

SO/AC Meeting #3 (18 August @ 05:00 UTC)

Attendees:

Sub-group Members: Alan Greenberg, Avri Doria, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Farzaneh Badii, John Curran, Jordan Carter, Julf Helsingius, Kavouss Arasteh, Mary Uduma, Samantha Eisner, Sebastien Bachollet, Seun Ojedeji, Sivasubramanian Muthusamy, Steve DelBianco, Tom Dale (14)

Observers: Stephen Deerhake

Staff: Brenda Brewer, Karen Mulberry

Apologies: Juan Alejo Peirano, Olga Cavalli

Please let Brenda know if your name has been left off the list (attendees or apologies).

Transcript

- [WORD DOC](#)
- [PDF](#)

Recording

- The Adobe Connect recording is available here: <https://icann.adobeconnect.com/p8pest9tf62/>
- The audio recording is available here: <http://audio.icann.org/accountability/ccwg-accountability-18aug16-en.mp3>

Agenda

1. Call Admin and Roll Call / Apologies (2min- Staff)
2. Welcome - Opening Remarks (3min- SDB, FB, CLO)
3. Review (brief) of last call #2 and any Action Items / Business Arising (5min- SDB, FB)
4. Discussion (25-30 min)
 - Problem statement (SD and then a discussion)
 - Clarifying concepts:
 - The accountable actors?
 - *Scenario one: Accountable to their stakeholder group
 - *Scenario two: Accountable to other SO/AC
 - *Scenario three: Accountable to the public global Internet users
 - Mechanism and Possible Frameworks for Accountability
 - * MAR: should it be discussed at this stage?
 - * Other Suggestions?
5. Discuss our work plan (5-10min- FB, SDB)
 - * Establishing various issue-specific tracks (for example track 1 problem statement and establishing actors and factors/ track 2 considering the tools to address the problems)
 - * Next Steps
6. AOB / Next Meeting (5min)

Notes

1. Presentation of the first draft of the SO/AC Accountability report prepared by the Co-Chairs. Discussion of the draft paper and suggested comments from participants on the call. Comments and proposals that had been submitted to the list were also discussed. Looked at the problem statement for the group - what the group is looking to solve.
2. Discussion of the Work plan:
 - Possible tracks to consider - problem statement, tools, issues,

Action Item

1. Suggest that edits from subgroup participants be made to the Google doc at: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1WTRZZJ9B3Q6BHP6AIDHmoiep8NeshNpomBNM4bBXpA/edit?usp=sharing>

Documents Presented

- [CCWGS2projectonSOACAccountability-reportv1.pdf](#)
- Google Doc is at <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1WTRZZJ9B3Q6BHP6AIDHmoiep8NeshNpomBNM4bBXYpA/edit?usp=sharing>

Chat Transcript

Brenda Brewer: Good day all and welcome to SO/AC Accountability Subgroup Meeting #3 on 18 August 2016 @ 05:00 UTC!

Kavouss Arasteh: Hi bRENDA

Kavouss Arasteh: dEAR chairs t

Kavouss Arasteh: The following is an extract from the general rules of procedure governing meetings

Kavouss Arasteh: The chairman shall have the general direction of all the work of the conference, and shall ensure that order is maintained at plenary meetings. The chairman shall rule on motions of order and points of order and, in particular, shall be empowered to propose that discussion on a question be postponed or closed. It shall be the duty of the chairman to protect the right of each Speaker to express its opinion freely and fully on the point at issue. The chairman shall ensure that discussion is limited to the point at issue, and MAY interrupt any speaker who departs therefrom and request such speakers to confine their remarks to the subject under discussion. During the debate, the chairman may rule that the list of Speakers wishing to take the floor be read. The chairman shall add the names of other SPEAKER which indicate that they wish to speak and may then, with the assent of the meeting, rule that the list be closed. Nevertheless, as an exceptional measure, the chairman may if finding it appropriate to do so rule that a r

Kavouss Arasteh: THERE WAS SOME ERROR

Kavouss Arasteh: HERE IT IS AGAIN

Kavouss Arasteh: The chairman shall have the general direction of all the work of the conference, and shall ensure that order is maintained at plenary meetings. The chairman shall rule on motions of order and points of order and, in particular, shall be empowered to propose that discussion on a question be postponed or closed. It shall be the duty of the chairman to protect the right of each Speaker to express its opinion freely and fully on the point at issue. The chairman shall ensure that discussion is limited to the point at issue, and MAY interrupt any speaker who departs therefrom and request such speakers to confine their remarks to the subject under discussion. During the debate, the chairman may rule that the list of Speakers wishing to take the floor be read. The chairman shall add the names of other SPEAKER which indicate that they wish to speak and may then, with the assent of the meeting, rule that the list be closed. Nevertheless, as an exceptional measure, the chairman may if finding it appropriate to do so rule that a r

Kavouss Arasteh: THESE RULES SHOULD BE APPLIED FAIRLY AND EQUALLY TO EVERY SPEAKERS AND not some specific one that is not favoured by the chair

Kavouss Arasteh: The above rules are for elected chairs

Julf Helsingius: Someone has their mic on

Kavouss Arasteh: THE CHAIR MUST ALSO BE BRIEF AND NOT NONO SPEAKER

Kavouss Arasteh: In summary every body to be treated equally .

Julf Helsingius: Could we please use the email list for procedural debates?

Kavouss Arasteh: yes

Kavouss Arasteh: Farzaneh

Kavouss Arasteh: Good time.

Kavouss Arasteh: Have you included my comments ???

Brenda Brewer: Google Doc is at <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1WTRZZJ9B3Q6BHP6AIDHmoiep8NeshNpomBNM4bBXYpA/edit?usp=sharing>

Kavouss Arasteh: Steve

Kavouss Arasteh: pls put my comprehensive comments on the screen

Kavouss Arasteh: I DO NOT WISH THE CH CHAIR STRART TO DISPUTE WITH ME

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): Kavouss you are in the que

Kavouss Arasteh: WHAT QUEUE?

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: OMG you're in the hospital, Cheryl???

Alan Greenberg: Sounds like she is recovering well!

Julf Helsingius: yes

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): YES WE WILL HAVE MUCH TO DISCUSS WHEN WE LOOK AT THE AC's and especially the GAC, but also as you point out Kavous there are complexities in the So's as well, but that is thtbasics of some of our work to Discuss

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): Thank you Kavous we have looked at your input with everyone else's and it will feed in (in good time) to our discussions

Jordan Carter (.nz): it helps the bodies be accountable to their own constituencies, by explaining and holding their work out there and sharing it with each other

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): Exactly Steve well said...

Jordan Carter (.nz): it helps develop accountability within and between ICANN actors

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): indeed Jordan

Jordan Carter (.nz): and so it does help us all hold each other accountable through the fact of having the discussion

Jordan Carter (.nz): poor performance or mistake are more likely to be heard and people asked about them

Jordan Carter (.nz): successes more likely to be celebrated

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): We need to discuss this Jordan to early for me to predict

Jordan Carter (.nz): it also is an exchange with the board and staff if memory serves

Jordan Carter (.nz): everyone can ask questions there's no proper place to ask today

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: @Jordan -- revealing what worked and did not work is more about Transparency about SOAC work. It's not creating accountability to the other SOACs

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): I agree with this approach Seb but that is why some of us like a concept of some sort of 'Sharing and Learning Framework' yet to be determined of course

Jordan Carter (.nz): I think it's not to - Willie specifically disclaims the linear model of accountability

Jordan Carter (.nz): it isn't about the SOs or ACs holding each other to account

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): You made perfect sense and had great clarity Seb despite your hour of day

Jordan Carter (.nz): it's about the whole system having a kind of conversation that buttresses and improves overall accountability through actors being more open about what has happened, exchanging views, being legitimised in asking occasionally difficult questions

Jordan Carter (.nz): everyone holding everyone to account for making ICANN work in the public interest

Jordan Carter (.nz): it's quite subtle and not direct, and shouldn't be seen as a hard edged accountability tool IMO

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: Kavouss -- I was quoting from Willie's document where he described the Mutual Accountability Roundtable. I did not say anything new

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: Perhaps the name Mutual ACCOUNTABILITY is giving us trouble here

Jordan Carter (.nz): maybe

Jordan Carter (.nz): but it is about accountability

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): I suspect so thus *me* rarely using the term since and in our last call

Jordan Carter (.nz): I guess I see it as creating a mini public sphere for ICANN in some ways

Jordan Carter (.nz): with less grandstanding than the public forum

Jordan Carter (.nz): I also don't support us getting too hung up on "who should SOs or ACs be accountable to" - it's a bit like saying voters in a democratic election should be held to account. It kind of misses the point.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: To my mind, GNSO is accountable to the entities and individuals who support and use generic TLDs

Jordan Carter (.nz): yup

Julf Helsingius: I agree

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: "SOAC Roundtable" could work

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: Brenda -- if we move to Effectiveness, please load my document and go to page 3.

Jordan Carter (.nz): but it's also about the ICANN Board and Management

Jordan Carter (.nz): the MAR is not and was never about just SOs/ACs

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: ICANN Bylaws (existing): require organizations reviews for every SOAC except the GAC.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: Here is the charge: (ii) whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness and (iii) whether that organization, council or AC is accountable to its constituencies, stakeholder groups, organizations.

Jordan Carter (.nz): why doesn't GAC get reviewed? Surely they all should

Farzaneh Badii: Jordan in the bylaws they should come up with their own mechanism

Kavouss Arasteh: Then call it overall or periodical review of SOs and ACs AND NOT MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Tom Dale (ACIG GAC Secretariat): The GAC has undertaken procedural reviews through the BGRI process, which focuses on Board-GAC interactions.

Jordan Carter (.nz): we aren't talking about that any more Kavouss

Tom Dale (ACIG GAC Secretariat): The GAC has also implemented the majority of ATRT1 and ATRT2 Recommendations.

Kavouss Arasteh: Farzaneh

Kavouss Arasteh: Pls kindly post my comments on the meetings report

Tom Dale (ACIG GAC Secretariat): Thanks

Julf Helsingius: Thanks and bye!

Mary Uduma: bye