SO/AC ACCOUNTABILITY SUBGROUP MEETING
Thursday, August 17, 2017 - 13:00 to 14:00

RAW CAPTIONING – NOT A TRANSCRIPT – A TRANSCRIPT WILL BE POSTED TO THE WIKI AS A SEPARATE DOCUMENT. THIS IS ONLY MEANT AS A QUICK REFERENCE UNTIL THE TRANSCRIPT IS POSTED AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED AUTHORITATIVE.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, less see if we can get the recording started please.

[This meeting is now being recorded]

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Good afternoon, good morning, good evening to everyone. Today is the 29th meeting of the work stream 2 accountability subgroup. For support organization of advisory committee accountability. It's meeting number 29. It's taking place to 17th of August, at 1300 UTC. The usual administration to begin with first of all we will be taking attendance from the Adobe connect room. If you are only on the audio channel for this meeting, please let us know now.

Not hearing anybody, any on audio, the next thing to ask is if there's anyone who has any updates or statements of interest if they want to respond now.

And somebody does need to mute. We are getting some background noise on the line. If you are not speaking, please be so kind as to mute your lines. So the rest of the meeting doesn't get background noise. And when you make an intervention if you would be able to speak slowly and clearly as practical. And please start your insation with your name. So that can be noted by the captioner.

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.

With that, that is our basic administration done. Our purpose for today's call is the continuation of our work, through the public comments and of course, the development of our statements. And recommendations that we will be hopefully soon taking by our focus effort October date that we discussed in our last call through to the a plan recross community working group for the review. With that, I'm going to ask Steve dell bang owe if he would be so kind as to give us a very brief run through on the meeting we had last. If there's anybody who has any questions, then please just put your hand up. But once we have a very brief run through of our meeting, which we started working on the sheet, the Google Doc, the Google she's that [indiscernible] had been so kind to put together, then we will continue on with the primary agenda. With that, let's hand over to Steve.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Good morning Cheryl. Everyone, I would suggest that the main action item, arising from our last call, was to update our draft responses to public comments. Also known as the Google sheet. And to put before this group, this subgroup, the draft responses for at least the first reading now that we have briefly touched on everyone of the 38 or 40 responses that we had. I have forgotten the number actually. And I was hope engine this call we would be able to get through that as well. Cheryl that's all I had on the previous call and the action item was to fill in any details on reflecting the discussion on the last call. Farzi and I did that and that's the sheet you distributed with your agenda and then I followed up with on a PDF a few hours later.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Steve. Cheryl for the record. And yeah, we would like the particularly think you and [indiscernible] the extra work you did on that. And I would suggest you just start with with I believe it's the board comments on tracks read, is that correct?

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: I think we should start with our run through, as we do a run through in the public comments there are four of them that touch on both the personal and board related discussion that Ranalia followed up with this morning. Rinalia here on the call. To Cheryl I prefer we go ahead with the comments instead of the 3 or 4 that touch Rinalia.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's fine, let's go, over to you Steve.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Brenda please load the document. For those that prefer to follow along on the Google sheet online I have that open as well. That doesn't display well in Adobe. We will bring it up in this Adobe and members of the subgroup have changes we will make changes in real time.

Brenda, does everyone have scroll control on this.

>> BRENDA BREWER: Yes everyone has scroll control. Just announce the track. They are not numbered.

I have give you scroll Steve. Would it be easier if you directed that?

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Probably.

>> BRENDA BREWER: There you go.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: And I do acknowledge that the sheet is a challenge to see in 2 Adobe window unless your lucky enough to have a very broad screen in front of you, and even then it's difficult.

The Google sheet itself and the PDF was distributed last night. I'll put into the chat a link to Google sheet. So this would be appropriate if anyone of you prefer to follow along with the PDF or sheet as well as the Adobe display. Anyone need us to resend the document?

Great.

So if we dive right in. Notice in the chat I put some things to Herb. He will be only on for a few minutes and he's confirming we are on the right track.

I have to scroll control in Adobe.

So the column that we need the pay attention to is the far right hand column. And the way this Adobe works I'm not able to display that much of it.

Really not going to help anyone significantly. If we do that you cannot see the first column. We will do our best.

Very first one, we have suggested that it was not within our remit, this is from John in row 2 we didn't I think it was in our remit to validity structural changes to ICANN overall. As we go through, it would be superb for group members on this call flag that they wish to discuss an item. Otherwise we assume it is first sustained first reading.

Seeing none row 3.

The they were concerned about the public records disclosure on open and closed meetings. And our responses we updated. Worked on that we updated the meeting records public practice to the concern.

the next is row 4 for the SSOAC gave us support and it reiterate best practice to where it's applicable. We have the word it's applicable to an abundance of clarity and good practices are optional and can to the extent they are improvement in the eyes of the ACs and SOs themselves.

Next the S sorry GNSO business consistency we have an endorsement we will acknowledge their are support there's nothing more we need to do for that. Now we move to row 6. I will scroll to second page on the Adobe. Good.

And row 6 is one where the board itself and Rinalia I would like you to come in on this one. The row 6 of the sheet, the first row on the screen where the board noted about responsibility. Now we are replying with the extent saying that there's a good practice and we put it under the accountability category that each participant should publish their position but November the public power of their position and it's abilitiability whether the AC or SO followed their policies to reach their decision you may not like what the GSO decided when to reject the budget. As a individual you may not like that decision but the ability to change that process would really just be an ombudsman challenge as we described earlier not IRP boom buds man or whether the contact of the GNSO came up with a decisions appropriately conducted with required processes there isn't really a opportunity to say to the GNSO to say you made the wrong decision only the people in the GNSO have an effect how the GNSO made it's decision we feel confident to say to the board that nothing more is that the been in the prefer o preferred community is representing the views in the community that's why the ICANN bylaws created each of the ACs and SOs to represent the interests in those groups. So this one Rinalia we indicated that the board gave us call identified support and our response not the make significant changes other than noting we look for more transparency when an AC and can SO

makes a decision and we reiterate if aporoses is not followed there's ombudsman review available. Any other comment on this one?

Again, this is the response of the sub team, column on the right hand side of the screen thank you.

>> RINALIA BADII: It's Rinalia, can you hear me?

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: We do.

>> Great, so based on my reading of it I think the response is okay. Rinalia. The request or question I pose to the group on the list is whether you also make a reference to whether or not you think the board's comment that link we made more available under accountability heading. The ICANN website and a good thing to have. I personally think it would be an enhancement because there's more sharing of information so I actually support that the group does that. I'm just putting it on the table. Now the response of the sub team, in that personal that's a permit and the other email to the group this morning is basically about adding context to the response to this board comment as well as to others. In this document to say that it's the   if SO/ACs follow their own internally set standards for transparency participation and repeals and regrets then the results or decision making of that can be an engagement in community could be robust as collective. And that's essentially good enough.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Rinalia thank you for that it's good and supportive where we are going and it clarifies that the board is not seeing the objective rt standard of accountability. And in fact we think you get collective accident accounts if every is accountable to who it represents.

>> Rinalia: I have a question on this if you clarify on this. In terms of the transcribing of SO/AC decision making are you making it a best practice or good standard to have that transparent to everyone across the community and to the public?

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes, the top yellow column says we will add a good practice. For each decisional participant and those are the ACs and SOs part of empowered community. They will publish the you decision when they make it, it will be publicly published. If you think it would be better, we can recommend that that practice include a description of how that decision was reached.

>> Rinalia I think that would be helpful.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: I'll add that to the Google dock right now.

Publication should include the description of how a process is followed to make a decision.

Okay good good.

Rinalia, the last paragraph in the comment block it's on the screen right now, is where you believe that links to documents on accountability be available for ICANN's main website. So you're well aware that there are 20 some pages in our report where we wouldn't gather the best practices from ACs and SOs and subgroups is and I put links to those underlying documents to the table. Now over time those links will go stale and our document isn't available any place. So on principal, we can fully support the idea that links to the AC/SOs and subgroup charters and the processes then list of officers, their minutes, their meeting records, that all of that is available. And away note that it is all available in various plays on the ICANN website. Specific to the AC and SO group. So the business consistency documents are not at

ICANN. Org as they are at this con sit Wednesdayy.org it will take a administrative procedure, a process of providing flings a single place, as you say here on a subheading of accountability. So Rinalia, if you are able to help us get staff you support to do that we believe the best practice document would be a road map where links should point on day 1. But it would be staff responsibility to keep the website current and check the links in case they are modified on any respective AC or subgroup.

So Rinalia, I'll go back to that, when you suggest to the board that you believe it's important that links be in documents we will a agree to that is and suggest that it would take a staff be responsibility to keep it current. How do you react to that?

Railroad I think itself fair and I believe if you put it in a document I think .org will keep it up.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Fantastic. Any other comments from our group? Okay so what I added to the Google dock with respect that one. The last paragraph of the Google screen in front of you I wrote regarding links to AC/SO is documents we support the recommendation and we note the ICANN staff have responsibility to maintain those links on the ICANN website.

And I can add under the heading, accountability.

All, everyone okay with that?

Okay great. Thank you Rinalia. Anything further from members of this group? On this row?

Thank you. Go to the next page what's on your Adobe.

That takes us to row 7 for those that are following in the PDF or Google sheet. Again this is the ICANN board as well. Where   row 7. Okay.

Okay, there are additional layers we have more responsibility to meet them. So the board is giving us qualified support on track 1 which is accountability. And this notion that the teams, the review teams would be designated quickly. Selecting a review team. So the SOs and ACs are responsible for selecting the team and parring the reviews and the reports. The board notes there's a fixed amount of time per cycle and the longer it takes the shorter the cycle in between. We can all do the math and we have all done the reviews and we are aware what the board is saying the board asks if there's things the AC, and SOs can do collectively to further the work on a timely basis. Meaning to do it more quickly. Our response, unfortunately for the board is that we are unable to identify any mechanism where an SO or an AC can individually other collectively make their work more timely in either selecting the team members performing the work or the report. We are a volunteer community and we find it necessary to achieve consensus in both selecting our team members and doing our work. And I don't know how we can make it happen more quickly. And if the board had specific ideas in that regard, this group would be happy to acknowledge and put them in our report.

Is.

>> Rinalia this is specific reviews, yes? Because the quality of my interpreted is very bad today.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes. These are the board comments on row 7. Were you talk about your responsible for the making sure that review. When talking about review we are not talking specific organizational reviews but things like the ATRT and CTRT where the board says what can we do to collectively do the work faster.

>> Rinalia: A thought that came to mind about that is something that can make the work go faster is if the scope of the specific reviews are defined before the review teams constituted.

That I think can resolve part of the problem. In terms of the length of time that all the reviews take, for organizational reviews, I have no better idea for specific reviews it's my observations of how to channel the specific reviews have procedure. I think if the scope issue has been decided before the team put together, we would have saved on some of the time.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Rinalia, this is Steve. I would very much like to capture that. So I'm reading the chat because I don't understand your voice as clearly.

You have   you have an idea or you have no idea? The chat transcript is confusing.

>> Rinalia: I have an idea regarding specific reviews to speed up the process. There's two things that can happen. The first thing is that this scope of the specific reviews like ATRT like the RDS, should be determined before the call and constitution of the review team members. If that can be a best beforehand and determined in collaboration with the SO, ACs then I think the process will go much faster. That's the first part. Second point is that when the review team members are being selected, the process might not is that each SO/AC chair does it individually in their own silos. We don't do it as a collective as a group. And I think that slows the pros down. Especially in terms of filling in a gaps based on skills and, also, figuring out solutions for problems that may arise such as conflicts of interest of people who propose to be on the review team itself. So those two levels are on my recommended. One is SOAC chaired need to get together to figure out the composition, they are supposed to anyway but that's not how they have been doing it. They have been doing individually not as a collective. And secondly the scope of the specific reviews are determined before the call goes out for the review team members and the selection of the review team members.

Is that clear?

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Rinalia while it's clear I would like a opportunity to respond. You're aware that the scope of each of these four reviews is dictated in the bylaws with language that was brought in from the ach I rememberration of commitments. The scope is already in the bylaws for each review. And with when the call for review team members goes out the staff simply repeats what the bylaws say is the scope of the review. I'm well aware in the most recent ATRT we tried to collectively limit the scope of the ATRT 3 so it wouldn't be duplicative of the work we are doing in work stream 2 on accountability. And we had some success of that but not every group agreed to change the scope ahead of time. I would submit to you asking the ACs and SOs to reexamine the scope of the bylaws or limit or expand it in any way would slow the process down.

The second comment you make is that we should collectively determine who the review team members are. You are probably well aware each AC and SO submits a list of names, both alternates and designated. Then it's the chairs of the ACs and SOs themselves that pick the 21 review team members from the names that are submitted. If each of the ACs and SOs designate at least 3 team members there's no need to do anything because 7 times 3 gets you to 21.

At least in the past 3 reviews never every AC and SO asks for 3. That left the chairs a collective responsibility of picking someone who fits the skills that are required and achieves a greater diversity for the review team. I'm saying to you that both of the things that you're suggesting are inherent in what the bylaws require already.

So I'm unable   still unable to see how we can do it better than what the bylaws require and make it faster.

And Rinalia I'll go to you first then Kavouss.

>> Rinalia: Right those are fair comments and can my answers are based on the learning and emerging from the processes in terms of what is working and not working. Like will be having meetings with the chairs to discuss it further before we go to the community in the next few months. Fair enough that the scope off on the specific reviews specify in bylaws that there are some gray areas and when asked to examine the specifics I noticed that some of the review teams are having difficulty scoping the review itself. That takes an incredible amount of their time. Which slows the process down.

So that is something   that's a problem that has to be addressed and I'm not sure if it can be addressed in the SO accountability tract.

The second thing regarding the SOAC chairing U.S. chairs and   their responsibility yes that's clear enough but discussion with the SO/AC chairs some of them it's what can be more efficient to them is their ability to come together to do this. It's a procedural issue. It is not done before but I believe there's interest in fixing it. And it will be done.

So, these are essentially my thoughts. Based on what's existing in coming out.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Rinalia it's Steve then I don't to Kavouss.

When they say come together does that mean face to face meeting with ACs and SO chairs what does that mean by come together?

>> Rinalia: Together as a group not necessarily face to face. Discussion at as a group I don't mean to do discussion but emerging issues that regarding problems that arise with review team as they proceed with their work.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: So the work come   I'm trying to understand this properly. For instance, the SSR review team, it's proceeding right you in.   And if any member of that review team thought they were hitting a inpass of some kind you believe the chairs of the ACs and SOs should come together and industry value of solve that that's a new mechanism we don't have.

>> Rinalia: Yes correct.   If there were issues regarding public conflicts of interest and it's somehow not addressed properly in the group itself in my view the SOAC chairs could be the responsibility in the right level to deal with this.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: I'll add it into suggestion. That wasn't what the public comments said. But I'm adding it as driveway where Rinalia suggests that AC and SOs share chairs should come together to resolve impasses or problems on a review team.

Okay, I'll note that as a suggestion. Are there members of the team that want the comment on that idea. That's the first time we have discussed anything like this. Much I'll paste it into the chat.

And Rinalia is that what the board meant all along? Or is it something that just came to you now?

>> Rinalia: It's come through my community and it's been evolving.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: okay I'll summarize and then we will move on because we need the members of the team to look at this. I noted in the Google Doc we were unable to identify any mechanism to make the work more timely. Then we note that Rinalia suggested that defining the reviews scope ahead of time and doing collective determination of the can be helpful. We notice the bylaws determine the scope of the reviews and bylaws determine the ACs and SOs

select the candidates from ACs and SOs in other words, the bylaws already reflect the suggestion. You go on to say another suggestion ACs and SOs can come together to vie problems and can suggestions during a review. I don't think we have any reactions to that from this team right now. Thank you.

There was a hand up for Kavouss. By the hand went down. I realize you're having connectivity issues Kavouss.

Do you wish to speak?

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: No, no. I don't need to speak. I have listened for more than 17 or 18 minutes. An argument between you and Rinalia that is very useful and respective and valid. I think you should continue that discussion may be a different way. Thank you.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you Kavouss.

Anyone who wants to speak up, please do. This is not a dialogue by any means. We are relying Rinalia personally and representatively of the board an opportunity to clarify the suggestions of the board. I hope that's okay with everyone.

All right let's move on to the next row, row 8. The registry stakeholder group.

They supported the consensus view. I wanted to be sure is that proposed best practices would note become ICANN bylaws and they want us to clarify that groups are not required to implement them.

And I think you are all aware of the previous calls, we reit rated, they are not part of the bylaws and that they are only implemented to the extent that they are perceived to be an

improvement on the current policies and applicable in the discretion of the ACs and SOs themselves.

The next one is row 9 and row 10 are both support. We will acknowledge their support. Row 11 is INTA international trademark association they supported the ebb best practices and wanted to make sure they are clarified we are not calling them best practiceds good practices are optional.

And row 12 an ALAC comment they don't support AC and SO best practice reviews in ATRT scope. Several commenters said the same thing. We revised their recommendation several weeks ago to say ICANN's organizational reviews should assess the implementation of good practices. Not the ATRT. I think our response, our comment is directly responsive on that. And should be satisfactory to the ALAC.

Next row is row 13. And this is the non be special shall commercial stakeholders group. Who said that

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Steve, if you don't mind, it's Cheryl here. Just briefly. Certainly on my screen the row E isn't showing. So if you could you seem to have control. If you can slide across to allow us to see that better. Thank you very much. Just for those who aren't in the Adobe in the Google Doc as well. Thank you, back to you.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes Cheryl. If someone has advice how the make this work better. For some reason I can't fit all of the columns into the Adobe window. I suppose I can make the type smaller still.

Now I can fit the entire document but it's difficult to read. Better or worse everyone?

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think if we can see E more, that's all right. Let's continue on. We have a fair amount to get through here.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: It's a challenge to do that. If you scrog to column E, it's suboptimal. Much better for you that can to follow along in the Google Doc itself on a full display screen or PDF that was circulated.

Okay, moving on to row 13.

This was the same thing that ATRT should not do it. And we revise a recommendation for the non commercial stakeholder concern with loading up the ATRT with too much to do.

The board also reviewed the ATRT is insistence i we revised the with the organizational reviews. The board put Ford to have the are organizational reviews cover this topic. I will scroll now to row 15. This is INTA again they simply wanted to clarify that the best practices would not be mandatory we have done that. The NCSG in row 16 I will try to scroll the Adobe to get to that.

  SSAC. Bottom row on the screen from SSAC. They doesn't spa it the best practiceses from ATRT we moved it from the ATRT to the organizational reviews.

Thousand the non commercial stakeholders group which is respecting tracts and best practices.

The NCSG said they would beaklike to understand how recommendations address the capture and then note from Farzi. Now Farzi would you please explain your thoughts the NCRSG which is captured in column E. Farzi.

>> Yes thank you Farzaneh   Badi. Speaking for the record. Now this is raising the issue that that there should be also good practices for term limits, for the leadership rolls and, also, the commented positions should so that one person or a group would not be always taking the leadership roles. And others would not have a chance to participate. So, this is, I think this is essentially what they mean by preventing capture. So they suggested that for the elections we need to suggest some best practices and, also, for   also such as term limits. The problem is that, and this was I think raised in our discussion, some of the groups, some of the SOAs the groups within them do not have elections. So we cannot   and, also, when we were discussing this, first of all we cannot come up with recommendation how they should governor themselves on how their internal governance should be. So we cannot impose having an election. Second of all, if they have election, then we need to be probably very broad and say well there should be term limits. And   but I don't think we can go further than that. And involve   and recommend things that involve their internal governance or changes in their structure.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you Farzaneh this is a new item because we don't have in best practices recommendations on term limits for officers in AC and SO groups. Some noted term limits but but not majority. So Farzaneh is recommending we add a best practice for those that have elections should have a term limits. We are not saying how many terms that is and whether there's term limits waived when there's no candidates. We can have a discussion in this group. This is a new idea not part of the original group.

I wanted to know that elections to the extent that they are held ought to be the way that a SO and AC avoids capture since it can elect someone else provided the candidate is willing to stand up. So Farzaneh I don't see the term limits to capture. I don't think it's the kind of

capture we were talking about. It's not the kind of capture that NTA mentioned but it's probably not a bad idea to suggest that those that have elections should consider having term limits. I don't have no objection to the suggestion but see how it speaks to capture. Cheryl you're next.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Steve, Cheryl for the record. I fear on this that we are starting to get into a more minute layer of practices. I am somewhat loathed to do that at this stage. if we get into the particles of things such as recommendation on having term limits, then there's going to be, well why not this, why not something else?

If I think everyone where these part of the GNSO is coming from that we have started all of our work by stating that we will be leaving a number of things up to the ACs and SOs and while we can encourage through the internal reviews of the ACs and SOs that such good are practices are then adopted as such operational procedures I think it's a step too far here. So I'm not in support. Thank you.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Farzaneh.

>> Farzaneh the: So I don't know why term limits could raise a big issue. Especially for those that have elections. It's a very it's I think it's a very basic understanding of the governance is structured at that those that get elected for two years that they will not be elected for two years then they will be eligible again to get elected. I don't know you how that raises big issues. But then also I agree with you, Steve, that this election and officers and the diversity and stuff like that does not really does not really relate to capture. So for NCSG comments, which is said at the end of of the comment, it says that it would be useful to understand how the recommendations concretely address the issue of capture in more detail rather than just the

comments that their accommodations are helpful to prevent capture. I think we might just want to kind of explain in a couple of sentences how their recommendations, that we are making in general in this good practices, will prevent capture.

And so just be general and not talk specifically into elections.

But as I said, I disagree with Cheryl, I think saying that those that have elections should also have term limits could be a good best   a good practice. And they are not even obliged to abide by it. And some of the groups already have term limits. So yeah, thanks.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: I will note from our bylaws that created us to use the word capture without defining it. But in stress test number 32 and # 34, N TIA secretary strict land suggested concern about capture and raised two kinds of capture that comment. Internal capture with SO and AC membership represented a single agency to the extent they excluded the reviews of other legitimate members of the SO and AC.

Second kind what that concern that that kind of capture could exclude new entrance to SO and AC. So that a particular subgroup of industry or single company could use the member eligibility to limit how new entrance could challenge their voting power within an SO and AC.

So those kinds of capture are very different from the notion of whether a officer is serving multiple terms because no other officer wants to run against them and members keep voting for them. So Farzi I think we are probably better off redoing this one is can explaining how our recommendations address capture rather than heading into a different direction about term limits and diversity by design.

And so Farzi I look to you to see whether that's agreeable to you and if that's the case we have to work on it before our next call.

>> FARZANEH: Yes that is fine so we have to explain how these good practices will help us prevent capture and yeah. I don't mind. We don't have to go to the granularity of the issue. But, I'm just saying, maybe   maybe saying that term limits are like good be practices is not such a bad thing. It's not like getting too much involved with their internal governance. But then if others disagree with me, I don't really insist on this. Unless NCSG wants to identify.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you Farzi. I see Cheryl's hand is up.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I wanted to give you a time check and remind you all how many rows is still to go. That's all. Thank you.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you Cheryl.

So I've noted on row 17 that Steve and Farzi are going to add the NCSG's requested information on that row, row 17.

Next is to the ALAC that wanted to make sure that best practices were not an undue burden on groups. So we clarified that best practices are an option.

Row 19 is from non commercial stakeholders group was concerning that the annual report on accountability would be a lot of extra work for a group like the NCSG to do. Concerns regarding the amount of time for volunteers. So we advized on the last call. We updated the best are practice to say it's a brief report and should be considered once per year.

And good practices such as this are optional. So that there's no requirement that a group who feels overworked would have to publish this brief report, yes we kept the notion that it's a good are practice once a year to do a report on how you have addressed and approved the accountability transparency participation. I believe we had consensus on our last call with the change on row 19. Any comments on that?

Great.

Next is row 20. This is from Mr. Santash. I don't know that individual. It was suggesting a perspectives and reviews and we updated practices to say it's a brief report. My only it's unclear from what Mr. Santash in row 20 was actually doing. His is the bottom row on the screen startingsing with furthermore. It will now be the top of the screen. Staff also said it's a bit unleer clear what they asked for. I think our response is that we clarify it's a brief report and good practices are also optional.

The next row, again from Mr. Santash, is row 21.

He seems to say that each SO and AC must another the end of the year you assess it's efficacy in participation. That's just an observationvation. I don't know if there Santash is asking us to make a change. But we have updated our practice to say it's a brief report. Any other comments on that?

Next one is number 22 where the registries identified our inconsistency about open meetings. We updated our meeting records publication practices to resolve that concern. Same thing is true on the next row from the registries where we noted from open meetings we were inconsistent. I think we covered both of on those owe an earlier call. Next is from Mr. Santash

again from capture from diversity requirement that voting rights allocated from the countries based on the population of Internet users. We have not discussed this one are before. I noted in the draft there that we could implement diversity by design where each region has a representative. That's only important for self organized ACs and SOs. Does anyone have an idea what to do about Mr. Santash want being to base the votes on population of Internet users. We can just disagree.

I propose we canted that the group did not agree with psychiatry population based allocation.

I take a cue on that. Any ideas? Go ahead Bernie.

Person see go ahead please.

We are not hearing you.

Bernie your hand is up and we are not hearing you.

All right moving on, row 25 is on again Mr. Santash wanting to link to diversity with respect to languages. This is legitimate point is this official languages are determined by the 6 united nation languages. Mr. Santash is saying that there should be the top 10 languages. Here's my suggested reply, this suggestion would apply to any document published by ICANN not just SO and AC publications and we could, I'm proposing to all of you we can recommend if ICANN could expand the list of the languages it supports then that support can be expanded to the publication of SO and AC groups and their document like meeting records. This is in the middle of the screen. I wanted to get a reaction. Cheryl is clarifying that language services today does more than the 6 UN languages a needed basis. What I'm trying to say to you is lets not put this on SO and AC subgroups because they don't have the resources to do the translation of

documents. And instead, we rely upon whatever services ICANN offers. We believe ICANN can extend the services to SO and AC groups.

Any objections to that?

Okay, great. That's helpful, thank you. Next row, is will Santash again. Suggested that what is a confidential matter? On page 6 is our draft and we were hoping we can do an indicative list same as regard to closed meetings. I'll acknowledge the list of exemplary reasons we have for closing a meeting should also be the reasons, potential reasons to determining items are confidential and we can make that clarification in that report.

I don't see any hands on that. Is that okay with everyone?

Okay, fantastic. Thank you.

Next one, where ALAC did not believe there should be a mutual accountably round table. We agreed early on that we decided to revert to our original recommendation not to form plea implement a round table.

Next is business consistency and we acknowledge their support for the recommendation and same is true for the   next two rows and now we are down to the notion of concerns and formlism from the ICANN board. Row 31 of the sheet for those following there.

Who watches the watchers? Which is the essence of this meant. I believe earlier in this call, Rinalia was speaking to this one. With regard to collective accountability.

And the answer that I have here was an answer that I believe Rinalia was looking at when she providedis her email a few hours ago. But Rinalia I'll stop here and give you a opportunity to

see whether the text that is in yellow on the screen is   can be improved based on the comments that you submitted.

>> MEGHAN HEALY:

>> Rinalia: Hi Steve can you hear me.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: We do go ahead please J Rinalia: I don't know if there's anything I can say to improve the comment. You ask whether the board can oppose a objective standard I would have to ask them this and then come back to you with a board response.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Rinalia the email you sent this morning was I believe a outstanding response. That there is not really collect i accountability just making sure there's trans I   and redress Rinalia   I like that answer so much better than trying to ask the board to define it.

>> Rinalia: It's my personal view that the email I sensent you is reinforces the principle that I believe this group has stepped on. Is that the accountability is vertical. And that's okay. I think what the board was trying to raise is what about the essence of the community, what holds it together. And I think what thinking about whether the there's a common set of standards that you can adhere to individually as SO and AC that would somehow maintain the whole. In addition to the vertical integrity of having SOs and AC that they settle this o themselves for transparency and regress. Earlier on the call we talked about the [indiscernible] transparent to everyone in the community and, also, the visible to the public. That only pertains to the empowered community that that should extend to issues within SO and AC beyond the empowered community range that's something for you to consider. Moving beyond that definitely applies. For example there's SO/ACs that have where they are members of the

community want to raise issues about specific SOs ACs and they can go to ohms buds to raid raise that. It can be outside of an empowered the community. Would you are consider that and allow it? That's something to agree on to being transparent across the board and agreeing to use the omsbud where ever theirs issue as across the AC/SOs and to have now the governing document of SO/ACs out for public comment just to get a chance to give community and public to provide input, happens to a certain extent but in my lifetime I have not seen it apply to every SO/AC. So I'm not sure if it fully applies.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you Rinalia. Noting we have a moment left we are going to stop at row 31. Rinalia I would address so much of what you just said to track 3, the question we had to address on whether the IRP should address should be applied to the activities of ACs and SOs and groups. We recommended no and the board supported that I believe. Instead we articulated that the ombudsman confirmed they have the capacity and scope to address grievance whether any AC or SO group was living up to accident ability and readdress as in its charter and Herb our Omsbu. Did s on a further call. Tract 3 on new draft report the omsbud to be vertical for the accountability. I hope that will do. There's a to do item I noted in the Google Doc that we will we will want to point that out. Go ahead.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Steve I wanted to make sure we very briefer threw to Kavouss before we wrap up the call. I'm going to jump in now and agree with you stopping at this line 31. Remind everybody that our next call is 1900 hours on Thursday the 24th and go to you Kavouss. Noting the time. Thank you.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you Cheryl for that. I am waiting 9 minutes when I raise my hand, two times my hand went down by somebody and put it again. This was the third time

today. The first one was when Rinalia asked for the efficiency. It should be determined I had a question. And then talked 10 languages. Top 10 you mentioned something that the ICANN can do something more then I had another question now I have question. Unfortunately the floor was not given to me. And this is very regrettable. Thank you.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Kavouss. I ensure you that nobody puts down people's hands. It certainly not in our calls where I have anything to do with the management of it. When staff has done that very rarely from time to time in other meetings I know exactly how frustrating it is. If we see your hand and it was maintained we got that at the next appropriate break was we do with any speaker list. However time is against us at the moment. We have Steve has another 10 rows to go. So we will be starting at row 31 in our next call on Thursday the 24th at 1900 UTC.

With that, let's wrap this call up and I'd like to thank you one and all. And say goodbye for now.

EN