

CCWG-Accountability
SO/AC Subgroup Meeting #33
14 Sept 2017 @ 19:00 UTC

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.

[This meeting is now being recorded]

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent, thank you very much for that. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is number 33 meeting of the support organization and advisory committee accountability subgroup meeting of the work stream 2. And it is the 14th of September at 1900 UTC.

Hopefully a few more people will join us on our call as we start at the top of the hour. But we do have a number of people and certainly sufficient to start our call already joined. Thank everybody for that.

We have at least 1 person who is only on audio. And is not in the Adobe Connect room. That is Sebastien. We have noted that. Is there anyone else that isn't in the Adobe Connect room? But only in by the telephone link? If so, let yourself be known now.

Not hearing anyone, we will assume that we can take the roll call from the Adobe Connect participants list. Is there anybody who has an [indiscernible] to the statement of interest that needs to be made?

Again not hearing anybody, we will move on to the next piece of our administration, which is where I ask you all to please when you make an intervention for the sanity of of all reading the records later, both the captioning and of course listening to the audio file, if you can make sure you state your name clearly at the beginning of your intervention. Then if you can also speak as clearly and as well placed as you can, so that the captioner can capture your words as accurately as possible. Remembering that captioning is our best effort record. And that we will also be making notes from today's call. And you will have the opportunity of course, to look at those notes as they turn up in the captioning pod. And if your system supports the description you can watch the description as it goes through.

And I want to thank everybody again for making sure that the interventions are as timely and as to the topic as possible. We will also make a suggestion as we move to wrap up if at all humanly possible today, our work on our final report for the plenary. And must receive documentation by the 20th of August if we are to complete our timeline as planned for its consideration in the plenary meeting of the 27th. So if we taking multiple interventions from people, we will after

say 2 or 3 interventions from one person, you make preference to a new speaker. Every speaker who is already said anything on a particular topic and we would ask that you do your best to keep down to a shorter time as possible. We won't put a time on things if need be we will do a 2 minute timer if need be.

With all that administration and any apologies that have gone to the list will also object noted for the file. I think that takes our purpose of today's call over as well. So I'm now going to ask if Steve and gnash gnaw they are both on the line so briefly update us on the few editorial changes that are made to the document based on last week's meeting between now and last week's meeting also looking at any of the list traffic that happened and any changes on over the list traffic.

Over to you Steve.

>> Thank you Cheryl Steve dell bee angiohere. On the last call we only made a few edits to the document to cleanup inconsistency we said there were 25 best practices and we were up to 28 or 29 and I made editises to that. And then the promise made the all of you on the last call was to circulate for broader input, the question on whether to add a good practice for term limits.

To add a good practice for term limits.

And the discussion at the end of the last call was one where we debated the merits of saying we consider term limits verses imposed term limits and I made a point that no where else in the good practices did we say it's good practice to consider something. Instead our good practices are objectively recommended as things worth doing. They are practices that are good which implies it's a good idea to implement them if they are applicable with the appropriate caveat about who gets to decides it's applicable over improvement of good be practices but they have necessarily have in NAC. So we put that out when asking a question who would support or object to good practice call an AC or SO group that practice good practices should impose term limits. I'll put that in the chat in case somebody didn't catch that. That was put out for question. We had 4 replies. Dr. Crocker came back without an opinion but a report about the degree which SSAC his group with term limits. Others disagreed but Dr. Crocker interpretation is merely an example not an interpretation.

Audrey Dora thought it should be considered and I replied to Aavri that some practices same thing I went over a minute ago. And Avri said she would support and consider. And Nigel came back and suggested that not in favor of term limits but would be okay if it said consider. And Alan green burg said he could live with consider. So we have 3 substantive replies from the entirety of the list which is long. And I would say all three of the replies could live with, consider as as opposed to impose. You know that my view is good practice should be objectively good. And 2 word consider being the verb is rather meaningless to me. So I am in interest of getting us to completion so we can close this report and get to the plenary in time, I too would support the term consider. And I'll put that back into the chat now.

So the chat now shows AC/SO/group consider term limits. That the good practice in the participation section bringing us 29 good are plan. Farzi anything to at add to the recap since our last recall.

>> FARZANEH BADI: Thank you Steve, I have nothing to add.

Cheryl.

>> SEBASTIEN: Cheryl Langdon or agreed with me and we agreed back and forth between the other raptories we agreed to maintain the integrity on very high level on what are good practice recommendations to the recommendations themselves are implementable and inherently g but in the case to try to find consensus with our group Cheryl and I are willing go along with Nigel and Allen and I think that was Avri's r's point of view.

I will stop there and I'll turn it back to you Cheryl to manage the queue.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much Steve. I appreciate that and thank you Farzi I certainly think the repertoire can agree to disagree but certainly can agree that with the appropriate language and the language on the list seemed to support going through we can find text that we can agree upon to the report that this can go to the plenary in a timely manner.

Taking a cue now I see Kavouss. First of all, I want to make sure Sebastien, if he's on mute, if he has any opinion and he's able to come off mute while he is only on audio, that he can just speak and make an intervention at any time that works for him. It is -- trying to manage Sebastien I know you're listening. If you want the make an intervention please.

>> SEBASTIEN: Thank you Cheryl.

I just am on mute and I'm driving so the sound may not be good. Sorry for that. I will agree with your [indiscernible] you mind if I say we could tweak the way we talk about that. But not the right time to do that. For me and for the group, I think it's better to good plenary please consider and therefore I will support your last officer made by the repertoire. Thank you and thank you for asking me Cheryl. I very appreciate.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No problem Sebastien this is Cheryl speaking. I traveled many hundreds of kilometers on conference call. I certainly know the challenges when one is driving. Thank you we note and I think it was captured quite accurate lose by transcription. So we have noted your opinion and that you can concur with the use of the term consider. Kavouss you have your hand up, over to you.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Excuse me, thank you very much. I have the answer very gated answer so I have no comment. Thank you.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl Langdon or for the record again. Good, thank you Kavouss. I wanted to make sure you didn't have additional comments that you wanted to say. Yes, obviously the language does say, if the AC or SO or components has any election then the term limit as term find by them is what we are referring to. But, it is important that we get our

language right and as agreed to by consensus as possible. So that we have a strongly supported set of text. In our documents as we go through to our pen e plenary.

With that, and that, I can was our major piece of change or new language that we needed to bring through very much as a, I guess as a first reading or final edit to the document. I'm just going to ask again, is there anyone on the queue who wishes to have a comment in general or on any particular part of our report?

You all have scrawling rights as any single -- we have not loaded the document we have only the agenda up at the moment. Perhaps if possible we should bring up our report document just so we know for the record that go through and double check anything at all.

We, thank you very much for that and I believe you all have scrolling rights. If you are going to make comment or intervention, if you would please let us know at the beginning of your intervention what page it is you're referring to, we can all scroll to that particular point.

Not seeing any hands being raised and I must say, Kavouss, thank you. Kavouss over to you.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, I think the question raised by Steve saying that we do need a new public comment on that. I don't think that did anything. What we have done is can clarification is not a major changes. I don't think that we need anymore public comment and it's submitted that to the committee after the readings finished here or finished all of them. So I don't think that issue there informed that we need another public comment. He could say that changes are not significant, which justify to have public comment. If everybody in our group agreed with that, would that be submitted to the plenary, thank you.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: For the record. Thank you very much for that Kavouss. That was actually the next point in our agenda that I was going the head to. But we will note that as your input now for this next agenda item that we will be moving to.

With this, the repertoires can under take to you all that as there's been no significant changes as Steve bank owe noted in the chat in the last 10 days that this final pieces of editing can be done extremely quickly. That the document as it is written with the final edit regarding the matter of recommendation good practice number 29, will be done and this will be turned around before close of business in the U.S. today. And will be in the hands of our fabulous MMSI staff. And therefore be able to get on to the plenary agenda in a timely manner and hopefully distributed to the men rein good time. Next step formerly is to do exactly as Kavouss is outlined, that is to discuss amongst ourselves and come to a consensus whether or not we believe any of these changes since our last public comment of the document and draft report are so significant that we believe they will be a required for another round of public comment. In our agendas, since we have reconvened and dealt with the input from the public comments that we received, we have had as standing agenda item, a note that indicates that in our opinion this is not the case. Let me be clear a what we are stating here. And as Kavouss has already intervened on. It is the opinion of and we have listed it on all of our agendas up until this time. Think we have reconveyance that the changes we have made as result of public impact is not, repeat, not significant enough to merit our final report requiring a second public comment.

Now I going to put that to the meeting for a oh hopefully consensus call which will confirm that view. How I'm going to put that to the meeting now is ask, is there anyone who believes that our document as a final report should be subject to a second public comment because of the significance of our edititial changes?

If you believe that, please make yourself known now.

Sebastien, if you believe that, just speak up. If.

I'm looking for h.

I hear nothing from Sebastien. I hope that's not a -- I see no hands.

Give it a another few seconds. I hear driving noises I think. That -- unmute it S>>:
SEBASTIEN we don't hear you well. Hello?

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I apologize I was waiting in silence making sure anyone that be wants to make a change can do so. I think the silence is telling. I suggest we do have a consensus on the fact that we do not believe that our document should be requiring another round of public comments. And with that, particular relief, I must say, on my accident. With that particular consensus for completed, I am unaware if there was any other business in required for the finalization of our documentation. If there is anybody who believes anything more needs to be done, please say so now.

Kavouss, you believe something more needs to be done as we finalize, please gentlemen ahead.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes Cheryl I'm sorry, is this our first reading or second reading. I lost the choice of this because there's so many meetings. Is it -- was it the first reading or second reading?

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Kavouss, Cheryl Langdon or for the record here. I think it's the umpteen reading in some ways. But it's certainly the second and final reading. The is only new text that was a minor he had coal change and I think we all agree with it is the discussed terms from last week and the condition of consensus based on the -- not consensus, on consider in the term limits good practice number 29 as was proposed during the list traffic and confirmed today. This is a final reading. And it will result in a document that will be going for plenary consideration at its meeting on the 27th of September.

If this is the -- if we are in agreement now, this will be the completion of our reporting. And our work in creating a report for the plenary. Obviously, the plenary can in fact may send it back to us for dish work.

This is a milestone. Not an ending.

Okay?

Steve, over to you and then back to Kavouss.

Today thank you Cheryl. This is Steve DelBianco. To clarify I believe we are going to be sending three documents to the plenary for the 20th of September. The documents are the

updated report, I have already made the changes, draft 3.3. The second would be a red line, comparing that to what the plenary last approved in May. And the third document, would be our response to public comments, so that long table, color coded columns we all put together in the last several weeks.

So I hope that covers it. If anyone has other suggestions let us know. But that would be the package I would put together. And your repertoires then, consult the notes to know what the transmittal email would look like. In other words, we describe the quantity of meetings that were held, the notion that we do not believe it was significant changes to report to merit another round of public comment and we would report a consensus report for both public comment response as well as the updated report itself. So Cheryl I'm taking that as our marching orders for repertoires and staff, unless anyone else has other point of view. Thank you.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Steve. Cheryl Langdon are or for the record. That's my understanding of the work in front of the repertoires. Obviously the plenary in receipt of itself package from us would be then be considering final reports and associated documentation for their first reading. And as I stated it might very well be that the plenary may make some suggestions and changes and send something back to us. If that's the case we will convene meeting and we will get on with the job of doing that. But it would be going to plenary as our final package of reporting for their plenary first consideration.

Kavouss over to you, Steve I'm assuming that hand is still up I'll come back if need be Kavouss.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes Cheryl I think if you have finished a session on this issue send something back to us. Which I don't hope so. I don't believe there is. But let me take this opportunity saying that our meeting have high and low situation. This is skilled with other. We argue with each other. We exchange views sometimes. I live with more than was what is necessary. But in fact this is the time that although I make it a plenary to express our deep and sincere appreciation to the co chairs starting from you over to your patients. Competitors and sometime the ruling sometimes in the -- commander and so on and so forth to receive a very, very competent devotion of [indiscernible] so much work and so much energy and to far Sanative who prepared so many documents in discussing so perhaps I could speak because of my senior or the in age and behalf of people in this meeting or other call that except all these additional. So ICANN staff Brenda, all with us all coming in finding out what to do. And Bernie always keeping the time saying about the hours. You have 2 minutes, you have 5 minutes. Thank you very much for all. That was a very, very good constructive meeting and good collaboration and good collective efforts for this report which I am sure that will serve the purposes which we are exposing about. And provided the community a good way how the use this good practice. Very applicable. Thank you.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl Langdon or for the record. Thank you very much Kavouss. I'm sure I speak on behalf of all of the repertoires in this group, and on Farzaneh already changed you in chat we do deeply appreciate your comments today. And I'm very glad to have them in the record. I think that I can also speak on behalf of them when I say, I think this work group was certainly some of my timeline has been extended a little longer than I had

ideally hoped it would. We have worked quite robustly at times, as you said, but very effectively and efficiently as best we can under the circumstances to bring things very close to our planned timeline in everything we have done to date. What you described of course is simply a healthy system at [indiscernible] and multi-stakeholder consensus model that is building consensus amongst often a variety of views. And it is a part of what makes ICANN interesting, sometimes occasionally challenging but you would say ultimately rewarding.

To that I understand, obviously I wasn't planning on wrapping up just yet so I don't want to start a whole round of most humble thanks between everybody. We may very well end up reconvened if the plenary do come back. But it is, I think, well noted that we have had a few very consistent and highly contributed members that should be noted and I think we will note formerly the two to the plenary particular thanks for those of you from our much larger number of members on our list traffic on our list who have been consistent contributors and if I look down today participants I'm pretty well sure I see most of you if not all of you there. So we will deal with that when we get to plenary. But thank you for yours thanks and I note others agreeing in the chat.

So, as we wish to finish today's agenda and in a perfect world we could do so allowing a shorter than planned meeting. With that we have had a excellent description of the package of goods that will be now created by the repertoires and go obviously copy to our list and off to the staff to give to normal processes inclusion for plenary documentation on the 27th. We have no other meetings planned at this stage. If indeed the plenary does require us to reconvene, and to take care of any particular business, we will do so. We will advertise the dates that are available and times on our usually rotation that are available. And we will reconvene later in our -- in the life of the total CCWG, if need be.

So yes it is a possibility that while we take a formal break from today's call, from regular meetings scheduled that this may be the last time we meet in teleconference mode. It might be the last time we meet per say of course because we will be meeting in the plenary and we will also be meeting in and reporting to the face-to-face meeting that is coming up at 16th in abwould you do. So with that, can I assure you Kavouss that I will, as I always do, go through the normal things at the wrap up of any meeting. But before we do that, I will be calling for any other business? Is there any other business? Other than our normal courtesies that right at the end of the meeting. That anyone wishes to raise on today's call?

I'll wait a minute.

Not hearing any one making an intervention. And not seeing any hands, let's wrap up today's call now. And as I bring this meeting to a close, I wanted to obviously make my usually thanks but with a little extra special asterisk on the side of it, to everybody who has attended today's call. I really do and Steve and Farzi and I really do appreciate the stoic work that those of you who are regulars our call group has put in the process and development of that documentation. It is something that we do deeply appreciate.

I also would like to formally thank the fantastic support we get from our ICANN staff and particular something that is of any recent time thank our captioners for their enormous value they

have contributed to our record taking. And our ability to, in my case, when audio is not always good, be able to follow what is being said by people. In many cases, when the listen to more clarity in what they have articulated being a huge. And we really do appreciate it and I would like the thank someone who is interested in the ability of what ICANN does and how easily people in all circumstances can contribute that this captioning will be something we will see as standard in just about every online meeting.

With that said, I think we will wrap up our thanks and wrap up our meeting and stop the recording. And look forward to meeting