others to chime into this discussion. Am I correctly summarizing your requests, Kavouss?

And then Greg, I would turn to you as rapporteur of the subgroup to make sure this is acceptable to you as well so that we're in line about the expectations.

Kavouss? I'm not hearing Kavouss. I don't know if he's still on the call. I'm still seeing Kavouss on the call but I would assume that I have summarized the request accurately and since you, Greg, I know there's a lot of background on my line. I'm very sorry about this. Greg, would you be prepared to give an update on the Jurisdiction work plan and progress during the next Plenary? That's my question.

GREG SHATAN:

Yes, I would be prepared to do that and would expect to work on that with the members of the subgroup in between now and then since it's our work plan and not my work plan. But certainly we can talk about where we are, what we've been doing, where we're going, and some of the challenges that we face, and would be happy to have that conversation and I think is a conversation that was originally... well, it was raised to an extent today, we overnight on the Jurisdiction Subgroup list and seems to have been elevated almost instantaneously to the Plenary and I do think that it's something that deserves renewed focus at the subgroup but we should be able to do that in time for a more well-rounded discussion at the next Plenary. Thanks.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thank you very much, Greg. I think that's an action item. Are there Any Other Business that we would have to right now?

Not seeing any hands I would likely give you 10 minutes of free time before the end of the call and adjourn with 10 minutes in advance.

Thank you very much for your contributions. We made progress today with [Inaudible] second reading successful. I'm looking forward to the next steps. And thank you very much for your constructive contributions. Bye, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]