

---

CCWG-SOAC ACCOUNTABILITY SUBGROUP

Thursday, August 03, 2017 - 19:00 to 20:00

All right, top of the hour, let's get our call started.

[This meeting is now being recorded]

>> CHERYL LANGDON ORR: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening! And today's call is the support organization advisory committee Accountability Subgroup meeting number 27, held the 3rd of August 2017, 19:00 hours UTC. A little bit of administration to begin with, calling for anyone who is only on the audio channel, only on by phone, to let themselves be known. Not hearing anybody, we will take our roll call from the connect room and start from there. Any apologies that have been taken to the list, in addition to that?

I would like to ask now is there anybody who needs to make a change or let us know if anything substantial that is effecting the work we do [indiscernible]. Not hearing anybody there, nothing particularly has obviously changed in our lives, I will move on now to the main part of the meeting.

Just before I begin, I remind you all for the sake of our transcript if before you speak, if are you making a statement, if you could state your name and speak as clearly as possible that will help. Apparently my line is not particularly good, so if staff can let me know if the quality drops at any time that would be appreciated.

Continuing our work, as you can see from our relatively simple agenda that we started at our last call, and with that, we'll take a moment just to review our agenda, which is a continuation on review of public comments and development of our final recommendations. If anybody

---

**Note: The following is the output resulting from the RTT (Real-Time Transcription also known as CART) of a teleconference call and/or session conducted 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.**

---

here has any changes to the agenda or if they would like to let us know of any other business [lost audio] at this stage, we will call for any other business at the end as well. And with that, we will move on with our agenda. [Indiscernible] and myself here today and we will be sharing the role as we usually do, but to begin with, I'm actually going to hand over to Steve who is going to give us a very quick review of our last meeting and, of course, the only action item out of our last meeting was for interaction on our list with the upgrading and change and comments to our document. And we did manage to eventually [indiscernible] a little bit of that. But it certainly wasn't like we had hoped. Towards the end of the call we [indiscernible] everyone to be more [indiscernible]. Over to you, Steve.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Cheryl. This is Steve DelBianco. The action item on our last call was with me and it was to circulate the essence of our dilemma on what to do about meeting records for closed and open meetings and the process about how the individual constituencies, stakeholder groups, AC and SOs make the decision about closing meetings. I think I can summarize we were all of the mind that the AC, SOs and groups should have the discretion to close. There could be a list of potential reasons to close, but those were not the only reasons. And then folks sorry, records, notes and recordings that are kept and the dilemma was whether they are open to all, as in posted publicly, or should they be closed to members? And so right after the meeting last time, we had not resolved it yet, so I circulated a discussion thread. And I said in our report of transparency that notes, records and minutes of all meetings should be made publicly available, but then under participation we said, number four, we said for any meetings, be they closed to members only or open to everyone, the members have to be able to access notes and recording subject to confidential matter. The registry stakeholder group in the public comment said this is confusing and inconsistent.

Others echoed that comment and the intellectual authority, IPC, and connectivity provider group made the same point. So the question for all of you was, how do we reconcile the good practice recommendations here? The immediate reply was Christopher Wilkinson, who had read our detailed report and said he would be willing to support it as it is. And I thank Christopher for that. And then Farzaneh came up with an idea to solve this inconsistency. He circulated it yesterday and said that recommended 5 be changed to say that notes, minutes or records of all membership meetings should be made publicly available to say, notes, minute and records of all open meetings should be made publicly available. So the essence of that change, and I'll put it into the chat, maybe to make it a little easier to track, is that the notes, meetings and records of all open membership meetings should be made publicly available.

So to that Kavouss replied two hours later, with what I think is even better, which is to clarify two ways. He takes what Farzaneh had indicated that the notes, records and minutes of all open meetings should be made available. And then Kavouss added that [indiscernible] should be made available for the members or membership and should not be made publicly available. So we tried to cover with Kavouss's comment, as well as Farzaneh's, both comments, open versus closed meetings, being publicly available versus available only to the membership itself. So I have that in the chat. And this would be a great time for us to do a public dialogue on whether these two good practices will reconcile our problem. And I did want to thank Farzaneh and Kavouss for coming in on that.

I see three hands. Bernie, Greg, and Kavouss. Bernie, you are first.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Steve. A note on the second one for the members. Just for your information, in the good faith group, talking about members got us into trouble with the

---

---

ASO. And so I don't know, I mean, I'm perfectly fine with the spirit of the recommendation, I'm just saying the ASO gets real serious heartburn with the word "members" in any kind of recommendation that it thinks it's going to have to something with.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Bernie. We'll be guilty on many counts if they come around to our report. In fact, we have mentioned members and membership many times without apology because we believe the ACs and SOs were created in the bylaws and I realize the ASO existed in a different way and had a broader constituency. So maybe we need a footnote to acknowledge that, but I doubt we can rip the word "members" or "membership" out of our report.

[Dog barking]

Bernie, your hand is still up, Bernie?

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'm not sure if it's a footnote or some sort of clarification somewhere, but I feel that is, again, and the ASO has time to look at it properly, that they're going to come up with that comment and if we have a footnote or anything that says, you know, membership and members where applicable, understanding that some groups within ICANN don't have that, we probably can save all ourselves a lot of problems. Thank you.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Good point, Bernie.

Greg Shatan and then Kavouss and then Alan.

>> GREG SHATAN: Greg Shatan for the record. I support Farzaneh's suggestion, but I have concerns with the second suggestion and specifically saying that notes, minutes and records

of all closed meetings should not be made publicly available. That essentially makes it a not good practice to make any of those publicly available if you have a closed meeting. I will confess that the IPC's standard procedure since before I was involved and continuing until now is to have meetings of its members and then to post the minutes for all to see on our website. If I were to comply or have IPC comply with this best practice, I would have to take all of those minutes down or put them behind a member's wall. I don't think that's encouraging any kind of transparency or accountability. I think it is certainly appropriate when one takes minutes, one can take care to avoid exposing certain things that were not intended to be exposed, while creating a public record. And I think that, in fact, I don't want to get into the fine points of what's a good practice and what's not, which is why I think Farzaneh's change or even the second change, without the second part, really makes sense. But the last part does not. That way at least it leaves it open as to whether or not in a closed meeting one would distribute anything afterwards and I would rather leave that to discretion than try to fine tune this to the nth degree. Thank you.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Greg.

Kavouss, you are next in the queue and it would be good to address that sentiment. I think what Greg is saying it's one thing to say that Kavouss, really quick, Kavouss, just before you do, I'll repost it to the chat so everyone can see it, it's the last part of your suggestion where you said "they should not be made publicly available." And Greg is saying that could that be omitted or softened to say that they are not required to be made publicly available. Go ahead, Kavouss.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I put [indiscernible] not to be, I said that open meetings [audio mumbled] closed meetings comma [indiscernible] comma to be available to membership and we have a footnote saying membership includes members with a capital M, participants, and if you want to add observer. So I would like to put in this. I want to be [indiscernible] I don't want to be unclear, I want it to be quite clear. This should not [indiscernible] [audio mumbled] absolutely right and what [indiscernible] also right, but what I think is good for the people [indiscernible] that sometimes they lack the understanding of the language, so let us be quite clear. So [indiscernible] I propose, if any, comma, and then continue and put membership as you propose, [indiscernible] member was not right, it is correct membership and add a footnote, membership including members with a capital M and participants and if you want to have observers.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Kavouss. I want to return you to what Greg said, perhaps you didn't hear it correctly. Greg said for closed meeting, the IPC sometimes publishes the meetings, maybe not the recordings, maybe not the detailed notes, but they publish the minutes. And I have to agree I have been part of many organizations where the minutes are sanitized even from confidential members only meetings where the minutes simply reveal the high level action that is were taken. So under the formulation that you suggested, you would be saying that it's a good practice that you not publish even minutes for closed meetings and I think Greg has a very good point, that minutes may be publishable, even if it was a closed meeting and so we ought not tell the IPC what they cannot public, but it may be necessary to publish minutes of a closed membership meeting. I think it's a good point and I think it shows that [indiscernible] has a way of dealing with it. And I want to call people to the four way to meeting records, we call them notes, minutes, records, and in one part we use the word

---

"recordings." And I think we need to acknowledge that the recordings of this meetings, such as this one, and transcripts, are all part of this broad set of records.

Greg is making the point of view that minutes that are sanitized or confidential matters [indiscernible] so Kavouss, if you could after Alan get back into the cue, if you would and respond to that particular improvement. Alan.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, I forget what I was going to say, I think, but I'll make it up. All of these statements are loosely worded and we need to be a lot more careful. Farzaneh's, for instance, as you just pointed out, says recordings, only talks about the recordings being made available, not the or documents. Kavouss's is better that it is all inclusive and involves a variety of different types of recordings, but does have the problem Greg mentioned. It could be easily be fixed by saying "should not" or "need not" or some similar wording. Our own ICANN Board has closed meetings that publishes minutes, so, you know, let's not say that they are not allowed to do that anymore. It took us a long time to even get that and get them to have some content in them.

I want to go back to the issue of membership and first of all, as Kavouss pointed out, we often have meetings where members is a technical term and there are other people who are there at the meetings and there's no reason to hide the record of the meetings from them. We call them participants, observers, whatever. You know, capitalizing words may or may not address that. I think we have to be really clear. And in addition to that, we have members of organizations and I will reiterate what Bernie said, we have to be very careful and we can probably cover it with a footnote, we are finding we have to be really careful for groups like ASO where their members are organizations which have their own governance and we cannot impose rules

---

upon the ASO or upon the groups that are subsidiary to the ASO. So we're going to have to look at this, no matter how many times we have used the words or published the drafts, we are going to have to be careful to make sure we do it properly. Thank you.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Alan, a couple of quick reactions before we go further into the queue. Farzaneh's plex did not use the word "recordings" it simply added the word "open" in the middle of the phrase we had.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I was looking at the "this means" sentence. My apologies.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Got it. She had just added the word "open." Kavouss added another line, said it was clear that it was a good practice that closed meetings, if any, should not be made publicly available. And you, myself, and Greg Shatan seem to be saying, and Cheryl as well, that if the word "should" were changed to "need" not be made publicly available, we relieve any group of the expectation that they must publish closed meetings information and yet we allow them to publish any aspect that they wish to share with the world. So by saying need not, I think we make a significant improvement on what Kavouss had suggested. And several of us agree with that. We look forward to Kavouss's reaction as well.

I wanted to point everyone to page 4 of our document, where in response to John Curran who told us many times that the activities of ASO and ITEF exist outside of ICANN we should not be presumed to tell them what to do outside of ICANN and we added this phrase and John Curran said thank you, and that the phrase was [Reading] within the scope of their ICANN activities. And when that was added, presumably that solved that problem. I don't know if the ASO will consider that to be appropriate with respect to the word "member" but it made it clear we were only trying to cover what happens at ICANN.

---



Alan, you are still in the cue?

>> ALAN GREENBERG: I put myself back in the cue because of what you just said. You are using the ASO and the ITEF as if they were equivalent. ITEF is not part of ICANN. No way, no how. The ASO is a supporting organization and one of the decisional members in the empowered community. They are very different for the ITEF. So let's not use them interchangeably. The ASO is one of the SOs we are talking about and for that we do have to be somewhat sensitive. Thank you.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: All right, I'll paste into the chat the very latest iteration on the Kavouss sentence and I'll put Kavouss into the chat. Please look at the chat, and this is rephrased, Kavouss, it's not the same thing you typed. It says if any, the word "should not" gets changed to "need not." Are you okay with that?

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, I am fine with that change. [Indiscernible] and for closed meetings, comma, if any, comma, notes, recordings [indiscernible] available to public, however, minutes of [indiscernible] would be or could be or may be should be available to the public. I don't go to should not. I put in a positive [indiscernible] but not in a negative one. So that is what I said and I fully comply with what Greg said and what other people said. So you want to separate the notes I'm sorry, the minutes and I agree with that. Even for the closed meetings, the minute will be [indiscernible] available to the public and records and notes are not available. Thank you.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Kavouss. That isn't exactly the remedy that Alan and I and Greg had proposed. We were not suggesting that we delineate between notes and minutes, but instead, by changing the Word "should not" to "need not" we leave it to the discretion of

---

---

the ACSO or group that they decide what, if anything, to publish. And I would argue we not try to make fine distinctions between notes, minutes, records, recordings, and transcripts. Rather, if the IPS wants to publish all of the above for a closed meeting, they may. We are just simply saying as a good practice, you need not disclose anything about a closed meeting. So that's currently the text that's in the chat. Changing "should not" to "need not."

Alan, your hand is up.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: I just wanted to point out the hilarity of a group on accountable setting up a best practice saying don't publish information under such circumstances. Just noting. Thank you.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: And Alan, that note is why it makes sense to change the word "should not" to "need not", agreed?

>> ALAN GREENBERG: That's why I said it.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: I'm sorry, a full day of phone calls and I am not catching the humor part of it, but I get the irony, I do.

Kavouss, I think you would agree that "need not" covers it. Go ahead, Kavouss.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, need not, however, I wish if you don't mind you put the latest version in the chat so I can see that.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: It's right there.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I think [indiscernible] unless otherwise decided by SO and ACs [indiscernible]. Thank you. I would like to have the final documented suggestion in the chat. Thank you.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Kavouss, it is there. It's right there in the chat next to my name. We will circulate this, of course, with our notes on the meeting to see if others have further ways to improve it. But before we leave this topic, we did delineate five different ways, notes, minutes, records, recordings and transcripts and to be consistent, where ever we discuss meeting documentation with respect to item five and four, let's use the same list, notes, minutes, records, recordings and transcripts. We are trying to cover the entire waterfront of the ways in which meetings with be reported. Everyone already with that?

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, but what you talk about the minutes could be anything available, where do you address that? I understood from some people saying that no matter whether meetings are closed or is open, the meeting sorry, the minutes should be made available publicly. Is that still on the table or not? Thank you.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Kavouss. What is on the table now is two sentences. The first one we'll call it the Farzaneh sentence and the second one is yours, but clang the word "should not." You see? And by saying "need not" it means they may. So you see in the chat, the first sentence I put in the chat was Farzaneh's, that all notes, minutes, and recordings of all open meet be made available. The second sentence is the one of need not be for closed meetings, and I'll paste that into the chat again. Need not be made. In both cases, we will try to clarify that we are talking about notes, minutes, records, recordings and transcripts.

---

>> CHERYL LANGDON ORR: Cheryl here, Steve, I'll just jump in and hopefully my audio is better. Alan has put in the chat that the use of the word "may" be made available. I think he is proposed not a change, but a different set of terms to get to the same end game. Maybe Alan wants to speak to that.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Go ahead, Alan.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I wasn't going to speak to the "may" I was just addressing Kavouss where he said they must be made, they should be made available and I'm saying they may be made available. It's at the discretion of the group. I would suggest, I know we are talking about details and I'm getting a little bit something about it, but I would suggest instead of having a long laundry list, we come up with one word, records, and then define what records mean. And records can mean minutes, records, transcripts, whatever, as applicable because as we're wording it right now for open meetings, we're saying things like transcripts must be made available. We don't always have transcripts. These days we now have chat scribes that are something different. So I would make use one word, define it as whatever the various recording type things are for a meeting and leave it at that and use the word "as applicable" because they vary from meeting to meeting. Thank you.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Alan, instead of delineating the five different kinds of records, you recommend adding the word "records" and then defining it as notes, minutes, records, transcript, et cetera and saying applicable. And would you speak to whether it should be "need not" or "may"? Alan can you explain?

>> ALAN GREENBERG: I'm saying we can use a positive term, may be made available or the negative need not be made available, both of them puts the discretion on the group. I think they are using the same thing, using semantically different structure.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: So the first one we have the word "should be made publicly available." And the second would say "for closed meetings, they may be made." And that would be clear enough to the audiences in the future.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: If not, add something in brackets to say it a third way. [Laughter]. Sorry, I'm losing patience.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah, me, too. Okay. I'll write this up, Cheryl, as a proposition and I'll put it in the context of the document as opposed to a stand alone e mail. I'll try to update table four and table five, that's transparency and participation and we will see how it looks in the good practices page. I think I will take it as an action item to send it around to the list afterwards.

So Cheryl, I think that concludes the discussion I see another hand up. Alan and Kavouss your hand is up.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, that is an old hand.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: [Indiscernible] [audio mumbled] or may be [indiscernible] just not in group. [Indiscernible] one word "record" and perhaps define what record means with a footnote. Thank you.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Kavouss, you are basically agreeing with Alan's improvements there. Thank you.

It's over to you, Cheryl, for the next item on our agenda.

>> CHERYL LANGDON ORR: Excellent. Thank you very much, Steve. Cheryl for the record. That's good because putting that somewhat [indiscernible] words back into our document and allowing that to be looked at in context will of course give those who are not at today's meeting another opportunity just to look at it again, but I'm feeling happy with this text. And believe me, Alan, I think many of us understand the frustrations, but you will understand how important these terms are to get as right as we possibly can before we push them towards the Plenary for final recommendation stage. And we do, of course, need to make sure that we keep getting it to final recommendation stage as our main game, but [lost audio] we often need to get them approved in a [lost audio] as possible.

Well, thank you all for [indiscernible] conversation. If we think about how much time we can take to do that [indiscernible] important things done. Look at the comments that are coming through our public comment and as you can see the amount of work that came out of one small section of discussion. So what I would like to do is ask you all just before we move on to the next topic of public comment, how you best want to make sure that we [indiscernible] develop our final recommendations? We're still relatively confident that once we've polished up these recommendations and put them towards the [indiscernible] that as you can see outlined in our next steps, the CCWG will hopefully not see the changes we have made as particularly significant and, therefore, that these recommendations as finalized will not necessarily have to go out to a second comment, but we can't predict that until we are at that

---

point in time. It is important that we keep moving the limitations of the timeline, which, of course, is distributed, or I think it was distributed [indiscernible] out of our last call. So if it's possible, I'd like to, if staff has it available, just project the timeline slide. And I'm going actually ask Bernie if he would do for us as he has done for some of our other meetings and no apology for anyone who has been through this before, it's important and repetition may help, but I do want to make sure that our group is very, very clear on what our milestones and deadlines now need to be.

Over to you, Bernie.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Cheryl. This is the standard slide we have been showing for a while. You'll notice that now we're all the way into August. This group is not on the top line because it's already produced a document for public consultation and we are working on getting that resolved, which means it could be on the second track, meaning there are two public consultations and that would mean that the public consultation would start in the latter half of November. Given the type of comments we received, I'm uncertain what the advice of the Plenary will be, if there will be a requirement for a full second public comment depending on how you to decide to address the comments that were made.

You will also see that as we start the final round of public comments in late November, we're starting to consolidate in the bottom line our recommendations into a final report so that we can show that to the Plenary and can have a public consultation on that.

We will remind everyone that as we go through these public consultations and what the Co Chairs have presented is that they expect any significant issues from the chartering organizations with any of our recommendations to be made ahead of time, before, as we're

---

doing public consultations on the individual Subgroup reports and not wait for the consolidated report for public comment. [Indiscernible] will focus and should only deal with interdependency issues between recommendations of the subgroups where there is a link and that may cause some changes on one side or another.

I think that should cover it, but I'll be glad to take questions if there are any.

>> CHERYL LANGDON ORR: I see both Kavouss and Steve's hand up. My app doesn't show which person put their hand up first though. So, Steve, if you don't mind, let's go to Kavouss first. Over to you, Kavouss.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I have no problem with the second public comment, what Bernie said is already in some of the notes from the Co Chairs of the CCWG and I think we should go ahead provided that our objective that [indiscernible] we finish the work of this group. Is that right? Or do still we want to continue? Thank you.

>> CHERYL LANGDON ORR: Kavouss, Cheryl here for the record, it would be ideal, indeed, if we could be finishing the work of our group by [indiscernible]. Of course, we may have more work given to us from the Plenary if, indeed, they decide that our recommendations do need to go out for second public comment. So at the moment we are tracking well, but we certainly do not need or want to [indiscernible] these major milestone dates.

Over to you, Steve, now.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. [Indiscernible] public comments and Plenary discussions that there is not significant support for the kind of changes that would require a second public comment. So it's not only that I prefer not doing the public comment again, that's not

---



important. What matters is that the reaction from our colleagues in the Plenary and the first round of public comments, I don't believe, would justify the kind of changes that would require a second public comment. So on that basis, I just ask Bernie to clarify for me, I can't tell from the table that's in the Adobe chat, on the assumption that we are not going to go to a second round of comment, but only to the Plenary, when are you telling us we need to finish our draft report in order to present it to the Plenary group?

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Ideally it would be, if we look at the bottom line, which stretches from the December to early March, ideally it would be at the beginning of that process. Now it can slip by even a month or two, but ideally I would agree with Kavouss that it would be a great way to close off the work of this group in Abergavenny and that would mean if we look at our dates for seven day warnings, et cetera, to submit document, the face to face meeting is Friday, 27th of October, and as such the latest date to submit the document for that Plenary is the 20th of Friday the 20th of October.

Now if we want that would be for a first reading. If we want Abergavenny to be a second reading, that would mean, and there are two meetings that are very close, so basically, as I said, we've got the face to face on the 27th of October, but we also have a Plenary on 18 October. So if we were to get the documents on 11 October from you, we could submit them for the Plenary on 18 October and if there are no significant changes or calls or anything else, we can then represent them for a second and final reading on Friday 27 October to close off the readings. I hope that's clear enough.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Bernie. This is Steve continuing. That is very helpful. And I think it is very doable for us. I do want to clarify, we not only have to publish our updated final

---

report, but we may, and I think Cheryl has suggested this on a previous call, we may also publish our response to the public comments that came in. That might be a separate column next to each public comment that staff summarized where we indicate how we accommodated it, if we accommodated it. It may also be a summary report of some kind, where we indicate what we have done with each of the public comments. So I think that's really doable and thank you.

>> CHERYL LANGDON ORR: Cheryl for the record. Thank you very much, Bernie, for those particular dates. And I wholeheartedly agree. I think the aim is to see if we can have that first reading running on the October 18 Plenary meeting and the second reading at the face to face. That does a number of things. It allows us to then, as individuals, focus our energy into other work groups, but it also allows the consolidation work to start in a timely manner. And hopefully allow that to be less complicated than it would be if we had everything coming in at once.

One thing we will then be able to do is look very carefully to see if there's any interdependencies or issues that are teased out that affect our work or are affected from our work to the other groups. So that consolidation goes on. And as we all recognized in a previous Plenary, that is a very important piece of work, indeed, as we put the final product together from the CCWG as a whole perspective.

And Kavouss, the only reason we would need to go to a second public comment is if the Plenary decided. We are working under the assumption that in fact our final recommendations will not be substantially changed and there will be no need for us to do that. So let's hope that we don't end up making changes that are substantial that the Plenary doesn't agree with us.

---

While we are talking about changes, and thank you very much for taking the time to go through all of that in great detail, I think it is important and I certainly am happy now we've got a couple of specific dates in terms of [indiscernible], so we are aiming for the 11 of October so we can have the first reading on the October 18 meeting. That would be terrific.

Christopher, your hand is up? No, that is something next to your name. My eyes are blurry this morning. I apologize. You are just muted or something.

So with that, let's now move to the next stage of work in hand and that is to get started on our next piece of public comment review. And hopefully, as we go through these comments, not all of them are going to take the great deal of interaction that the last one did, some of them may, so let's continue through them as efficiently as possible.

And with that, Steve, I think you have something primed and ready for us to talk about. Is it the annual report section of best practices or good practices, sorry?

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Cheryl. Steve DelBianco here. There were four public comments on the notion of reporting. It is in best practice, track one, item five. I've pasted it in the chat. We concluded in our report that [Reading]. We had four public comments on this item. [Indiscernible] said taken together they have concerns about the impacted we would have on groups since they are all volunteers. And I think that it is the ALAC suggestion that we have to be conscious of the workload, as a concern of workload. The non commercial stakeholders group, and the largest concern with the suggestion of an annual report, they think it would be time consuming for the volunteers to produce and lend itself to bias. And other options might warrant consideration like engaging the services of an external consultant to objectively produce such a report for the entire community. That scarce me with the

---

experience we've had with ICANN hiring outside consultants who don't know much about what we do.

The third is from Mr. Sanchez. Regularly assess the annual report and he went on to say it should be adopted to fill these gaps. I think they are suggesting that the annual report be even more detailed than they had suggested.

And the final, again, was by Mr. Sanchez, he wants us at the end of the year to [indiscernible] the efficacy from diverse parts of the community.

So I would like to focus where we go with this. Farzaneh, you are the suggester of the end report and with wide approval. We have four public comments. Two from active participants, the ALAC and non commercial stakeholders group. The question is whether the effort is worth the gain on a regular report. Mr. Sanchez is trying to go deeper into it and I don't believe we will have support from the Plenary or this group to expand the obligations of the annual report. Why don't we take a cue of what we do for a good practice for the annual report? Farzaneh, please.

>> FARZANEH BADI: Thanks, Steve. I think Bernie has his hand up. Okay, I'll just say my point. So this suggestion, which was not supported by my own group [laughter], it's funny I may [indiscernible] I may have [indiscernible] and they didn't like it. So basically what they are saying is that we are volunteers [indiscernible] as stakeholder group, we don't get paid, we cannot we don't have the bandwidth. But what I think they don't consider is that the annual report can be like a one page concept paper of what we have done on our accountability, have we changed bylaws, did we come up with operating procedures, did we decide to do this and that? It can be very lightweight. It doesn't have to be long. It doesn't have to be a special format

---

or template, but just touch on what they've done. It can be a one pager and I think since I'm the chair of [indiscernible] they just [indiscernible]. I'm not insisting on it and it's not really mandatory, I'm not insisting on it, but I think we can have a very lightweight suggest for report.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Farzaneh. And it's possible that the word "annual report" conjured up the image of something substantial. And Alan and Cheryl, others from ALAC, can you weigh in since ALAC said this could be an awful lot of extra work.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: It did say all told. It wasn't specifically to this one item. It was all these little things you are saying we should do to be squeaky clean and transparent and accountable are all the adding up. And all of them together are starting to be something that might well be unreasonable unless there is really superb staff and many of us do not have access to unlimited levels of staff report.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Alan. Is the annual report sort of the straw that broke the camel's back? Is it one of the major efforts of new items?

>> ALAN GREENBERG: I would not have described this as one of the major items, but it's certainly yet another one. I, you know, I'm not sure I can conjure up the thought process that lead to that sentence exactly, but it was essentially a long laundry list of things we should all be doing. And even if they are all applicable to the ALAC in our case, you know, this all takes resources. And it's volunteers and it's volunteers who don't even have a vested interest in seeing the success of the group as you might in the business constituency or in a registry because none of us are employed in this business. So, you know, it's volunteer squared.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Alan. For the record I know NCSG said it's too much work and one other option is to hire an outside consultant. And I do not personally think that's a good idea at all. And there was only one group who made that suggestion, so Farzaneh, this is your group, the NCSG, was that sort of a throw away option? Or is it something you want us to address as a public comments, in notion of hiring an external consultant?

>> FARZANEH BADI: Thank you, Steve. To be honest, I did not participate in drafting the comments mainly because I was the Rapporteur of this group and didn't want to influence their decision on how to address issues. I don't personally think it's a good idea to have an external consultant. And I don't think NCSG is very much sold to that idea and really wants to implement it. So I don't think it's a concern

>> Right. I don't believe there's anyone in this group that would support the hiring of an external consultant. If anyone wants to hire an external consultant, please speak up now. But we don't need others to weigh in to say.

>> I believe Bernie has his hand up there, who I believe is an external consultant.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: You're right. I'm sorry, Bernie, you're name being above the line there.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, thank you. Technically I'm [laughter] people have another name for me in many places. I think the external consultant thing is not a good idea and I really support Farzaneh's point of let's keep it simple and how that is done and be done, I don't know. One way to make this more palatable is SOs and ACs have to go through cyclical reviews anyway. So maybe one way to make some of this stuff more palatable to everyone is that, yes, it's a requirement. I'm not sure it's a volunteer requirement. Possibly policy staff could help

---

with this. The worse thing in these things in my experience is doing the first year and after that it rather becomes a little formulaic and people who have been following the work of an SO or AC all year can bang them out quickly and provide them to the group. So those are my points. Thank you.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Bernie. Kavouss.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I'm sorry, I'm not in favor of external activities at all. I have been in this business for many years. I have seen [indiscernible] external people, they are group of writer people, they are a group [indiscernible] but they come to the people and they get information and put things together. [Indiscernible] right to left, up to down, put them in a nice colorful folder and present it. I don't think we need external entities. I don't think we need to create jobs for external people and whatever those that are external is much more expensive and I don't believe we need that. So I disagree with that totally. Thank you.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Alan, you had your hand up?

>> ALAN GREENBERG: I

>> CHERYL LANGDON ORR: This is Cheryl. Can I jump in? I am running a meeting in five minutes and they are calling me so what I wanted to do was just hand over to you, Steve, to wrap up the meeting, noting we have already covered item four, so you can stop this one at any point and raise any [indiscernible] and remind everybody of our next meeting date and time. I apologize, I just have to get off this call now. Thank you. Bye.

---

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. In the chat I put a revised formulation of this support requirement to make it less of an annual report, so review that as you consider your comments here in the four minutes remaining. Yeah, I think Alan, you were saying something.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I was. Although all of our best practices have, you know, you should consider them, this might be one you want to add the words explicitly of it, of AC and SO should consider an annual report and that lessens the whatever as much.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Alan, look at what I have in the chat. What if it says, they should consider annually publishing a brief report?

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, if you add the word "consider" then I have absolutely no push back at all for it. I think it's fine.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. So the word "brief report" instead of the word "annual report" but I kept the word "annually" in there.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: I do like the word "consider" which you just said, but you did not write.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: That's right. That's because I said it after I wrote it. Thank you.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Someday they will invent a chat with editing capability.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Kavouss, you must be having a tough connection. Nobody on this call wants to have an external entity. We have acknowledged it in the chat, there was no support, so don't worry.



Okay, we're close to the top of the hour. I will make this revision with respect to four of the public comments on the annual report part and we will revise our Google Doc that goes out. I will also send out an e mail sending where the changes are because I don't think it's fair to ask all of you to read 30 some pages to find out where the changes are. So I'll try to put two things out, one is the earlier discussion on the publication of recordings or meetings and the second is the laying down the length and urgency of the annual report. So those are the only two changes we got done today and I think for our next call, it will be necessary to go through the summary of public comment and see which ones we have not covered off. I sure would love to have some help from another volunteer on this team to do that. All of the comments were summarized already by Bernie, and I circulated them with the last e mail. I'll recirculate them in preparation for our next call, but we ought to focus, we ought to be able to complete our work. There are a couple of controversial comments and they have to do with whether we have adequately addressed the issue of capture. And if we have not addressed the issue of capture, it may require extensive edits to good practices, not just something like wordsmithing like we are doing right now.

I see Kavouss with your hand up with only one minute left.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, I'm sorry because [indiscernible] I did not request [indiscernible] to exclude from any meeting from 16 to 23 of August. I will not be available for any meeting, please kindly inform others. I'm very sorry to disturb you, but I may not be able to do it through the 23rd August I am not available for any meeting. And thank you very much and have a nice time.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Kavouss.

---

All right, with that, folks, we will terminate this call. The next meeting is on the 10th of August at 500 UTC.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: After the 16th I will be available.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: I understand, Kavouss. I was simply telling everyone when our next call is. Bye, all.