

SO/AC Meeting #4 (25 August @ 13:00 UTC)

Attendees:

Sub-group Members: Alan Greenberg, Avri Doria, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Christian Dawson, Farzaneh Badii, Fiona Asonga, Jorge Villa, Kavouss Arasteh, Mary Uduma, Matthew Shears, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Roaslia Morales, Steve DelBianco, Tatiana Tropina, Tom Dale (15)

Staff: Berry Cobb, Brenda Brewer, Karen Mulberry, Trang Nguyen

Apologies: Juan Alejo Peirano, John Curren, Isaac Maposa, Sebastien Bachollet

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/p2k7zaar663/>
- The audio recording is available here: <http://audio.icann.org/accountability/ccwg-accountability-25aug16-en.mp3>

Agenda

1. Welcome - Opening Remarks
 2. Review (brief) of last call #3 and any Action Items / Business Arising
 3. Discussion
 - Existing requirements for reviews of SO/AC Accountability
 - Effectiveness: community representation in SO/AC decisions and outreach
 - measuring representation
 - measuring outreach
 - Effectiveness and Transparency
 4. the work plan: Track 1: Effectiveness , Track 2. Working plan on enhancing SO/AC accountability , Track 3. MAR, Track 4. IRP
 5. AOB / Next Meeting
- Next call: 1 September 1900 UTC

Notes

Farzaneh - Review of what was discussed on last call - one was the problem statement so that the groups is clear as to what is being worked, include to whom the SO/AC is accountable to. Changes and updates and notes in the Google doc.

Steve - review of the changes made to the draft document to include comments that have been submitted on the list.. Added a new table on the organizational reviews the covers details from the AoC and bylaws.

Discussion - Kavouss raised concern with SO/AC accountability and what is being addressed by the group. Response the new table shows the SO/ACs and to whom they are accountable. Every 5 yrs every SO/AC with the exception of the GAC must undergo a review according to the bylaws, this has been required for 16 yrs. Looking at accountability and to whom the group is accountable, not just the executive team. Accountable to the concept of Users.. Questioned the use of the term accountability, as no problem with the use of the term review as its important to improve, but improvement is not accountability.

Greg - Question raised who decides who the SO/ACs are accountable to? Need to figure out what the accountability vectors are.

Farzaneh - Pointed out the text in the draft Google.doc that covers to whom the SO/ACs are accountable.

Steve - certainly within scope to further fresh out the terms and what they mean - effectiveness and accountable. Suggested some ways - can look at participation diversity, group accessible, esp. to newcomers, interest and decisions made ex. was the decision truly representative of those who did not show up.. Reviews have not defined effectiveness and accountability and it might be useful to define these terms for the bylaws.

Alan - Bylaws say review should verify if the organization is accountability to its stakeholders, words added in the new bylaws. Need to make sure that reviews in the future include accountability. Ground rules are different depending on the SO/AC, GAC construct different than other SO/ACs as they are not accountable to every government. Need to be aware that each group may be different when considering accountability and to whom. Accountable to the global group is new.. Each group is responsible for being accountable for specific interests.

Cheryl - noted the first ALAC review looked at the structure of the organization and balanced of representation by 15 person group, based on regional representation. Also looked at activities - structure of community, regional organizations, and Council representatives.

Note proposal by Mathew in chat - perhaps we can look at this more linearly - what do we mean by accountability, how do the existing SOs and ACs address accountability, how through the various reviews has this changed over time, etc.

Proposal - to highlight areas in document for comments.

Steve - word effectiveness has been part of bylaws for sometime, but not defined. Use of the term appears to be in the context that the word was used and by the specific SO/AC that it was noted.. Ex look at how effectiveness was used for/by GNSO in its reviews. May also look at accountability

Alan - may need to add disclaimer to document as need to be clear as to how using the term accountable as it may not be the same for each SO/AC. Need to define what we mean by it to move ahead.

Farzaneh - For effectiveness, considered measuring two items., representation and outreach

Noted chat from **Matthew Shears**: we then need an accepted set of criteria that could be used to measure accountability of the SOs and ACs - appropriately tailored to the ICANN space - we are jumping the gun by having discussions of representation. such a topic has to be measured against something and the AC/SOs performance - but we need criteria first

Google doc for editing and contributions is located at <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1WTRZZJ9B3Q6BHP6AIDHmoiep8NeshNpomBNM4bBXYpA/edit?ts=57ba7a43>

Documents Presented

- [Existing requirements for reviews of SO.pdf](#)
- [CCWGS2projectonSOACAccountability-reportv1.pdf](#)

Chat Transcript

Brenda Brewer: Good day all and welcome to SO/AC Subgroup Meeting #4 on 25 August 2016 @ 13:00 UTC!

Kavouss. Arasteh: Hi Brenda

Kavouss. Arasteh: Good day

Rosalía Morales: hello everyone

Brenda Brewer: hello all!

Farzaneh Badii: hi all

Steve DelBianco: Our current report doc is at <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1WTRZZJ9B3Q6BHP6AIDHmoiep8NeshNpomBNM4bBXYpA/edit?ts=57ba7a43>

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): hi everyone,

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): a

Alan Greenberg: Howdy

Tatiana Tropina: hi all

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): thx Farzi :-)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): All Good go ahead

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): Yes Thanks for the doc updates Steve and Farzi... Deems I am having some audio issues as well so will mainly type

Farzaneh Badii: yes

Tatiana Tropina:I hear echo too

Tatiana Tropina:no more echo

Rinalia Abdul Rahim:ok now

Alan Greenberg:Can we please use the speaker queue and not have a bilateral debate?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Thx Kavous here you need to refer to the external Reviews. GNSO and ALAC has done or is finishing its 2nd one already

Steve DelBianco:Exactly, Alan

Kavouss. Arasteh:Alan

Kavouss. Arasteh:Yes

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Yes Alan thanks for that clarity of our 'purpose'

Kavouss. Arasteh: Change the term

Alan Greenberg:A review is a way of measuring or estimating accountability. And it is only one part of doing that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Indeed Alan

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Thanks Greg, your point of view is also noted and we should note the options to discuss a 360 degree approach as well in our work... THANKS

Tatiana Tropina:I have a bit of déjà vu because I think Greg asked something like this already - and I agreed. Agree again.

Farzaneh Badii:we had a discussion last week on that. I will update the document on that discussion.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):we will go around things a few times at this stage I suspect Yes Tatiana

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Thx Farzi T

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Alan I assume that is a new habit

Alan Greenberg:Most definitely

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Your next then :-)

Matthew Shears:what is missing from the document and would provide a useful starting point would be to capture - similar to the table on page 4 - the language that each SO and AC has in their founding documents as to whom and for what they are accountable

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):noted Matthew Thanks

Steve DelBianco:Good point, Matthew. Not easy to find that language for every SOAC and constituent, though

Matthew Shears:I think we need that as a starting point - even there we may find that there are deficiencies

Steve DelBianco:Same as the old bylaws in that regard, Alan

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):So let's capture what we can where the language exists

Steve DelBianco:No, Alan. The language in the table was in the old bylaws too.

Steve DelBianco:Section 4. had this shall be to determine (i) whether that organization has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure, and (ii) if so, whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Well noted Alan

Steve DelBianco:and you are right that we added the bit about accountable to its constituent members

Matthew Shears:perhaps we can look at this more linearly - what do we mean by accountability, how do the existing SOs and ACs address accountability, how through the various reviews has this changed over time, etc.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):hoping we will get there Matthew :-)

Tatiana Tropina:+1 to Matt

Steve DelBianco:GNSO's first review resulted in a re-structure of GNSO Council.

Steve DelBianco:2nd review (just completed) did not recommend structural changes

Kavouss. Arasteh:Farzaneh

Kavouss. Arasteh:Effectiveness is entirely different from accountability

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):yes Steve indeed, the ALAC's 2nd one is focussed more on the structure and function(s) of the Regional constructs RALOs and the ALSes in far more detail than was done in the 1st

matthw shears:Perhaps if we start with track 2 - the Working Plan first the other pieces can be worked into it - may allow us a way forward

matthw shears:yes - that should be the way we structure the work

Alan Greenberg:Kavouss is correct in that At-Large and the ALAC is "NOT" accountable to the 4 billion users. We would not want those users to sue ICANN because we were not doing our job. But we MUST be ensure that we do our best to represent their needs.

Kavouss. Arasteh:Reviews YES.eFFECTIVENESS YES

Kavouss. Arasteh:aCCOUNTABILTY AND MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY ARE VERY COMPLEX TO DEFINE, DESCRIBE, GOVERNED AND IMPLEMENTED

Kavouss. Arasteh:Lan

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):WE ALL (I trust) agree this is complex Yes, and Matthew is proposig a way of looking at how any reviews so far have highlighted matters for our future track work

Kavouss. Arasteh:Agree with you ,but it would not be accountability as there is entity to ck whether ALAC doing its job to fully represent them. I.In fact you never could do that

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):nothing wrong with developng a disclaimer or more Alan :-)

matthw shears:Alan makes the point that we need to understand our respective sense of accountability first

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):yup

Steve DelBianco:barriers to participation might include: language, fees, travel costs, etc.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):indeed it may

matthw shears:we then need an accepted set of criteria that could be used to measure accountability of the SOs and ACs - appropriately tailored to the ICANN space - we are jumping the gun by having discussions of representation. such a topic has to be measured against something and the AC/SOs performance - but we need criteria first

Steve DelBianco:Criteria are in the bylaws, Matthew: effectiveness and accountability. Now we are trying to add specifics to those criteria

matthw shears:no mic sorry

Alan Greenberg:Hard stop on the hour. CWG-IANA

Kavouss. Arasteh:There is no need that I prepare ANY DOC.

Kavouss. Arasteh:PLS TAKE THE RECORD AND CHAT CONTENT

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):we always capture the Chat

matthw shears:thanks Steve - happy to

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):THANS ALL Bye for now

FIONA ASONGA:Bye

Tatiana Tropina:bye

jorge villa (ASO):bye!

Christian Dawson:Thanks all

Rosalia Morales:thanks bye!

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):bye We will follow the existing Master schedule I assume