

SO/AC Meeting #17 (19 January @ 05:00 UTC)

Attendees:

Sub-group Members: Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Farzaneh Badii, Greg Shatan, Jorge Villa, Julf Helsingius, Kavouss Arasteh, Seun Ojedeji, Steve DelBianco, Tom Dale (10)

Staff: Brenda Brewer, Nathalie Vergnolle

Apologies: Sebastien Bachollet, Christopher Wilkinson

*** If your name is missing from attendance or apology, please send note to acct-staff@icann.org ***

Transcript

- [Word Doc](#)
- [PDF](#)

Recording

- [Adobe Connect Replay](#)
- [mp3 Replay](#)

Agenda

0. Call Administration

1. Review of any AI's from call #16 on January 12th @1300 UTC

2. Updates: (5 min CLO/FB /SDB)

- * Input from the Survey sent to SOandAC's
- * Any Sub Team Activities since our last call

3. Discussion, current DRAFT documentations readings and review

a) Data Capture documentation of input materials from SOAC's - Methodology review and discuss, desired objectives for this track from the data capture exercise see [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1OyUsSISvrcvotPpTCSqpAr4iqz7edoyUKPQD0ef-Yj0/edit?usp=sharing\[docs.google.com\]](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1OyUsSISvrcvotPpTCSqpAr4iqz7edoyUKPQD0ef-Yj0/edit?usp=sharing[docs.google.com])

b) Overall Reporting See [https://docs.google.com/document/d/14XrP2QiGv04qNtn_EuOR3nEc6uAN2ySlpQM5f69PNi8/edit?usp=sharing\[docs.google.com\]\[docs.google.com\]](https://docs.google.com/document/d/14XrP2QiGv04qNtn_EuOR3nEc6uAN2ySlpQM5f69PNi8/edit?usp=sharing[docs.google.com][docs.google.com])

- track 1. Review and discuss time line and process for Drafting ST1 to conduct Data Capture and Develop Recommendations to improve SO and AC processes for accountability, transparency, and participation that are helpful to prevent capture.

- track 2. Evaluate the proposed "Mutual Accountability Roundtable" to assess its viability and, if viable, undertake the necessary actions to implement it. The preliminary conclusion in the doc on page 4

- track 3. Assess whether the Independent Review Process (IRP) should be applied to SO & AC activities.----- The preliminary conclusion in the doc on page 5 -----> Discussion regarding this outcome and CCWG Plenary.

4. Next Meeting and future Meeting schedule

- 26 January @ 13:00 UTC
- 02 February @ 19:00 UTC
- 09 February @ 05:00 UTC
- 16 February @ 13:00 UTC
- 02 March @ 05:00 UTC

5. AOB and review of any AI's

Notes (including relevant parts of chat):

0. Call Administration

Audio only: no participants - roll call will be taken from AC room.

No SOI updates

1. Review of any AI's from call #16 on January 12th @1300 UTC

Encourage more participants to volunteer to take part in the drafting team, as there is a lot of work and little time remaining before Copenhagen

Very close to receiving additional response from IPC

Greg Shatan: IPC response is all but final -- it's being put out for comments by membership for a couple of days and then will be submitted to this august body.

2. Updates

Limited updates, suggestion to move to 3rd item of agenda

3. Data Capture documentation of input materials from SOAC's - Methodology review and discuss, desired objectives for this track from the data capture exercise

see <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1OyUsISvrcvotPpTCSqpAr4iqz7edoyUKPQD0ef-Yj0/edit?usp=sharing>

Farzaneh presented the categories she proposes to organize the data capture documentation. We need to agree on the methodology and start implementing.

We have received responses from GNSO, ccNSO, RCC, NCUC, ISPCP, ASO, GAC and SSAC.

Only 2 GNSO subgroups have not responded: NCSG and NPOC (Registries and registrars)

Some responses are very specific, and others are more general

Farzaneh Badii: expectation is to come up with workplan for each SO/AC? or can it just be general? coming up with recommendations for each SO/AC is a very large task, I don't know if we have the means to do that.

Greg: I think that rather than customizing recommendations for each SO/AC, we should come up with best practices or overall advice, and it's up to each organization to operationalize these recommendations

Alan: each group is unique, I doubt there are going to be many similarities. We can only summarise the responses. Do the responses include a self assessment, or just reflect on facts?

Steve DelBianco: What Alan is describing satisfies our charter to "Review". But it does not meet our charter to "develop recommendations to improve processes"

Several remarks in the chat in favor of the "best practices" approach.

Steve: our initial proposal was to identify unique vs convergent mechanisms. Categorizing mechanisms as best practices is an add-on.

Steve DelBianco: Once we have described best practices, our "review" could identify AC/SOs could benefit from moving towards the best practices. THAT could be our "recommendation. that is, we compare each AC/SO against the Best Practices, and not against each other

Kavouss suggests a linear approach, ie take one question at a time in our next calls and analyze the responses to test the methodology,

Steve: if we do that, let's start with an easier question, eg the Transparency question.

Kavouss Arasteh: Steve, the easiest question may not represent the methodology to be agreed for difficult question.

Cheryl: we shall continue our plea for more volunteers to join the drafting team.

Proposed way forward: drafting team to pick 1 question to analyze in our next call.

4. Next Meeting and future Meeting schedule

- 26 January @ 13:00 UTC
- 02 February @ 19:00 UTC
- 09 February @ 05:00 UTC
- 16 February @ 13:00 UTC
- 02 March @ 05:00 UTC

Documents Presented

- [Data-Capture-Accountability.pdf](#)

Chat Transcript

Brenda Brewer: (1/18/2017 20:48) Good day all and welcome to SO/AC Accountability Subgroup Meeting #17 on 19 January 2017 @ 05:00 UTC!

Kavouss Arasteh: (20:55) Hi Brenda

Kavouss Arasteh: (20:58) vbRENDA

Julf Helsingius: (20:58) Good morning

Kavouss Arasteh: (20:59) i am disconnected from the phone

Steve DelBianco: (21:00) Kavouss -- hope you are recovering from your injury

Kavouss Arasteh: (21:00) could the operator re dial me

Brenda Brewer: (21:00) Yes, Kavouss. Will call again

Greg Shatan: (21:01) Good midnight, all.

Kavouss Arasteh: (21:03) that is done brenda tks

Brenda Brewer: (21:03) You're welcome, Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: (21:06) Dear Cheryl, GM .perhaps we should get into the business rather descing the aganeda. sorry to ask that

Greg Shatan: (21:06) IPC response is all but final -- it's being put out for comments by membership for a couple of days and then will be submitted to this august body.

Kavouss Arasteh: (21:06) describing

Kavouss Arasteh: (21:06) co chairs should also respect the time and not only the participants

Steve DelBianco: (21:08) Thanks, Greg.

Kavouss Arasteh: (21:08) sorry to say that it is just for efficiency

Kavouss Arasteh: (21:10) CO Chairs

Kavouss Arasteh: (21:11) Have you received replies from all who questioned?

Kavouss Arasteh: (21:13) those replied, did they really replied to the substance of the question or merely replied in a very general manner?

Farzaneh Badii: (21:13) some of them general. some specific answers Kavouss

Greg Shatan: (21:14) IPC's is about 10 pages....

Kavouss Arasteh: (21:14) will we achieve from the reply our objectives?

Alan Greenberg: (21:14) I may have it by our next meeting and barring that will have it prior to the following meeting.

Kavouss Arasteh: (21:15) May you pls who replied and who has not replied and whether the second opportunity to reply or no?

Steve DelBianco: (21:16) I believe the only non-replies are from Registries and registrars

Farzaneh Badii: (21:16) NCSG

Farzaneh Badii: (21:16) NPOC

Brenda Brewer: (21:17) the replies can be found on this wiki page...https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_x_IBWOAw&d=DwlCaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=kbiQDH54980u4nTPfwdloDLY6-6F24x0ArAvhdeDvvc&m=TjgzKTVEOG-4bZiEgCk7rtlKPepE421nV9B9wtT8Qk&s=Qs6BIQeOzrxm0OEWPVXBjAvA2G2GAEO6EatGCy0msE&e=

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): (21:17) I just listed them Kavous

Kavouss Arasteh: (21:17) The important issue is whether they replied as expected

Farzaneh Badii: (21:17) yes I need to update the google doc

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): (21:18) yes I believe the link has the list and the actual responses to as I s

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): (21:18) I a

Kavouss Arasteh: (21:18) pls also provide PDF as I have difficulties to read google doc.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): (21:18) a

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): (21:19) said pdf is all

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): (21:19) there

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): (21:21) sorry my tablet is being fragile and sending partially complete chat interventions apologies

Kavouss Arasteh: (21:21) Perhaps we need a working doc, in which first we table the questions and then put all replied received from the respondents

Farzaneh Badii: (21:21) transparency is listed under catagory 3

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): (21:22) Steve of course this is why we are discussing Methodology for DT2 with our group in today's call...

Farzaneh Badii: (21:22) expectation is to come up with workplan for each SO/AC?

Farzaneh Badii: (21:22) or can it just be general?

Farzaneh Badii: (21:23) but what if some dont provide answers?

Farzaneh Badii: (21:23) we leave them?

Kavouss Arasteh: (21:24) After reading the reply, would we need any further clarification if the answers are not clear

Steve DelBianco: (21:25) The bylaw for us says we are to come up with "improved processes for ... accountability, transparency, and participation"

Kavouss Arasteh: (21:25) We should be careful not to make a personal selection of reply or interpret the reply

Steve DelBianco: (21:26) May I say that we are to provide "recommendations" for each AC/SO -- but that is not as detailed as providing a workplan for each AC/SO to implement

Kavouss Arasteh: (21:27) EACH so/AC needs to assume the responsibility on the replies given

Steve DelBianco: (21:27) Farzi and I began to prepare a spreadsheet/table with all responses, and it was completely un-usable. Just too much text, and too many entities

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): (21:28) I personally had only envisaged a high level documentation / recommendations Greg. yes

Greg Shatan: (21:29) Steve, thanks for sharing that info. I can see that it would take a wall chart to capture everything.

Farzaneh Badii: (21:30) I have captured the convergence as much as I could

Farzaneh Badii: (21:30) there are some similarities and some interesting unique mechanisms

Steve DelBianco: (21:30) What Alan is describing satisfies our charter to "Review". But it does not meet our charter to "develop recommendations to improve processes"

Farzaneh Badii: (21:32) sorry I kicked myself out of the room!

Farzaneh Badii: (21:33) haha yes Steve, I am up for that! :)

Greg Shatan: (21:34) I think we can encourage each group to look at the "best practices" and determine whether they fall short.

Greg Shatan: (21:34) And what to do about it.

Steve DelBianco: (21:35) Agree with what you are describing, Farzi.

Greg Shatan: (21:35) We were not asked for "self-crit."

Farzaneh Badii: (21:35) yes best practices is a good idea

Steve DelBianco: (21:36) @Greg -- "best practices" is promising approach. Farzi's original method lends itself well to capturing common versus unique processes

Julf Helsingius: (21:38) i agree, "best practices" sounds like a good way to do it

Steve DelBianco: (21:40) Once we have described best practices, our "review" could identify AC/SOs could benefit from moving towards the best practices. THAT could be our "recommendation"

Steve DelBianco: (21:41) that is, we compare each AC/SO against the Best Practices, and not against each other

Farzaneh Badii: (21:42) oh I think I agree with you Steve. I think that's a good approach

Farzaneh Badii: (21:42) we can try it

Greg Shatan: (21:42) We should give that a try....

Greg Shatan: (21:43) And see if it gets "interesting."

Farzaneh Badii: (21:43) :)

Farzaneh Badii: (21:45) yes I agree Steve

Greg Shatan: (21:49) "Young girls they do get weary."

Greg Shatan: (21:50) Otis Redding, Try a Little Tenderness (1966).

Farzaneh Badii: (21:50) try a little tenderness

Farzaneh Badii: (21:50) oh

Greg Shatan: (21:50) Good!

Greg Shatan: (21:50) The song was from 1966. :-)

Greg Shatan: (21:51) Even I was young in 1966...

Steve DelBianco: (21:51) Guess I would suggest the easiest one: Transparency

Kavouss Arasteh: (21:54) Steve, the easiest question may not represent the methodology to be agreed for difficult question

Farzaneh Badii: (21:56) that is correct Kavouss

Farzaneh Badii: (21:57) so we have volunteers here for drafting team 1? please :))

Greg Shatan: (21:57) I think we are better off cutting our teeth on a simpler question and then seeing if we have issues when we apply the method to a more difficult question.

Kavouss Arasteh: (21:58) tHAT ANOTHER MEETING SHOULD CONCENTRATE ON "Methodology"

Greg Shatan: (21:58) A training exercise, so to speak. Let's not make our first run a marathon.

Farzaneh Badii: (21:58) yes sure. we test this and see

Steve DelBianco: (21:58) Agree, Greg. What do you think of Transparency as the first attribute to analyze?

Farzaneh Badii: (22:00) I think it's a good idea to focus on the method

Steve DelBianco: (22:00) that is precisely what we did in the last hour

Farzaneh Badii: (22:01) oh I mean next week

Farzaneh Badii: (22:01) that was great thanks, so we will test drive this method and come back!

Farzaneh Badii: (22:01) and more volunteers please

Greg Shatan: (22:01) Thank you all.

Julf Helsingius: (22:01) Thanks everybody!

Farzaneh Badii: (22:01) bye all

Greg Shatan: (22:02) Agree Steve.